United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 154 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 13, 2008 No. 43

House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.m.

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

Eternal Source of life and human freedom, unite those here present with all the Members of the United States House of Representatives in this moment of prayer.

Help them to be fully engaged in their work today as they shape laws that will make this country stronger in integrity and solidarity.

Inspire them to reach out with policies of compassion to those most in need of society's concern.

May our military sons and daughters be protected from harm and remain focused on doing what is right and just.

Assist the poor and the sick, especially those who are disabled or uninsured.

By Your love and presence, claim us as Your very own, both now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DENT 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.

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR THE BRAVE AND FALLEN MEMBERS OF THE U.S. MILITARY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, as we prepare to mark the 5-year anniversary of the war in Iraq, I would like to take a moment and offer a moment of silence for the brave and the fallen, including 19 members of my unit, the 82nd Airborne Division, who never made it home.

On this somber occasion, we are united behind our troops. We honor the memories of thousands, and we pledge our support for those still fighting for our freedom.

The SPEAKER. All Members will stand and observe a moment of silence.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3547

Mr. GALLEGLY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 3547.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 10 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

COMMEMORATING THE 90TH BIRTHDAY OF AN AMERICAN HERO, MR. JAMES W. MURDY OF ALLENTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA

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

Mr. DENT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 90th birthday of an American hero, my constituent, Mr. James W. Murdy.

James Murdy wanted to serve his country in the United States military and learn a trade. He joined the Navy in 1940 and soon thereafter served as an electrician aboard the USS *Helena*, a St. Louis-class light cruiser stationed at Pearl Harbor. On December 7, 1941, shortly after James began serving on the *Helena*, the ship was hit by a torpedo dropped by a lone Japanese torpedo plane. Thankfully, James Murdy survived the attack that killed 20 of his fellow sailors.

James Murdy then attended the Naval Mine Warfare School and worked as a minesweeper for the next 3 years. He was honorably discharged from the Navy in 1946 after achieving the rank of chief electrician's mate, the highest rank he could obtain as an enlisted man.

Shortly after being discharged from the Navy, James wed Mary Robb, with whom he had three children; James Murdy, Rosemary Murdy-Haber, and Patricia Murdy-Cressman. He still lives in Allentown, Pennsylvania and loves rebuilding or constructing items from scratch and being called upon to speak about his experiences at Pearl Harbor. He is an ardent fan of the Philadelphia Phillies and Eagles and loves spending time with his family, including his granddaughter and stepgranddaughter.

Mr. Murdy served our county with valor and distinction, and we should honor his service, his dedication, and his allegiance to our great Nation. It is my honor to join with his many friends

Printed on recycled paper.

and family in celebrating the 90th birthday of this wonderful man.

DEMOCRATIC BUDGET IS FISCALLY RESPONSIBLE BUT ALSO FUNDS CRITICAL PRIORITIES

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

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, today we continue debate on the Democratic budget that boosts economic growth and restores fiscal responsibility. While the Bush administration's budget priorities and policies are responsible for the largest fiscal deterioration in our Nation's history, the 2009 Democratic budget is not only balanced by 2012, but it also invests in our Nation's top priorities.

We reject the President's budget proposal because it creates a $396 billion deficit this year, while cutting funding for Medicaid and Medicare, veterans and homeland security. Our budget rejects the President's cuts and instead fully invests in Medicare and Medicaid, so that the most vulnerable amongst us, our children and our seniors, continue to have access to healthcare assistance.

We also reject the President's proposal to add more than $18 billion, billion with a B, over the next 5 years in new fees for our veterans and military retirees.

We reject the President's attempt to eliminate several State and local law enforcement programs, including the successful COPS, Community Oriented Policing Services program, which has put more police on the street to help reduce crime.

CALLING FOR AN IMMEDIATE VOTE ON THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT

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

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, the Protect America Act expired on February 16. It has been almost a full month since the majority allowed this important element of our national security to lapse.

President Lincoln once told this Nation, ''A house divided against itself cannot stand.'' Madam Speaker, for this past month, Democratic leadership has needlessly attempted to divide this Congress on a national security matter. A bipartisan majority of this House wants to adopt the Senate version of the bill to restore our intelligence teams' ability to protect us, but we have been denied a chance to even vote on the Senate measure.

The leadership has kept this House divided, and for what reason? This morning the newspapers are full of reports that we are jeopardizing our national security in order to benefit the trial lawyers, who stand to gain billions of dollars in suits against the telecommunications companies. These are the companies that reportedly responded to pleas from our government for help, and now they are subject to potentially crippling lawsuits.

A house divided against itself cannot stand. The people of this great Nation expect bipartisan action, and the time is long overdue to come together.

□ 1045

IN MEMORY OF ALDO TATANGELO

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

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize a man that made a significant impact on my hometown of Laredo, former Mayor Aldo Tatangelo.

Mayor Tatangelo passed away last Friday, but not before leaving a mark on our great city. Mayor Aldo Tatangelo served as mayor in Laredo from 1978 to 1990. He is remembered by those closest to him as being a man of honesty and fairness, a man with a vision to improve the city that he loved so much.

Immediately upon taking over as mayor, Tatangelo ordered taking care of a lot of services for Laredo, including the restructuring of the city's Public Works Department, oversaw comprehensive drainage projects, established a pension system for city workers, and created many departments to make sure that the quality of life was improved.

Mayor Aldo Tatangelo pushed for affordable housing for low-income residents, and he also, when he left the office, was active in civic affairs and encouraged young people to get involved in public service.

I rise to recognize a Laredo hero, former Mayor Aldo Tatangelo, and thank him and his family for the great work that they did.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF CHINCOTEAGUE, VIRGINIA

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

Mrs. DRAKE. Madam Speaker, I am delighted to rise in tribute to the town of Chincoteague, Virginia, which is celebrating its 100th birthday today.

Since its founding one century ago, Chincoteague has enamored citizens and visitors alike with its small town charm and pristine natural beauty. This is no small feat if you consider just how much has changed in the past few 100 years.

As we commemorate Chincoteague's proud history and rich traditions, we must acknowledge its roots as a small fishing village. Today, thousands of people still flock to Chincoteague each year to share in its bountiful shores and the abundance of nearby wildlife. Chincoteague should serve as an example of a happy coexistence between people and nature.

From Chincoteague's annual pony roundup to the annual seafood festival, even the simple everyday beauty of its sunsets, the town of Chincoteague is truly a unique community which has come a long way without letting time erode its proud heritage.

That is why I ask my colleagues to join me today in wishing the town of Chincoteague a happy 100th birthday.

LET US SPEAK OUT FOR PEACE

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Madam Speaker, we are at the fifth anniversary of the war in Iraq, a war based on lies. A war that has cost the lives of over 4,000 of our brave young men and women, the injuries to tens of thousands, over 1 million innocent Iraqis have perished, a cost of up to $3 trillion.

Let us speak out for peace, as the Winter Soldiers today are speaking out for peace by communicating the truth of a soldier's experience in Iraq and Afghanistan. Let us speak out for peace as the young people involved in the Stop Loss project are doing. Let us speak out for peace and stop financing this war and use the money to bring our troops home.

Let us speak out for peace, for international peacekeepers to move into Iraq as our troops lead. America has had a long period of silence about this war. Let us be silent no more. Let us speak out for peace.

OUTSOURCING NATIONAL DEFENSE

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, the next Air Force plane that you will see in the air will be branded with ''Made in France'' on the side of it. Not only France but Spain, Germany, and the United Kingdom will be making 170 or more of the new Air Force supertankers built by that European subsidized company, Airbus.

This $40 billion contract will rob thousands of workers of Boeing Company of their jobs. Why is our Air Force outsourcing national defense to the Europeans, of all people? Aren't they the ones that take every opportunity to bash our U.S. military?

The Air Force is trying to do damage control by saying the Airbus is better than the Boeing plane.

Madam Speaker, that dog just won't hunt. U.S.-built planes have been successfully defending our skies and our homeland since before World War II. We are not talking about outsourcing some cheap Wal-Mart product that's made in China. We are talking about outsourcing sensitive military equipment. Some things should always be made in America, by Americans, for Americans.

What's next? Is the Air Force going to outsource those airplane crews with the French as well?

And that's just the way it is.

AVOID MILITARY CONFRONTATION WITH IRAN

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Madam Speaker, any voice of reason inside the current administration is a voice in the wilderness, a voice that will be silenced by the President, all of which should be a matter of grave urgency for the American people.

The administration has set its sights on military confrontation with Iran. Just like Iraq, any voice of reason will not be merely muffled; it will be silenced.

Remember Colin Powell? Where is he? Remember General Shinseki? He was drummed out for speaking truth to power about what it would really take to win in Iraq.

Now Admiral Fallon, the Secretary of Defense, wouldn't return phone calls until the Admiral got the message to turn in his resignation because he questioned the President's policy toward Iran.

The President's foreign policy is open hostility and a finger on the trigger looking for any provocation for a military strike against Iran. That's what the neocons want; that's what co-President DICK CHENEY wants.

Their thirst for oil is matched only by their thirst for war. They think the U.S. will dominate the world with military confrontation. They are the only ones who believe that. We must keep the pressure on to ensure the President does not launch another war. Four thousand have already died.

That's enough.

THE HIGH SPRINGS FARMERS MARKET

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

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the contributions of High Springs Farmers Market, which is in my congressional district.

It was established in 2001. The market provides local growers with an opportunity to sell their products directly to consumers and to provide area residents with high quality, fresh produce and other farm products at affordable prices.

This market then has encouraged and assisted local residents to grow fresh produce through a community garden program, and it provides training and entrepreneurial opportunities for the new growers. By promoting local Florida products, this market allows traditional farmers to sell in today's competitive market.

In addition, the High Spring Farmers Market is the first and only market in the State of Florida to accept food stamps, providing high-quality, fresh food to those who otherwise could not afford it.

I am grateful for the market's dedication to the entrepreneurial spirit and am proud to have it in my district. Congratulations to them and keep up the great work.

COLORECTAL CANCER AWARENESS

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

Mr. BOREN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of access to colorectal cancer screening for all Americans. The month of March is Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month.

Like far too many other Americans, my life has been touched by cancer. Nine years ago I lost my mother, Janna, to colon cancer. I understand too well the importance of catching this type of cancer early. Colorectal cancer is one of the leading killers in the United States that will this year unnecessarily take the lives of almost 50,000 of our constituents nationwide.

This is a tragedy because we have every tool necessary to prevent the suffering and death from this disease. Only 22 States and the District of Columbia have protections in place to provide access to screening and early detection procedures for colorectal cancer. This is unacceptable. Lifesaving tests that are widely available and reliable should be accessible to each and every one of our constituents.

Please join me in recognizing Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month and the importance of making early detection of this disease a priority.

FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WAR IN IRAQ

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

Mr. PENCE. Madam Speaker, on this fifth anniversary of the war in Iraq being commemorated in the Capitol today, the statistics tell the tale.

Because of the military surge and Sunni cooperation, we are making significant progress towards stability and freedom in Iraq. Violence is down nationwide by more than 60 percent in the last year.

But as the saying goes, seeing is believing, and thanks to the miracle of youtube.com, Americans can join me for a walk down the streets of Haditha, Iraq, in the heart of al Anbar province. On March 2, with a military security detail and our bipartisan delegation, we walked the streets of this war-torn city, and I posted 15 minutes of unedited interviews with local Iraqis on youtube.com.

The fight is far from over, but we are making significant progress in Iraq. Thanks to youtube.com, the American people can hear and see that progress for themselves.

HONORING KAREN BASS

(Ms. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. RICHARDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the newly elected Speaker of the California State Assembly, the Honorable Karen Bass. It is with great pleasure that I applaud her accomplishments and wish her future much success.

At the end of this legislative year, Karen Bass will break historic glass ceilings in California and across this Nation by becoming the first African American woman Speaker of the State legislative body.

Speaker-elect Karen Bass, who is respected on both sides of the aisle, received unanimous support. Throughout her career, her public service and social justice has been something that she commonly really used not only in her community but now in her service. In 1990, Speaker-elect Bass founded the Community Coalition for Substance Abuse, Prevention and Treatment. She served as its executive director for 14 years. After the 1992 civil unrest, her organization played a pivotal role in the success of South Los Angeles.

Speaker-elect Bass turned to politics when she concluded that the best way to implement change would be to be an elected official herself. At the time of her election, there were no other African American women serving in the California Legislature. She was immediately appointed majority whip, and now she serves as majority leader.

Please join me in congratulating her as we wish her tremendous success.

THE PRICE OF OIL

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, energy security is national security. When President Bush was sworn into office, a barrel of crude oil was approximately $27 a barrel. When the Democrats took over the House, the price of a barrel of crude oil was $58, a $31 increase.

Since this Democrat-controlled House has been in power, the price of a barrel of crude oil has gone from $35 to today $110 a barrel of crude oil.

Now, what's the solution? The solution is more supply. Democrats continue to block Outer Continental Shelf exploration. They continue to block oil exploration. They continue to block coal-to-liquid technologies.

More supply brings lower prices. If you know basic economics supply and demand, you know that if you have a high demand you need more supply.

Until we bring more supply back into this debate, the only thing we could

tell our consumers and our constituents is be prepared for more price spikes. Energy security is national security.

HONORING OTTO SCHNELLBACHER AND THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

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

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Madam Speaker, I rise today because earlier this week the House passed H.R. 948 to recognize the University of Kansas football team on their astonishing accomplishments of the last season and their victory at the Orange Bowl.

I also rise this morning with great sadness because just this Monday KU lost one of its great all-time athletes. Otto Schnellbacher was an all-American who, in 1948, led KU to its very first Orange Bowl appearance. He was a wide receiver whose career 58 catches was a record for almost three decades. As a professional athlete, he played in both the NFL and the NBA.

This man was an American and an astonishing athlete. Otto was a giant of Kansas athletics. He was a very good friend. He leaves behind many admirers and a legacy that will last forever.

To the University of Kansas, congratulations again on a historic season. To Otto Schnellbacher, we will miss you. To his widow, Jane, God be with you.

THE BUDGET

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

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, we are voting later today on the Democrat budget.

I am not surprised that it represents larger government and higher taxes. That is the type of government our friends on the other side of the aisle generally prefer. I am surprised, however, that at a time when our economy is shaky and American families are making difficult budget decisions at their kitchen table, that our friends have chosen not to make the difficult decisions necessary to craft a responsible budget.

Their proposal represents what will be the largest tax increase in American history; $683 billion in increased taxes. It is nothing short of irresponsible to simply ignore the coming fiscal crisis, a tsunami, represented by increased spending and entitlement programs.

Perhaps if our friends on the other side of the aisle would ask their constituents what they think, they would hear what I heard from a constituent named Debra in Pennsylvania who said she is working two jobs to pay taxes and oil bills. She said, ''There is no way I can afford to pay more taxes. Enough is enough.''

Well said, Debra.

□ 1100

SUPPORT DEMOCRATIC BUDGET

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

Mr. KAGEN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express in the strongest terms possible my opposition to President Bush's proposed budget for 2009, a budget that simply does not reflect our traditional American values. The Republican budget would sink us deeper into debt and will destroy Medicare and Medicaid as we know them. Everything, everything the President says he is, he is not. And with the help of his party, the President is doing what Germany and Japan could not do in World War II, destroying our Nation.

The question America voters must ask is: Whose side are we on? Does anyone in this Chamber seriously intend to cut Community Service Block Grants, Community Oriented Policing, the Centers for Disease Control, NIH, the FAA, and Social Service Block Grants? These are essential people-oriented programs that serve as our Nation's social safety net, and we must invest in them.

Join me in supporting the Democratic budget. Let's invest our hard-earned tax dollars right here at home in America based upon our traditional American values.

FISA: FACT VERSUS FICTION

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

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, President Bush and the congressional Republicans refuse to face the facts on the expiration of the President's Protect America Act, and instead continue their false and misleading scare tactics that are not productive and will do nothing to protect our Nation.

Republicans continue to claim that the expiration of the Protect America Act has reduced our ability to conduct surveillance. That is false, and Republicans know it. They know that the Protect America Act gave the intelligence community authorization for one full year, meaning that they are all still in effect until August of this year.

If Republicans really believed that the expiration of the act would jeopardize our national security, why did every single Republican Member of this body vote against a 21-day extension of the act last month?

Washington Republicans can't have it both ways. Rather than resorting to political games, congressional Republicans should have joined bicameral negotiations that were conducted for several weeks to develop a strong compromise bill. It is time that the Republicans get off the sidelines and work with our Congress. Let's see this legislation come to the floor today.

DEMOCRATS' FISA BILL PROTECTS AMERICA

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

Mr. ARCURI. Madam Speaker, later today the House will have an opportunity to vote on a strong new FISA bill that has been negotiated over the last couple of weeks.

The new legislation will modernize the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. First, it rejects the President's plan to provide blanket immunity to telecom companies who turned over information about their customers. Instead, it gives the Federal court the exclusive opportunity to hear clear classified evidence in order to make a determination whether telecom companies should be held liable for their actions.

Our legislation also requires a special bipartisan commission to investigate the Bush administration's use of wiretaps and other surveillance programs. The commission would be similar to the bipartisan 9/11 Commission that played a critical role in reviewing the events leading up to 9/11 and developing recommendations on how to best protect our Nation.

Madam Speaker, House Democrats are hopeful that Republicans will join us in supporting a FISA bill that protects our Nation and our civil liberties.

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)1 of rule IX, I hereby notify the House of my intention to offer a resolution as a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of my resolution is as follows:

H. RES. —

Whereas on December 11, 2007, a bipartisan group of 21 State attorneys general wrote to Senate Majority Leader Reid and Senate Minority Leader McConnell regarding the FISA Amendments Act of 2007 (S. 2248);

Whereas this bipartisan group of State attorneys general represents the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin;

Whereas the State attorneys general stated that protecting communications carriers from ''unprecedented legal exposure is essential to domestic and national security. State, local and federal law enforcement and intelligence agencies rely heavily on timely and responsive assistance from communications providers and other private parties; indeed, this assistance is utterly essential to the agencies' functions. If carriers and other parties run the risk of facing massive litigation every time they assist the government or law enforcement, they will lack incentives to cooperate, with potentially devastating consequences for public safety'';

Whereas on February 5, 2008, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation testified before the Senate Select Committee on

Intelligence that ''in protecting the homeland . . . it's absolutely essential we have the support, willing support of the communications carriers'';

Whereas in the same hearing, Director Mueller further stated ''[m]y concern is that if we do not have this immunity, we will not have that willing support of the communications carriers'';

Whereas on March 4, 2008, a bipartisan group of 25 State attorneys general wrote to the Speaker of the FISA Amendments Act of 2007;

Whereas this bipartisan group of State attorneys general represents the States of Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Maryland, Michigan, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, and West Virginia;

Whereas the State attorneys general stated they ''are our states' chief law enforcement officials and therefore responsible for taking whatever action is necessary to keep our citizens safe'';

Whereas the State attorneys general also stated ''[a] bipartisan majority of the United States Senate recently approved S. 2248. But until it is also passed by the House of Representatives, intelligence officials must obtain FISA warrants every time they attempt to monitor suspected terrorists in overseas countries. Passing S. 2248 would ensure our intelligence experts are once again able to conduct real-time surveillance. As you know, prompt access to intelligence data is critical to the ongoing safety and security of our nation.'';

Whereas on February 12, 2008, after passage of S. 2248, the Senate amended the bill H.R. 3773 with the text of S. 2248 and sent the amended bill back to the House for its consideration;

Whereas the State attorneys general concluded that with ''S. 2248 still pending in the House of Representatives, our national security is in jeopardy.'';

Whereas all Members of the House of Representatives have a responsibility to provide the intelligence community and Federal law enforcement with all the necessary and appropriate tools to keep Americans and the homeland safe;

Whereas all Members of the House of Representatives have a responsibility to ensure they are not impeding the efforts of State and local law enforcement to use all the necessary and appropriate tools to keep Americans and the homeland safe;

Whereas according to the calendar distributed to Members by the House majority, the House of Representatives is scheduled to be in recess during the two-week period beginning on March 17, 2008; and

Whereas it would bring discredit to the House of Representatives to adjourn for two weeks without considering the amendments to H.R. 3773 now pending before the House: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) should immediately consider a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 3773; and

(2) should not adjourn for the Easter District Work Period prior to consideration of a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 3773.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House and offer the resolution just noticed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER). The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. —

Whereas on December 11, 2007, a bipartisan group of 21 State attorneys general wrote to Senate Majority Leader Reid and Senate Minority Leader McConnell regarding the FISA Amendments Act of 2007 (S. 2248);

Whereas this bipartisan group of State attorneys general represents the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Kansas, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, Washington, and Wisconsin;

Whereas the State attorneys general stated that protecting communications carriers from ''unprecedented legal exposure is essential to domestic and national security. State, local and federal law enforcement and intelligence agencies rely heavily on timely and responsive assistance from communications providers and other private parties; indeed, this assistance is utterly essential to the agencies' functions. If carriers and other parties run the risk of facing massive litigation every time they assist the government or law enforcement, they will lack incentives to cooperate, with potentially devastating consequences for public safety'';

Whereas on February 5, 2008, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation testified before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence that ''in protecting the homeland . . . it's absolutely essential we have the support, willing support of the communications carriers'';

Whereas in the same hearing, Director Mueller further stated ''[m]y concern is that if we do not have this immunity, we will not have that willing support of the communications carriers'';

Whereas on March 4, 2008, a bipartisan group of 25 State attorneys general wrote to the Speaker of the FISA Amendments Act of 2007;

Whereas this bipartisan group of State attorneys general represents the States of Alabama, Alaska, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Maryland, Michigan, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, and West Virginia;

Whereas the State attorneys general stated they ''are our states' chief law enforcement officials and therefore responsible for taking whatever action is necessary to keep our citizens safe'';

Whereas the State attorneys general also stated ''[a] bipartisan majority of the United States Senate recently approved S. 2248. But until it is also passed by the House of Representatives, intelligence officials must obtain FISA warrants every time they attempt to monitor suspected terrorists in overseas countries. Passing S. 2248 would ensure our intelligence experts are once again able to conduct real-time surveillance. As you know, prompt access to intelligence data is critical to the ongoing safety and security of our nation.'';

Whereas on February 12, 2008, after passage of S. 2248, the Senate amended the bill H.R. 3773 with the text of S. 2248 and sent the amended bill back to the House for its consideration;

Whereas the State attorneys general concluded that with ''S. 2248 still pending in the House of Representatives, our national security is in jeopardy.'';

Whereas all Members of the House of Representatives have a responsibility to provide the intelligence community and Federal law enforcement with all the necessary and appropriate tools to keep Americans and the homeland safe;

Whereas all Members of the House of Representatives have a responsibility to ensure they are not impeding the efforts of State and local law enforcement to use all the necessary and appropriate tools to keep Americans and the homeland safe;

Whereas according to the calendar distributed to Members by the House majority, the House of Representatives is scheduled to be in recess during the two-week period beginning on March 17, 2008; and

Whereas it would bring discredit to the House of Representatives to adjourn for two weeks without considering the amendments to H.R. 3773 now pending before the House: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) should immediately consider a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 3773; and

(2) should not adjourn for the Easter District Work Period prior to consideration of a motion to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 3773.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Georgia wish to be heard on whether the resolution constitutes a question of the privileges of the House?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I do, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, we are now 27 days, 27 days into a unilateral disarmament. We are not doing our job in the House of Representatives. We are not fulfilling our oath, and we are not protecting the American people. This brings discredit on the House of Representatives.

□ 1115

The underlying bill simply allows the American intelligence community to make certain that they are able to listen or surveil on terrorists in a foreign land speaking to another terrorist or suspected terrorist in a foreign land.

My constituents don't understand why the House isn't acting on this. They believe the House is bringing discredit on the Nation. Americans don't understand.

The Senate has acted responsibly. It is imperative that the majority of the House be given an opportunity to vote on this issue. The majority of the House has said that they would pass this bill. Not bringing this bill to the floor for a vote brings discredit and abrogates our responsibility as Representatives of the United States of America.

I urge the Speaker and I urge my colleagues to allow this to come to the floor for a vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair ruled on March 11, 2008, under the precedents recorded in section 702 of the House Rules and Manual, the resolution addresses a legislative sentiment and not a question of the privileges of the House.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the

Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I move that the appeal be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by a 5-minute vote on approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 192, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 135]

YEAS—222

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

NAYS—192

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carnahan
Carter
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)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
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
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Boustany
Cubin
Hooley
Hunter
Issa
LaHood
Oberstar
Rangel
Renzi
Ruppersberger
Rush
Tancredo
Udall (CO)
Woolsey
Young (AK)

□ 1141

Messrs. COSTELLO and ALTMIRE changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 183, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]

YEAS—222

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman

Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—183

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Altmire
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carney
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
English (PA)
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Goode
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Lamborn
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Souder
Stearns
Stupak
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Gohmert

NOT VOTING—23

Blackburn
Boustany
Cubin
DeGette
Hooley
Hunter
Issa
Jordan
Kline (MN)
LaHood
Linder
McCollum (MN)
Oberstar
Pitts
Rangel
Renzi
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sullivan
Tancredo
Udall (CO)
Woolsey
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1149

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1036 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 312.

□ 1150

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 further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 312) revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2010 through 2013, with Mr. PASTOR (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, March 12, 2008, all time for general debate had expired.

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

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 312

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008 is revised and replaced and that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2009, including appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2010 through 2013.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2009.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 301. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for SCHIP legislation.
Sec. 302. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for veterans and servicemembers.
Sec. 303. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for education benefits for servicemembers, veterans, and their families.
Sec. 304. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for infrastructure investment.
Sec. 305. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for renewable energy and energy efficiency.
Sec. 306. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for middle-income tax relief and economic equity.
Sec. 307. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for reform of the alternative minimum tax.
Sec. 308. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for higher education.
Sec. 309. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for affordable housing.
Sec. 310. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for medicare improvements.
Sec. 311. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for health care quality, effectiveness, and efficiency.
Sec. 312. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for Medicaid and other programs.
Sec. 313. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for trade adjustment assistance and unemployment insurance modernization.
Sec. 314. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for county payments legislation.
Sec. 315. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for San Joaquin River restoration and Navajo Nation water rights settlements.
Sec. 316. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for the National Park Centennial Fund.
Sec. 317. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for child support enforcement.

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 401. Program integrity initiatives.
Sec. 402. Oversight of government performance.
Sec. 403. Point of order against advance appropriations.
Sec. 404. Overseas deployments and emergency needs.
Sec. 405. Budgetary treatment of certain discretionary administrative expenses.
Sec. 406. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 407. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.
Sec. 408. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE V—POLICY

Sec. 501. Policy on middle-income tax relief.
Sec. 502. Policy on defense priorities.

TITLE VI—SENSE OF THE HOUSE

Sec. 601. Sense of the House on the Innovation Agenda and America Competes Act.
Sec. 602. Sense of the House on servicemembers' and veterans' health care and other priorities.
Sec. 603. Sense of the House on homeland security.
Sec. 604. Sense of the House regarding long-term fiscal reform.
Sec. 605. Sense of the House regarding waste, fraud, and abuse.
Sec. 606. Sense of the House regarding extension of the statutory pay-as-you-go rule.
Sec. 607. Sense of the House on long-term budgeting.
Sec. 608. Sense of the House regarding the need to maintain and build upon efforts to fight hunger.
Sec. 609. Sense of the House regarding affordable health coverage.
Sec. 610. Sense of the House regarding pay parity.
Sec. 611. Sense of the House regarding subprime lending and foreclosures.
Sec. 612. Sense of House regarding the importance of child support enforcement.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $1,879,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,027,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,205,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,442,025,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,669,315,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,771,740,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be adjusted are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $0.
Fiscal year 2009: −$70,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $23,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $14,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $16,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $17,000,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $2,556,254,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,529,246,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,564,161,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,698,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,740,065,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,866,862,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $2,462,616,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,563,380,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,622,295,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,716,979,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,728,965,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,857,394,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $583,076,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $536,256,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $416,431,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $274,954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $59,650,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $85,654,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the debt subject to limit are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $9,567,484,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $10,199,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $10,724,264,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $11,103,954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $11,295,107,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $11,495,218,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $5,396,807,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $5,753,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $5,981,334,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $6,047,654,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $5,885,687,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $5,744,120,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2008 through 2013 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $590,686,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $576,173,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $542,497,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $573,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $550,414,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $560,726,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $557,026,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $560,099,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $565,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $556,699,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $576,223,000,000.
(B) Outlays, 568,829,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $32,648,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,843,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $37,111,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,702,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $38,516,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $39,433,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $40,247,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,154,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $40,677,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,346,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $27,407,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,456,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $29,934,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $31,165,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $32,474,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,201,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $33,853,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,564,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $35,298,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,477,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $3,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,681,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $4,674,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $4,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $4,712,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,371,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $4,803,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,738,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $4,895,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,020,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $32,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,440,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $38,651,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,576,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $33,782,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $34,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $35,568,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,745,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $36,490,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,299,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $22,456,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,528,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $21,529,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,279,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $21,719,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,680,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $21,891,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $22,263,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,621,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,816,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $11,216,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $9,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,722,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $13,887,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $8,998,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,193,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $9,246,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,735,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $9,642,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,648,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $79,794,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,795,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $73,444,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $80,443,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $77,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $78,534,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $86,062,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $79,485,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $88,134,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $80,478,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,443,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $20,029,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,819,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $14,553,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,251,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $14,826,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,816,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $15,134,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,874,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $15,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,817,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $15,755,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,561,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $90,077,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $95,235,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,947,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $102,594,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,345,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $105,612,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $103,135,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $107,828,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $104,397,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $101,690,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $103,490,000,000.

(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $285,101,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $286,688,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $306,795,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $305,334,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $323,767,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $324,138,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $344,749,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $343,718,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $367,766,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $366,312,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $393,085,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $391,326,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $390,458,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $390,454,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $420,191,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $419,974,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $445,225,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $445,349,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $494,370,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $494,193,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $491,353,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $491,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $552,389,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $552,503,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $389,865,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $394,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $411,699,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $414,032,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $417,519,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $418,617,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $426,924,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $427,541,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $412,355,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $412,831,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $427,988,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $427,703,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $19,378,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $21,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $23,794,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,794,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $27,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $30,342,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,342,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $33,162,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,162,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $86,365,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $93,268,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $92,443,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $96,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,710,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $101,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $101,475,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $99,115,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $105,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $104,266,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $46,237,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,282,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $48,104,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,936,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $49,101,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,602,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $50,338,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,596,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $51,622,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,501,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $52,967,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,542,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $56,407,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,920,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $23,520,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,890,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $19,961,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,987,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $20,611,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,496,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $21,319,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,332,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,007,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,787,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $349,296,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $349,296,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $334,233,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $334,233,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $370,534,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $370,534,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $406,997,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $406,997,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $427,954,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $427,954,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $436,292,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $436,292,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $1,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $531,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $307,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, −$150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$53,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, −$200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$164,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, −$200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$178,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$200,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, −$86,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$86,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$67,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$67,060,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, −$70,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$70,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, −$73,364,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$73,364,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, −$76,104,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$76,104,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$79,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$79,691,000,000.
(21) Overseas Deployments and Other Activities (970):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $108,056,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,901,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $70,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,809,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $47,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $18,251,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $5,176,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $1,775,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING.—Not later than September 12, 2008, the House Committee on Ways and Means shall report a reconciliation bill making changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending by $750,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013.

(b) CHANGES IN REVENUE.—Not later than July 15, 2008, the House Committee on Ways and Means shall report a reconciliation bill making changes in laws within its jurisdiction that will reduce total revenues by $70,000,000,000 for fiscal year 2009 and will increase total revenues by $70,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2010 through 2013.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS TO ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—

(1) Upon the reporting to the House of any bill that has complied with reconciliation instructions, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates.

(2) Upon the submission to the House of any conference report recommending a reconciliation bill in which a committee has complied with its reconciliation instructions, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

(3) Allocations and aggregates revised pursuant to this subsection shall be considered to be allocations and aggregates established by the concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 301 of such Act.

TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 301. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR SCHIP LEGISLATION.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report, which contains matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce that expands coverage and improves children's

health through the State Childrens Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) under title XXI of the Social Security Act and the program under title XIX of such Act (commonly known as Medicaid) and that increases new budget authority that will result in no more than $50,000,000,000 in outlays in fiscal years 2008 through 2013, and others which contain offsets so designated for the purpose of this section within the jurisdiction of another committee or committees, if the combined changes would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 302. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR VETERANS AND SERVICEMEMBERS.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that—

(1) enhances medical care for wounded or disabled military personnel or veterans;

(2) maintains affordable health care for military retirees and veterans;

(3) improves disability benefits or evaluations for wounded or disabled military personnel or veterans, including measures to expedite the claims process;

(4) expands eligibility to permit additional disabled military retirees to receive both disability compensation and retired pay;

(5) eliminates the offset between Survivor Benefit Plan annuities and veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation; or

(6) provides or increases benefits for Filipino veterans of World War II or their survivors and dependents;

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 303. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EDUCATION BENEFITS FOR SERVICEMEMBERS, VETERANS, AND THEIR FAMILIES.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that enhances education benefits or assistance for servicemembers (including Active Duty, National Guard, and Reserve), veterans, or their spouses, survivors, or dependents by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 304. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides for increased investment in infrastructure projects by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 305. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR RENEWABLE ENERGY AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides tax incentives for or otherwise encourages the production of renewable energy or increased energy efficiency; encourages investment in emerging energy or vehicle technologies or carbon capture and sequestration; provides for reductions in greenhouse gas emissions; or facilitates the training of workers for these industries (''green collar jobs'') by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 306. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR MIDDLE-INCOME TAX RELIEF AND ECONOMIC EQUITY.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides for tax relief for middle-income families and taxpayers or enhanced economic equity, such as extension of the child tax credit, extension of marriage penalty relief, extension of the 10 percent individual income tax bracket, elimination of estate taxes on all but a minute fraction of estates by reforming and substantially increasing the unified credit, extension of the research and experimentation tax credit, extension of the deduction for small business expensing, extension of the deduction for State and local sales taxes, and a tax credit for school construction bonds, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 307. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REFORM OF THE ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides for reform of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 by reducing the tax burden of the alternative minimum tax on middle-income families by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 308. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR HIGHER EDUCATION.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that makes college more affordable or accessible through reforms to the Higher Education Act of 1965 or other legislation by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 309. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides for an affordable housing fund, offset by reforming the regulation of certain government-sponsored enterprises, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 310. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICARE IMPROVEMENTS.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that improves the Medicare program for beneficiaries and protects access to care, through measures such as increasing the reimbursement rate for physicians while protecting beneficiaries from associated premium increases and making improvements to the prescription drug program under part D, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 311. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR HEALTH CARE QUALITY, EFFECTIVENESS, AND EFFICIENCY.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that—

(1) provides incentives or other support for adoption of modern information technology, including electronic prescribing, to improve quality and protect privacy in health care;

(2) establishes a new Federal or public-private initiative for research on the comparative effectiveness of different medical interventions; or

(3) provides parity between health insurance coverage of mental health benefits and benefits for medical and surgical services, including parity in public programs;

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 312. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR MEDICAID AND OTHER PROGRAMS.

(a) REGULATIONS AND ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS.—In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that prevents or delays the implementation or administration of regulations or other administrative actions that would affect the Medicaid, SCHIP, or other programs by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

(b) TRANSITIONAL MEDICAL ASSISTANCE AND QUALIFYING INDIVIDUALS.—In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that extends the transitional medical assistance program or the qualifying individuals program, which are included in title XIX of the Social Security Act, by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 313. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE AND UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE MODERNIZATION.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report

that reauthorizes the trade adjustment assistance program to better meet the challenges of globalization or modernizes the unemployment insurance system to improve access to needed benefits by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 314. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR COUNTY PAYMENTS LEGISLATION.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides for the reauthorization of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self Determination Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–393) or makes changes to the Payments in Lieu of Taxes Act of 1976 (Public Law 94–565) by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 315. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR SAN JOAQUIN RIVER RESTORATION AND NAVAJO NATION WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENTS.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that would fulfill the purposes of the San Joaquin River Restoration Settlement Act or implement a Navajo Nation water rights settlement as authorized by the Northwestern New Mexico Rural Water Projects Act by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

SEC. 316. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE NATIONAL PARK CENTENNIAL FUND.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides for the establishment of the National Parks Centennial Fund by the amounts provided in such measure for that purpose if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018

SEC. 317. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT.

In the House, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that improves Federal child support collection efforts or results in more collected child support reaching families by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 401. PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—

(1) CONTINUING DISABILITY REVIEWS AND SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME REDETERMINATIONS.—In the House, prior to consideration of a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2009 that appropriates $264,000,000 for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations for the Social Security Administration, and provides an additional appropriation of up to $240,000,000, and the amount is designated for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations for the Social Security Administration, the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of the additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2009.

(2) INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TAX COMPLIANCE.—In the House, prior to consideration of a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2009 that appropriates $6,997,000,000 to the Internal Revenue Service and the amount is designated to improve compliance with the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and provides an additional appropriation of up to $490,000,000, and the amount is designated to improve compliance with the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of the additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2009.

(3) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL PROGRAM.—In the House, prior to consideration of a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2009 that appropriates up to $198,000,000 and the amount is designated to the health care fraud and abuse control program at the Department of Health and Human Services, the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2009.

(4) UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM INTEGRITY ACTIVITIES.—In the House, prior to consideration of a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2009 that appropriates $10,000,000 for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor and provides an additional appropriation of up to $40,000,000, and the amount is designated for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor, the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2009.

(b) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the House, prior to consideration of a bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make the adjustments set forth in subsection (a) for the incremental new budget authority in that measure and the outlays resulting from that budget authority if that measure meets the requirements set forth in subsection (a), except that no adjustment shall be made for provisions exempted for the purposes of titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 under section 404 of this resolution.

(2) MATTERS TO BE ADJUSTED.—The adjustments referred to in paragraph (1) are to be made to—

(A) the allocations made pursuant to the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(B) the budgetary aggregates as set forth in this resolution.

SEC. 402. OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE.

In the House, all committees are directed to review programs within their jurisdiction to root out waste, fraud, and abuse in program spending, giving particular scrutiny to issues raised by Government Accountability Office reports. Based on these oversight efforts and committee performance reviews of programs within their jurisdiction, committees are directed to include recommendations for improved governmental performance in their annual views and estimates reports required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on the Budget.

SEC. 403. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), a bill or joint resolution making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation, or an amendment thereto or a conference report thereon, may not provide for advance appropriations.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—In the House, an advance appropriation may be provided for fiscal year 2010 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the report to accompany this resolution or the joint explanatory statement of managers to accompany this resolution under the heading ''Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations'' in an aggregate amount not to exceed $27,558,000,000 in new budget authority, and for 2011, accounts separately identified under the same heading.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2009 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2009.

SEC. 404. OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENTS AND EMERGENCY NEEDS.

(a) OVERSEAS DEPLOYMENTS AND RELATED ACTIVITIES.—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for fiscal year 2008 or fiscal year 2009 for overseas deployments and related activities, and such amounts are so designated pursuant to this subsection, then new budget authority and outlays resulting therefrom shall not count for the purposes of titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(b) EMERGENCY NEEDS.—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for discretionary amounts, and such amounts are designated as necessary to meet emergency needs, then the new budget authority and outlays resulting therefrom shall not count for the purposes of titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 405. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 4001 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and of the Postal Service.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—In the House, for purposes of applying section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any off-budget discretionary amounts.

SEC. 406. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—In the House, for purposes of this resolution, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget.

SEC. 407. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

In the House, upon the enactment of any bill or joint resolution providing for a change in concepts or definitions, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution in accordance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002).

SEC. 408. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The House adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House, and these rules shall supersede other rules of the House only to the extent that they are inconsistent with other such rules of the House; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of the House.

TITLE V—POLICY

SEC. 501. POLICY ON MIDDLE-INCOME TAX RELIEF.

It is the policy of this resolution to—

(1) minimize fiscal burdens on middle-income families and their children and grandchildren;

(2) provide immediate relief for the tens of millions of middle-income households who would otherwise be subject to the alternative minimum tax (AMT) under current law, in the context of permanent, revenue-neutral AMT reform; and

(3) support extension of middle-income tax relief and enhanced economic equity through policies such as—

(A) extension of the child tax credit;

(B) extension of marriage penalty relief;

(C) extension of the 10 percent individual income tax bracket;

(D) elimination of estate taxes on all but a minute fraction of estates by reforming and substantially increasing the unified tax credit;

(E) extension of the research and experimentation tax credit;

(F) extension of the deduction for State and local sales taxes;

(G) extension of the deduction for small business expensing; and

(H) enactment of a tax credit for school construction bonds.

This resolution assumes that the cost of enacting such policies is offset by reforms within the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that promote a fairer distribution of taxes across families and generations, economic efficiency, higher rates of tax compliance to close the ''tax gap,'' and reduced taxpayer burdens through tax simplification.

SEC. 502. POLICY ON DEFENSE PRIORITIES.

It is the policy of this resolution that—

(1) the Administration's budget requests should comply with section 1008, Public Law 109–364, the John Warner National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2007, and the Administration should no longer attempt to fund overseas military operations through emergency supplemental appropriations requests;

(2) the Department of Defense should exclude nonwar requirements from its funding requests for Iraq and Afghanistan;

(3) implementing the recommendation of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States (commonly referred to as the 9/11 Commission) to adequately fund cooperative threat reduction and nuclear nonproliferation programs (securing ''loose nukes'') is a high priority and should receive far greater emphasis than the President's budget provides;

(4) readiness of our troops, particularly the National Guard and Reserve, is a high priority, and that greater emphasis needs to be placed on mitigating equipment and training shortfalls;

(5) TRICARE fees for military retirees under the age of 65 should not be increased as the President's budget proposes;

(6) military pay and benefits should be enhanced to improve the quality of life of military personnel;

(7) improving military health care services continues to be a high priority and adequate funding to ensure quality health care for returning combat veterans should be provided;

(8) higher priority defense needs could be addressed by funding missile defense at an adequate but lower level, not providing funding for development of space-based missile defense interceptors, and by restraining excessive cost and schedule growth in defense research, development and procurement programs;

(9) the Department of Defense should reassess current defense plans to ensure that weapons developed to counter cold war-era threats are not redundant and are applicable to 21st century threats;

(10) sufficient resources should be provided for the Department of Defense to do an aggressive job of addressing as many as possible of the 1,260 unimplemented recommendations made by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) over the last 7 years to improve practices at the Department of Defense, including investigation of the billions of dollars of obligations, disbursements and overcharges for which the Department of Defense cannot account;

(11) savings from the actions recommended in paragraphs (8) and (10) of this section should be used to fund the priorities identified in paragraphs (3) through (7);

(12) the Department of Defense report to Congress on its assessment of cold war weapons and progress on implementing GAO recommendations as outlined in paragraphs (9) and (10) by a time determined by the appropriate authorizing committees; and

(13) the GAO report to the appropriate congressional committees by the end of the 110th Congress regarding the Department of Defense's progress in implementing its audit recommendations.

TITLE VI—SENSE OF THE HOUSE

SEC. 601. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON THE INNOVATION AGENDA AND AMERICA COMPETES ACT.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) the House should provide sufficient funding so that our Nation may continue to be the world leader in education, innovation and economic growth;

(2) last year, Congress passed and the President signed the America COMPETES Act, bipartisan legislation designed to ensure that American students, teachers, businesses, and workers are prepared to continue leading the world in innovation, research, and technology well into the future;

(3) this resolution supports the efforts authorized in the America COMPETES Act, providing substantially increased funding above the President's requested level for 2009, and increased amounts after 2009 in Function 250 (General Science, Space and Technology) and Function 270 (Energy);

(4) additional increases for scientific research and education are included in Function 500 (Education, Employment, Training and Social Services), Function 550 (Health), Function 300 (Environment and Natural Resources), and Function 370 (Commerce and Housing Credit), all of which receive more funding than the President's budget provides;

(5) because America's greatest resource for innovation resides within classrooms across the country, the increased funding provided in this resolution will support initiatives within the America COMPETES Act to educate tens of thousands of new scientists, engineers, and mathematicians, and place highly qualified teachers in math and science K–12 classrooms; and

(6) because independent scientific research provides the foundation for innovation and future technologies, this resolution will keep us on the path toward doubling funding for the National Science Foundation, basic research in the physical sciences, and collaborative research partnerships, and toward achieving energy independence through the development of clean and sustainable alternative energy technologies.

SEC. 602. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON SERVICEMEMBERS' AND VETERANS' HEALTH CARE AND OTHER PRIORITIES.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) the House supports excellent health care for current and former members of the United States Armed Services—they have served well and honorably and have made significant sacrifices for this Nation;

(2) this resolution provides $48,150,000,000 in discretionary budget authority for 2009 for Function 700 (Veterans Benefits and Services), including veterans' health care, which is $4,888,000,000 more than the 2008 level, $3,602,000,000 more than the Congressional Budget Office's baseline level for 2009, and $3,232,000,000 more than the President's budget for 2009; and also provides more discretionary budget authority than the President's budget in every year after 2009;

(3) this resolution provides funding to continue addressing problems such as those identified at Walter Reed Army Medical Center to improve military and veterans' health care facilities and services;

(4) this resolution assumes the rejection of the health care enrollment fees and pharmaceutical co-payment increases in the President's budget;

(5) this resolution provides additional funding above the President's inadequate budget levels for the Department of Veterans Affairs to research and treat veterans' mental health, post-traumatic stress disorder, and traumatic brain injury; and

(6) this resolution provides additional funding above the President's inadequate budget levels for the Department of Veterans Affairs to improve the speed and accuracy of its processing of disability compensation claims, including funding to hire additional personnel above the President's requested level.

SEC. 603. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) this resolution assumes additional homeland security funding above the President's requested level for 2009 and every subsequent year;

(2) this resolution assumes funding above the President's requested level for 2009, and additional amounts in subsequent years, in the four budget functions—Function 400 (Transportation), Function 450 (Community and Regional Development), Function 550 (Health), and Function 750 (Administration of Justice)—that fund most nondefense homeland security activities; and

(3) the homeland security funding provided in this resolution will help to strengthen the security of our Nation's transportation system, particularly our ports where significant security shortfalls still exist and foreign ports, by expanding efforts to identify and scan all high-risk United States-bound cargo, equip, train and support first responders (including enhancing interoperable communications and emergency management), strengthen border patrol, and increase the preparedness of the public health system.

SEC. 604. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING LONG-TERM FISCAL REFORM.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) both the Government Accountability Office and the Congressional Budget Office have warned that the Federal budget is on an unsustainable path of rising deficits and debt;

(2) using recent trend data and reasonable policy assumptions, CBO has projected that the gap between spending and revenues over the next 75 years will reach 6.9 percent of GDP;

(3) publicly held debt will rise from 36 percent today to 400 percent of GDP by the decade beginning in 2050 under CBO's alternative policy scenario;

(4) the most significant factor affecting the long-term Federal fiscal landscape is the expectation that total public and private health spending will continue to grow faster than the economy;

(5) the House calls upon governmental and nongovernmental experts to develop specific options to reform the health care system and control costs, that further research and analysis on topics including comparative effectiveness, health information technology, preventative care, and provider incentives is needed, and that of critical importance is the development of a consensus on the appropriate methods for estimating the budgetary impact and health outcome effects of these proposals; and

(6) immediate policy action is needed to address the long-term fiscal challenges facing the United States, including the rising costs of entitlements, in a manner that is fiscally responsible, equitable, and lasting, and that also honors commitments made to beneficiaries, and that such action should be bipartisan, bicameral, involve both legislative and executive branch participants, as well as public participation, and be conducted in a manner that ensures full, fair, and timely Congressional consideration.

SEC. 605. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) all committees should examine programs within their jurisdiction to identify wasteful and fraudulent spending;

(2) title IV of this resolution includes cap adjustments to provide appropriations for agencies that control programs that accounted for a significant share of improper payments reported by Federal agencies: Social Security Administration Continuing Disability Reviews, the Medicare/Medicaid Health Care Fraud and Abuse Control Program, and Unemployment Insurance Program Integrity;

(3) title IV also includes a cap adjustment for the Internal Revenue Services for tax compliance efforts to close the $300,000,000,000 tax gap;

(4) the resolution's deficit-neutral reserve funds require authorizing committees to cut lower priority and wasteful spending to accommodate any new high-priority entitlement benefits; and

(5) title IV of the resolution directs all committees to review the performance of programs within their jurisdiction and report recommendations annually to the Committee on the Budget as part of the views and estimates process required by section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act.

SEC. 606. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING EXTENSION OF THE STATUTORY PAY-AS-YOU-GO RULE.

It is the sense of the House that to reduce the deficit, Congress should extend the PAYGO rules originally enacted in the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

SEC. 607. SENSE OF THE HOUSE ON LONG-TERM BUDGETING.

It is the sense of the Congress that the determination of the congressional budget for the United States Government and the President's budget request should include consideration of the Financial Report of the United States Government, especially its information regarding the Governments net operating cost, financial position, and long-term liabilities.

SEC. 608. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING THE NEED TO MAINTAIN AND BUILD UPON EFFORTS TO FIGHT HUNGER.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) 35.5 million Americans (12.6 million of them children) are food insecure—uncertain of having, or unable to acquire, enough food, and that 11.1 million Americans are hungry because of lack of food;

(2) despite the critical contributions of the Department of Agriculture nutrition programs (particularly the food stamp program), which significantly reduced payment error rates while providing help to partially mitigate the effects of rising poverty and unemployment, significant need remains, even among families that receive food stamps;

(3) nearly 25 million people, including more than nine million children and nearly three million seniors, sought emergency food assistance from food pantries, soup kitchens, shelters, and local charities last year;

(4) legislation that passed the House with bipartisan support was an appropriate first step toward ensuring that nutrition assistance keeps up with inflation and rising food prices; and

(5) Department of Agriculture programs that help us fight hunger should be maintained and that the House should continue to seize opportunities to reach Americans in need and to fight hunger.

SEC. 609. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING AFFORDABLE HEALTH COVERAGE.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) nearly 47 million Americans, including nine million children, lack health insurance;

(2) people without health insurance are more likely to experience problems getting medical care and to be hospitalized for avoidable health problems;

(3) most Americans receive health coverage through their employers, and a major issue facing all employers is the rising cost of health insurance;

(4) small businesses, which have generated most of the new jobs annually over the last decade, have an especially difficult time affording health coverage, because of higher administrative costs and fewer people over whom to spread the risk of catastrophic costs;

(5) because it is especially costly for small businesses to provide health coverage, their employees make up a large proportion of the Nation's uninsured individuals; and

(6) legislation consistent with the pay-as-you-go principle should be adopted that makes health insurance more affordable and accessible, with attention to the special circumstances affecting employees of small businesses, and that lowers costs and improves the quality of health care by encouraging integration of health information technology tools into the practice of medicine, and by promoting improvements in disease management and disease prevention.

SEC. 610. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING PAY PARITY.

It is the sense of the House that rates of compensation for civilian employees of the United States should be adjusted at the same time, and in the same proportion, as are rates of compensation for members of the uniformed services.

SEC. 611. SENSE OF THE HOUSE REGARDING SUBPRIME LENDING AND FORECLOSURES.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) over the last six months, the Nation has experienced a significant increase in the number of homeowners facing the risk of foreclosure with estimates of as many as 2.8 million subprime and other distressed borrowers facing the loss of their homes over the next five years;

(2) the rise in foreclosures not only has an immediate, devastating impact on homeowners and their families, but it also has ripple effects—

(A) local communities experiencing high levels of foreclosures experience deterioration as a result of the large number of vacant foreclosed and abandoned homes;

(B) rising foreclosure rates can accelerate drops in home prices, affecting all homeowners; and

(C) home mortgage default and foreclosure rates increase risk for lenders, further restricting the availability of credit, which can in turn slow economic growth; and

(3) the rise in foreclosures is not only a crisis for subprime borrowers, but a larger problem for communities as a whole, and considering the multi-layered effects of increasing foreclosures, the House should consider steps to address this complex problem.

SEC. 612. SENSE OF HOUSE REGARDING THE IMPORTANCE OF CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT.

It is the sense of the House that—

(1) additional legislative action is needed to ensure that States have the necessary resources to collect all child support that is owed to families and to allow them to pass 100 percent of support on to families without financial penalty; and

(2) when 100 percent of child support payments are passed to the child, rather than administrative expenses, program integrity is improved and child support participation increases.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the concurrent resolution is in order except the amendments printed in House Report 110–548. Each 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 read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, and shall not be subject to amendment.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. KILPATRICK

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 110–548.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 1 offered by Ms. KILPATRICK:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009.

The Congress determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2009, including appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2010 through 2013.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2013:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2009: $2,113,137,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,333,975,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,520,860,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,736,299,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,838,866,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be adjusted are as follows:

Fiscal year 2009: $16,013,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $151,111,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $92,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $82,984,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $84,126,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2009: $2,597,686,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,630,042,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,761,520,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,802,739,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,929,212,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2009: $2,596,055,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,680,087,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,777,894,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,790,731,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,919,409,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2009: $482,918,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $346,112,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $257,034,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $54,432,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $80,543,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the debt subject to limit are as follows:

Fiscal year 2009: $10,146,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $10,601,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $10,963,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $11,149,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $11,344,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2009: $5,701,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $5,858,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $5,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $5,740,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $5,593,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2009 through 2013 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $542,497,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $573,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $550,414,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $560,726,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $557,026,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $560,099,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $565,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $556,699,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $576,223,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $568,829,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $40,506,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,529,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $41,911,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,535,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $42,828,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $43,642,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,307,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $44,072,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,672,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $30,049,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,761,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $31,280,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,704,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $32,589,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,312,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $33,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,677,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $35,413,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,591,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $5,374,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,423,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $5,345,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,354,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $5,412,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,983,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $5,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,370,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $5,595,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,684,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $41,428,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,340,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $36,559,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,557,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $37,447,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,030,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $38,345,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,424,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $39,267,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $40,038,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $22,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,726,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $22,284,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,226,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $22,456,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,436,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $22,828,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,995,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $23,186,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,376,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $11,022,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,913,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $15,349,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,245,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $10,460,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,617,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $10,708,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,188,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $11,104,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,110,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $74,619,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $81,067,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $78,682,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $84,845,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $79,709,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $87,159,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $80,660,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $89,274,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $81,653,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $91,609,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $16,546,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,684,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $16,819,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,720,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $17,127,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,392,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $17,443,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,669,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $17,748,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,507,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $115,485,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,894,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $122,844,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $118,545,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $125,862,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $123,385,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $128,078,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $124,647,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $121,940,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $123,740,000,000.

(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $323,727,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $310,812,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $340,699,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $337,134,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $361,681,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $359,998,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $384,698,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $383,092,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $410,017,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $408,170,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $420,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $420,420,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $445,725,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $445,825,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $494,870,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $494,693,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $491,853,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $491,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $552,889,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $553,003,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $419,956,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $420,166,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $425,776,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $426,298,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $435,181,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $435,414,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $420,612,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $421,056,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $436,245,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $435,944,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $21,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $23,794,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,794,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $27,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $30,342,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,342,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $33,162,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,162,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $97,404,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,269,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $100,136,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $99,789,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $105,936,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,581,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $103,251,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $102,386,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $109,230,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $108,398,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $52,104,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,184,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $53,101,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,336,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $54,338,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,526,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $55,622,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,474,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $56,967,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,542,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $24,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,328,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $20,461,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,469,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $21,111,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,985,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $21,819,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,827,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,283,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $333,566,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $333,566,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $367,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $367,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $401,371,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $401,371,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $421,521,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $421,521,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $429,535,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $429,535,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $2,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,554,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $2,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,915,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $2,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,031,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $2,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,101,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $2,150,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,132,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, −$67,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$67,060,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, −$70,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$70,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, −$73,364,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$73,364,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, −$76,104,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$76,104,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, −$79,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$79,691,000,000.
(21) Overseas Deployments and Other Activities (970):
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $70,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $74,809,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $47,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $18,251,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $5,176,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $1,775,000,000.

TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) between 2001 and 2007, GAO provided the Department of Defense with 2864 recommendations, many related to improving their business practices and, to date, the Department of Defense has implemented 1389 recommendations and closed 215 recommendations without implementation; and

(2) the GAO estimates that the 1389 implemented recommendations have yielded the Department of Defense a savings of $63.7 billion between fiscal years 2001 and 2007.

(b) ASSUMPTION; REPORT.—

(1) ASSUMPTION.—This resolution assumes $300,000,000 to be used by the Department of Defense to implement the remaining 1260 recommendations of the Government Accountability Office.

(2) REPORT.—The Secretary of Defense should submit a report to Congress within 90 days that demonstrates how each such recommendation will be implemented, and, in the case of any such recommendation that cannot be implemented, a detailed reason for such inability to implement such recommendation.

SEC. 202. REDEPLOYMENT.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the war in Iraq should end as safely and quickly as practicable and our troops should be brought home;

(2) the performance of United States military personnel in Iraq and Afghanistan should be commended, their courage and sacrifice have been exceptional, and when they come home, their service should be recognized appropriately; and

(3) the purpose of funds made available by this Act should be to transition the mission of United States Armed Forces in Iraq and undertake their redeployment, and not to extend or prolong the war and occupation.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1036, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK) and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, at this time, the Congressional Black Caucus will present our 2009 budget for the fiscal year: Tough Choices, Right Priorities.

The Federal budget is $3.1 trillion. Of these four main entitlements: Medicare, programs for over 40 million Americans, disabled children, low-income; Medicaid, 40 million children, low-income, disabled; Medicare, 44 million seniors' health program; and veterans, who have worked to build our country's security over these many years.

The budget we have before us invests in American families. It invests in our children, in our families, and it secures us at the same time.

There is no tax increase in this budget. And you will hear over and over from the other side that we're increasing taxes. We are not. We are rolling back those permanent tax cuts, for any American citizen who earns over $200,000 will have the regular tax procedure. What we're rolling back and increasing the revenue so that we invest in America's families are incomes over $200,000, that we might ensure all of America's children, that we might invest and save Medicare, as well as Medicaid.

We will increase the funding for No Child Left Behind, our premier education program that has never been properly funded. Education is the equalizer. America now falls behind the major nations of the world because our education system is crumbling, and our Congressional Black Caucus budget invests in education. We also offer money

in our Justice Department for having safer communities across America.

We will present to you our 2009 Congressional Black Caucus budget. It is fair, it reduces the deficit, and it invests in America's children and in America's families.

It is my opportunity, as we move on and present the various Members who will speak, that we will show you that this budget is a budget that America needs: tough choices, right priorities.

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

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. First of all, let me commend the gentlelady from Michigan and the other colleagues for bringing forth an alternative budget. As a member of the Budget Committee for the past 6 years, I know how difficult it is to put together a budget of this magnitude. It takes a lot of work and a lot of dedication, so I commend my colleagues for doing this.

This is a true substitute budget, Mr. Chairman. It highlights the stark differences between the Democrats' priorities and the Republican priorities. And yes, it does increase taxes by actually more than $1.1 trillion. I think that bears repeating. It increases taxes by more than $1.1 trillion over the next 5 years. This includes actually $427 billion in increases on top of the $683 billion in the underlying Democratic budget.

The differences between the Republican budget priorities and those of my Democrat friends, frankly, are rather clear. They're crystal clear. The Democratic budget that came to the floor yesterday will raise taxes by $683 billion over the next 5 years. Apparently, however, some of my Democratic friends think that that increase is still not enough, so this substitute raises taxes by, as I said before, $1.1 trillion over the next 5 years. Now, however, Mr. Chairman, the Republican substitute that will be offered later today does not raise a single penny in taxes. It contains absolutely no tax increases.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take some time to discuss frankly the underlying Democratic budget.

Last year, the Democratic budget promised to raise taxes by $217 billion, and a lot of us were shocked because that was such a huge tax increase. A lot of us thought that was a lot of money. But this year they offer a newer and, frankly, bolder, more dramatic budget and more dramatic tax increase than last year. The underlying Democratic budget raises taxes by over $683 billion over 5 years. It sets up years and years of even higher spending and higher taxes.

Mr. Chairman, at last week's committee markup, the Budget Committee that I am privileged to serve on, a number of my Republican colleagues and I offered several amendments to extend the widely popular middle class tax provisions. And we're going to hear that this budget and the underlying Democratic budget only raises taxes on the wealthy. Well, we had that debate also in the Budget Committee. So, we offered some amendments to see if, in fact, that maybe they had just made a mistake. And yet, not one of these commonsense tax relief amendments were adopted. Every single Democrat on the committee voted against these amendments.

And I want to talk about what those amendments are, because, again, we're going to hear time and time again, oh, that's tax cuts for the wealthy. Let's talk about the specifics of the amendments that were voted down, that did not receive one single Democratic vote in the committee.

They voted against extending the $1,000 child tax credit. You know, I don't know, maybe it's different in the rest of the country, but in Florida, not only the wealthy have children. And they voted against that, against extending the $1,000 child tax credit. And that's raising taxes on families with children by $51 billion.

They voted against extending the marginal tax rates for all Americans and, thus, increasing taxes by $326 billion. They voted against, Mr. Chairman, eliminating the death tax. Now, I thought we could at least all agree that there should be, as a friend of mine here once said on the floor, ''no taxation without respiration,'' but no, they voted against eliminating the death tax, increasing taxes again by 181 additional dollars.

They voted against extending tax relief for married couples, increasing taxes by $25 billion on married couples.

□ 1200

And, again, I don't know, maybe Florida is different; but at least in the State of Florida not only the wealthy get married. That is a tax increase on every married couple in the entire country.

They voted against extending the 10 percent tax bracket for the very-low-income taxpayers. That's correct: we will hear time and time again, no, we only want to raise taxes on the wealthy. Yes, but then why did they vote against extending the 10 percent tax bracket for the very-low-income taxpayers?

Again, extending the State and local sales deduction for States like Florida, Nevada, and Texas, where people should be able to deduct what they pay in sales taxes because we don't have an income tax, which is deductible in other States, this provision expires this year. But the Democratic budget rejected this deduction, increasing taxes on Floridians and others right away.

My friends on the other side of the aisle claim they support tax relief, and they'll say it time and time again; but, frankly, their actions just don't match their rhetoric.

Those amendments were defeated in committee just a few days ago. Those amendments which are not tax cuts for the wealthy, as we're going to hear, no. They were for middle-class American families in the United States, and they voted against every single one of those amendments. And, again, every single one of them our colleagues on the Democratic side voted against those tax cuts for middle America, for American families, for small businesses, et cetera. Again, not one single Democrat voted for these tax cuts for the middle class.

But these tax provisions affect real people, Mr. Chairman, real American families, workers, and small business owners. Let's take a look at what these tax increases mean. Again, these are real numbers. This is not theory. This is not rhetoric:

A family of four with $50,000 in annual income, not wealthy people but a family of four with $50,000 in annual income, would see its tax bill increase by $2,100. That's $2,100 in tax increases in 2011 as a result of the Democrats' budget. That's a 191 percent increase in their Federal taxes.

Forty-eight million married couples will see their tax bills rise by an average of $3,000; 12 million single women with dependents will face a tax increase of nearly $1,100; 18 million seniors, seniors, will see a tax increase of more than $2,100 in the year 2011; 27 million small business owners, Mr. Chairman, which are the backbone of our economy, which are the job creators in our economy, will see their tax bills increase by over $4,000. More than six million taxpayers who previously had no Federal income tax liability will become subject to the individual income tax in 2011. Again, these are low-income Americans, because, again, unfortunately, the 10 percent bracket has gone away, and also their child deduction will go away.

These are just a few examples, not rhetoric, concrete specific examples of how this amendment and the underlying bill will affect hardworking American families, the American taxpayer.

With this budget, 116 million American taxpayers will see their tax increase by an average of $1,800 in the year 2011. That's actually the underlying bill. With this amendment it would be even higher than that.

I often hear my Democratic friends say that a budget sets priorities. And it's obvious that this budget and this amendment to the budget set priorities. And what are those? More runaway spending and much higher taxes. That's what this budget offers and what this amendment offers. More of the same, just more taxes, more spending, more taxes, more spending, and no reform.

Some people, I guess, believe in this budget, and this amendment shows that some people believe that the Federal Government just doesn't have enough money and that the people

have too much money in their wallets; so the Federal Government needs to take it from them because we can do a better job here. The bureaucracy and those smart men and women in Congress, we know much better how to spend people's money than they do.

But, Mr. Chairman, wait. Like those TV commercials: but wait, there's even more. This budget does absolutely nothing to address the huge entitlements, the crisis that our Nation faces. As entitlement programs continue to grow, this underlying budget contains no instructions to reform them so that we will be able to keep them so that they can continue to serve the people that they are serving and they will not bankrupt those programs and also not bankrupt the country.

Again, the truth is, Mr. Chairman, that Medicare and Medicaid are both growing at more than 7 percent a year. Social Security is growing at 7 percent per year. These huge growth rates are, unfortunately, unsustainable for our economy, for those programs, for our fiscal future. We must tackle this crisis. We must reform them to save those programs and also to make sure that we save the fiscal situation in this country. And if we don't, if we put it off for another 5 years, as this amendment does and as the underlying budget does, it will just make the situation worse. We have to act on that now.

Mr. Chairman, this substitute budget and the underlying Democratic budgets are both deeply flawed. They both raise taxes on hardworking Americans to a level that we have never seen. We know what higher taxes will do. It will kill job creation. I mean, we all agreed to that. When we wanted to make sure that we avoided a recession, what did this Congress do on a bipartisan level? We cut taxes because we know that cutting taxes, on a bipartisan level we know, that helps economic growth. But yet this amendment and the underlying budget will increase taxes on the American people without precedent, at levels that, frankly, have no precedent. And this is just more of the same.

And for those reasons, Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully request that we vote down this amendment.

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

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I am honored to yield 4 minutes to the chairperson of our House Congressional Black Caucus Budget Task Force, as well as a proud member of the House Democratic Budget Committee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentlewoman for her leadership in the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin the discussion on the budget with where we are. And I'd like to use charts because a lot of rhetoric goes back and forth.

This is a statement of where we are right now. You will see the budget deficit year by year was improved in the 8 years of Democratic leadership on the budget and in the last few years has totally collapsed. It has collapsed to the point where we had a surplus projected, a 5- or 10-year surplus of $5.5 trillion, a surplus projected for those 10 years starting in 2001. Those 10 years look like they're going to come in at a $3 trillion deficit. That's an $8.8 trillion deterioration. That's an average of over $800 billion a year deterioration in the budget.

We didn't create any jobs during this time. This job performance under this administration is the worst since Herbert Hoover. You can say what you want, but that's just the arithmetic fact.

The Congressional Black Caucus is dealing with this budget responsibly. We, first of all, repeal the tax cuts that put us into the ditch to begin with. You can call that process whatever you want. You can rant and rave, but the fact is we are repealing all of those tax cuts that got us in the ditch, except those tax cuts that primarily affect that portion of your income under $200,000. Under $200,000 those tax cuts are protected. Those tax cuts that primarily affect your income over $200,000, those are the ones that we are repealing. We are able to, with that money, balance the budget and to go into surplus.

The red is the President's budget, which is significantly worse than the Congressional Black Caucus every year. The Congressional Black Caucus has a lower deficit in the first 3 years and a higher surplus in the next 3 years than either the President's budget or the Democratic budget. We are so responsible, in fact, that we save interest on the national debt. Cumulative compared to the President we save $23 billion in the fifth year alone, $48 billion saved in interest over the 5 years compared to the President's budget.

We are also able to spend on our priorities. Education, compared to the President's budget, $160 billion more on education, particularly No Child Left Behind; $119 billion more in health care, particularly children's health that the President vetoed. Veterans benefits, $60 billion over the President's budget. We're not charging our veterans fees for the services that they desperately need. And justice programs, prevention programs, after-school programs, and Second Chance Programs to make our communities safer, almost $35 billion extra.

This budget is responsible. It invests in our priorities, and it is much more fiscally responsible than the President's budget.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to recognize, frankly, one of the most talented and one of the most knowledgeable Members in the United States Congress on fiscal matters, that is, the ranking member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First off, Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the gentlewoman from Michigan and the gentleman from Virginia. The gentleman from Virginia is a knowledgeable man who's very sincere, who understands the budget process, and I want to congratulate you for bringing a budget to the floor. It's not easy to write a budget resolution, and it's important to bring a budget to the floor that reflects your priorities. So first of all, to the CBC, I simply want to congratulate you and your staff for doing this because that's how a debate works here. It's not enough just to criticize; it's important to propose things.

Now for the criticizing part. I simply want to talk about the underlying Democratic Party budget. And there was a debate yesterday about this for a number of hours, whether there's a tax increase in the Democrats' budget or not.

Well, when we hear the Democrat chairman say that they are balancing the budget, that is what their budget does. It is certified by the Congressional Budget Office as actually achieving balance. So we need to accept the fact that their budget does balance.

There's only one reason, there's only one way that it balances. It does so by passing the largest tax increase in American history.

Now, here's what they do with their budget: this red line, which is what we call the Congressional Budget Office baseline, that is the line they use to show that they are achieving a balanced budget. The green line here says here's what the line would be if you don't raise taxes, if you keep the marriage penalty repealed, if you don't raise the child tax credit, and so on. This is the difference between the two budgets.

So when we hear our friends on the other side of the aisle say, We're balancing the budget and we're not raising taxes, they can't have it both ways. It's simply not correct. It's simply untrue. You can't, on the one hand, say you're balancing the budget, which by very definition requires by their math you raise taxes in order to achieve balance, and then not say you're raising taxes.

The question is this: What taxes are we talking about? Are these taxes that just hit wealthy people? No. Everybody who pays income tax rates will see a giant tax increase. All income tax rates will be increased under the Democratic budget. The per child tax credit will get cut in half, from $1,000 per child to $500 per child. That means every family in America will see a $500 per child tax increase. The marriage penalty will come back in full force. That hits people, on average, $1,400 for married couples. Capital gains and dividends tax, which is the tax on our pensions and our 401(k)s, that goes on. And the death tax comes back in full force.

The question before us now, Mr. Chairman, is this: We are almost going

into a recession. We are clearly in an economic downturn. Is this the time for a tax increase? I think the answer is no.

The other question is this: We have high prices. It costs a lot to fill the gas tank today. It costs a lot to send kids to school. It costs a lot of money for health insurance. Where I come from in Wisconsin, it costs a lot to heat your home. So the real question for this Congress here and for the American people is, Can you afford the Democrats' tax hike? Can you afford the massive tax increases? We are paying higher prices for everything in America today. Our paychecks for working men and women in America aren't going as far as they used to go. So at this time can we afford this tax increase?

We think there's a better way. And in 2 hours we will be showing the American people the better way we think we ought to go, and that is let's balance the budget, but let's do it not by raising taxes but by controlling spending.

The big problem I also see with the Democratic budget in addition to that it has the largest tax increase in history is that it doesn't think there is any waste in Washington.

□ 1215

They believe we should keep earmarking this place. They believe there is no room to find waste, fraud, abuse and inefficiencies in government. We disagree. We think that there is waste in Washington. We think that there is fraud in the way our taxpayer dollars are being spent. And we think we ought to say this earmark system is coming unglued.

This earmarking system needs to be cleaned up. All this pork, 11,000 pieces of which left this Congress last year, to the tune of $14.9 billion. Let's say stop it for this year and let's clean it up. Let's have a bipartisan commission, clean up the way Congress porks this place up. Save that money. Reduce the deficit. Make sure we don't raise taxes and clean up the way Congress spends taxpayer dollars.

By simply saying no to pork this year and banking that savings in this budget, we can make sure that that per child tax credit stays. We can make sure that people don't pay higher taxes by virtue of simply being married.

Those are the choices we have before us today. We in the Republican budget say no more pork. Let's protect paychecks, and let's make sure we are not taxing people for having children or for getting married.

That's the values we have in our budget. And we think we can go farther and say, let's reform government. Let's reform spending. Let's clean it up. Let's not raise taxes.

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia be permitted to control the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

First of all, the gentleman indicated that we have nothing in there for waste, fraud and abuse. In fact, we spend $300 million in the Defense Department budget to make sure that they follow through on the GAO recommendations to reduce fraud, waste and abuse.

Furthermore, we protect all of those tax cuts for that portion of the taxpayers' income under $200,000. It is just the tax cuts over $200,000 that primarily got us in the ditch.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget which exercises fiscal and moral responsibility. And I thank Chairwoman KILPATRICK and Congressman SCOTT for their leadership.

The President's budget contains disastrous cuts which the base Democratic budget goes a long way to restoring. But people who have been left out of the health, education and the economic mainstream need more to ensure the equality, fairness and justice which our country has promised.

The CBC budget does this while balancing the budget and bringing back a surplus. Our budget will strengthen our Nation's overwhelmed and underresourced health care system, extend the Children's Health Insurance Program, strengthen Medicaid and Medicare, save and expand programs to build the diverse work force we need, and increase health information technology.

We fund more vital services for people with HIV/AIDS, increase funding to our National Center and rural, infant, mental health and other critically needed programs.

Very importantly, for the first time, the CBC budget creates a Health Equity Fund, a bold but long overdue step that would fund the Health Equity and Accountability Act of 2007 and begin to eliminate the health disparities that claim the lives of 100,000 African Americans and other people of color every year. And we do this by providing tax relief where it is needed, recalibrating taxes so that they are fair, and we put that money where it is needed most.

Mr. Chairman and colleagues, the time is now to pass a budget that balances tough decisions with fiscal and moral responsibility and reflects the needs of all Americans and not just a privileged few.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in full support of the Congressional Black Caucus' alternative budget—Tough Choices—Right Priorities: Exercising Fiscal and Moral Responsibility. Thank you, Chairwoman KILPATRICK and Congressman SCOTT, for your leadership.

The President's budget contains disastrous cuts which make it blatantly clear that his priorities are out of sync with African-Americans and all Americans.

The base Democratic budget is a good budget. It goes a long way to restoring the cuts and eliminations the President proposes, but people who have for so long been left behind and left out of the health care mainstream and others, need more to ensure the equality, fairness, and justice which this country promises to all.

The CBC alternative budget provides additional critical funding to health, education, crime prevention, economic opportunity and more, this while still maintaining sound fiscal policy, providing moral leadership while balancing the budget and bringing back a surplus in five years.

As a physician and as the chair of the CBC Health Braintrust, I want to focus on the health care fixes the CBC budget provides.

The CBC budget alternative will strengthen our Nation's overwhelmed and underresourced health care system, champions critically important health care needs, and fills the gaps in health care access and quality that detrimentally affect our Nation's health care providers, and the overall health care system. It expands the State Children's Health Insurance Program to insure the majority of the Nation's 9 million uninsured children and strengthens Medicaid and Medicare. It also saves title VII programs to build the diverse workforce we need; it implements health information technology to improve continuity and safety of care.

We fund the Ryan White Program including ADAP, National Minority AIDS Education and Training Centers, and the other vital services for persons with HIV/AIDS; increase funding to the National Center on Minority Health and Health Disparities at NIH and save rural, infant, mental health and other critically needed health programs that the President wants to terminate.

Mr. Chairman, very importantly, for the first time, the CBC budget creates a health equity fund. It is a bold but long overdue step that would finally put our money where our mouth is and finally fund the Health Equity and Accountability Act of 2007 and begin to eliminate the health disparities that literally claim the lives of 100,000 African-Americans and other people of color every single year—bringing wellness within the reach of millions of innocent, hard-working Americans who are now in poorer health, un- and under-insured, and more likely to become disabled or die prematurely from preventable causes during what ought to be their most productive years.

Mr. Chairman and colleagues, the time has come for us—as lawmakers—to pass a budget that delicately balances tough decisions with fiscal and, more important, moral responsibility in a manner that reflects the needs of all Americans and not just a privileged few.

The alternative CBC budget does just that and I encourage all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I want everybody to kind of listen to this debate, to just listen to see where you hear one reduction in this amendment or in the underlying budget, one reduction in Federal spending, one reduction in waste, one cut in waste, one program that is eliminated, one thing in the Federal Government that should get a little bit less money. Please listen to that, and what you will hear is

just the opposite. More spending. More spending. More spending, more Federal programs, and not one reduction.

Is the Federal Government so efficient there is nothing that can be reduced? I don't think so.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairwoman KILPATRICK, the Congressional Black Caucus and my colleague, Congressman SCOTT from Virginia, for their leadership and unwavering support for the development of this alternative budget.

The CBC alternative budget is filled with progressive and visionary funding that is motivated by principle and compassion. It is a budget that voices the concerns and needs of the poor, the children, and the elderly that have been so easily set aside by this current administration.

The CBC alternative budget understands that our Nation's transportation system is the backbone of our economy and our way of life, neither of which we cannot afford to shortchange.

Funding included in the CBC budget also supports great competitiveness in science and technology. As a senior member of the House Science Committee, I feel it is important to invest in our children's futures, which is also an investment in our own future.

Provisions for the science and technology fields will address access to higher education, enrichment programs in the STEM fields, and spur critical research and development to meet the needs of this country.

Our Nation's future depends more and more on the quality of our innovative ideas. The fruits of these investments meet vital national needs and improve the quality of life for all Americans.

The CBC alternative budget also provides funding for programs and services crucial to the American people, rather than continuing to provide tax breaks for those who least need it.

By repealing several of the tax cuts implemented under the current administration, the CBC budget provides robust funding for much-needed programs and services. Such programs include health care for uninsured children, education, and job training programs, an expanded GI Bill for post-9/11 veterans, as well as increases in benefits and services, juvenile justice prevention and intervention programs, community and regional development, public housing, the Army Corps of Engineers, and homeland security needs.

Mr. Chairman, we are in a position to provide funding for long-neglected programs and to advance on our promise for progress.

The CBC alternative understands that our Nation's transportation system is the backbone of our economy and our way of life, neither of which we can afford to shortchange.

Funding included in the CBC budget also supports greater competitiveness in science and technology. As a senior Member of the House Science Committee, I feel it is important to invest in our children's futures. Provisions for the science and technology fields will address access to higher education, enrichment programs in STEM fields, and spur critical research and development to meet the needs of our country.

Our Nation's future depends more and more on the quality of our innovative ideas. The fruits of these investments meet vital national needs and improve the quality of life for all Americans.

I ask, Mr. Chairman, that Members of this body listen to their conscience.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I reserve my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlelady from California, Ms. Maxine Waters.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Mr. SCOTT for the tremendous effort that he has put forward to help develop this CBC alternative budget.

We have before us perhaps the most important piece of legislation that we will vote on all year; the budget resolution that sets forth the priorities this House will pursue for the remainder of the year.

I am very pleased to join with my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus to present an alternative budget, a budget that is wise, prudent, responsible and balanced. I have many concerns, deep concerns with health care, education, criminal justice elements of the resolution. But I think I want to focus my time on housing and community development, given my position as the chair of the subcommittee that bears that name.

We have all witnessed the instability of our economy in the face of turmoil directly resulting from the housing and mortgage market. Incredibly, at a time when we should be focusing more resources on this area, the President's budget slashes programs that provide housing and supportive services to our country's poorest disabled and elderly households. It starves the local housing authorities of funds they need to sustain and modernize public housing stock, and once again seeks to cripple the Community Development Block Grant program.

Specifically, the President's budget reduces funding for HUD 202 supportive housing for the elderly by 27 percent. If enacted, this cut would leave funding for this program at a level 40 percent below its fiscal year 2001 appropriations. The CBC adds $300 million to the President's request to rectify this cut.

There are a number of other cuts, but let me draw your attention to the proposed elimination of the HOPE VI program, which the House of Representatives recently voted to reauthorize on a bipartisan vote of 271–130. The CBC budget adds $1 billion to restore this program.

Let me also bring to your attention a cut in the Community Development Block Grant program of $657 million and a zeroing out of the section 108 Loan Guarantee program. If enacted, the President's budget would culminate a multi-year attack on CDBG that could put the program at a funding level of about one-half of its appropriation in fiscal year 2001.

I ask support of the CBC budget. I believe that all of America would be served well by this budget.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California, Ms. BARBARA LEE.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank my colleague from Virginia for his leadership. Also I want to thank the chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus, Congresswoman Carolyn Cheeks Kilpatrick, for her leadership and all of our staff for their very diligent work in putting together this fiscally and morally responsible budget.

This budget rejects the President's budget and his attack on working families, minority communities and many of our most vulnerable populations like seniors and low-income individuals. Instead it, invests in the right priorities for our Nation.

It calls for the implementation of GAO's recommendation to cut waste, fraud and abuse at the Defense Department. We have witnessed billions and billions of dollars disappear, lost or misspent through companies such as Halliburton or Blackwater. We have found, and the GAO has found, that there is at least now a savings of $63.7 billion between fiscal year 2001 and 2007. We want them to complete their audit, and this budget will allow them to do that so we can realize these savings and invest in our communities, in our families and in our children.

This budget also recognizes that domestic security enhances national security. It makes critical investments to build housing and to strengthen our communities. It fully funds SCHIP and increases funding to fight HIV/AIDS. It expands education and job training programs and rebuilds schools destroyed by Hurricane Katrina.

In short, the Congressional Black Caucus budget is fiscally and it is morally responsible. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Let me just highlight the HIV/AIDS budget. We have not received the type of increases for the minority AIDS initiative that our communities need so desperately. The HIV/AIDS pandemic is wreaking havoc on the African American and now unfortunately the Latino communities in our country. And so this bill funds the Ryan White HIV/AIDS program in a way that it should be funded, but it also funds the minority AIDS initiative in the manner that it should be funded.

Also let me just say we have seen such massive cuts in programs for education, such as for our historically black colleges and universities. This budget makes sure that our historically black colleges and universities

receive the type of funding they need to educate our young people.

Also it is important to recognize the Congressional Black Caucus understands that our children need health care this, and this budget provides the funding through SCHIP for health care for our children, our most precious resources, who are our future. And it is a shame and disgrace that we haven't been able to do what we needed to do.

So I thank the gentleman from Virginia for making sure this budget is fiscally and morally responsible.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I think if you ask the American taxpayer if it helps our domestic security to increase their taxes by $1.1 trillion over the next 5 years like this amendment does, they would probably tell you that no, and that frankly, it puts their domestic security in great jeopardy, or the $683 billion in tax increases in the underlying Democratic budget. I think obviously the answer would be the same.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds to remind the public of where we are and how we got in the ditch, and these taxes they are talking about is just repealing what got us into the ditch.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Thank you, Member SCOTT, and I thank you for the stellar job that you have done on this budget. I thank Chairwoman KILPATRICK for what she has done as well.

The Members on the other side talk about control spending. I think we need to give some indication of what ''control spending'' is. Control spending occurs when you spend $144 billion per year on war and you cut Medicaid by $500 billion over 10 years.

□ 1230

Control spending is spending $12 billion a month on war, and you are cutting Medicaid by $100 billion over 10 years.

Control spending means that you can't fully fund health care, education, first responders and infrastructure repair; but you can spend $243,550 per minute on war.

It is time for us to assess our priorities. If we can spend $395 million per day on war, then we can spend $32 million to fully fund FHIP, the Federal initiative to make sure that we end discrimination in housing. We can fund it for 1 year for $32 million. It has been cut. In 2006 we had 27,000 housing discrimination complaints; 18,000 were resolved. The administration is presently requesting $26 million in 2008. That is a 15 percent cut, given that $6 million of it will go toward a study.

FHIP is a way to end discrimination in housing. We have to have the will to fund it. If we fund FHIP, we can end housing discrimination. The Fair Housing Initiative Program deserves to be funded, and let's control spending in some other areas and take care of home.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia. I rise in favor of the CBC alternative budget.

Mr. Chairman, a nation is judged by how it treats its most vulnerable; and during the last 7 years, families have experienced a decline in their income, increased hunger, skyrocketing home heating costs, and higher taxes. This has had a devastating impact on children, families, and our seniors; and that is why our CBC budget assumes extension of these family-friendly tax cuts, but just not extending the tax cuts, for example, for corporate offshoring of jobs.

The CBC budget goes above and beyond the President's budget request. Yes, we are spending. We are spending to reinvest in the future of America's children by providing increased funding for the State Child Health Insurance Program, the Low Income Heating and Energy Assistance Program, the child welfare services, the Child Care and Development Block Grants, the Community Supplemental Food Program, child nutrition programs, and Child Support Enforcement to address the problem of the 13 million children who live in poverty.

The CBC budget also recognizes the importance of fueling the global economy by providing increased funding for educational programs like TRIO and Head Start, and fully funds No Child Left Behind.

The CBC program also increases funding for Pell Grants and Perkins loans to ensure that young people will continue to have the opportunity to get a college education and, again, support America's aspiration to stay ahead in the global economy.

Last week, a government report revealed that employers made their deepest cut in staffing in almost 5 years in the month of February. The report showed that there was a net loss of 63,000 jobs, according to the Labor Department. The CBC budget acknowledges the importance of job training programs by providing increased funding for programs under the Workforce Investment Act.

Along with laying a strong foundation for children, families and seniors and workers, the CBC budget also takes care of our Nation's veterans by providing increased funding for post-traumatic stress disorder and mental health services. It is imperative that we provide veterans with the necessary resources to guarantee excellent health care for these courageous men and women.

Most importantly, the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget applies over $16 billion to reduce the egregious Federal deficit.

I want to thank my colleagues, and particularly the gentleman from Virginia who worked on this budget.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

As you have heard, yes, we have heard time and time again this amendment does, and the underlying budget does, increase spending. And how do they pay for the increased spending? Well, $1.1 trillion over the next 5 years in increased taxes. Let me repeat that: $1.1 trillion in increased taxes. Including who? Who would get taxed? Well, everybody would get a tax increase, including, for example, reducing the child tax credit in half; including raising taxes by not extending the 10 percent tax bracket for the very-low-income taxpayers of this country; including not extending the tax relief for married couples.

This $1.1 trillion in increased taxes would hit every American, every small business, every family, every taxpayer.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 30 seconds to remind the public that we are in the ditch. We are repealing what got us in the ditch; but we are protecting those tax cuts, many of which were just mentioned, those that affect that portion of your income under $200,000. But the alternative is to stay in the ditch.

We have a problem in that we have got Social Security we are going to end up having to pay in a few years. We have got more money coming in in Social Security than going out now. That is going to change in 2018, and we are not setting aside any money for that. We have a credible plan to get us out of the ditch by repealing what got us into the ditch.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 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. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman from Virginia for the leadership of the Budget Committee and the CBC budget effort that he has led continuously, and Congresswoman KILPATRICK, the chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus.

It is important to note that I think Americans are tired of the ''I's and me's'' budget, and that is the budget of this administration, a lot of ''I's,'' a lot of ''me's,'' but never a lot of ''we's.''

I think it is evident that this budget, the Congressional Black Caucus budget, reflects some of the startling facts that Americans are facing. First, the loss of 63,000 jobs in the last month under this administration, the categorizing of this administration as second only to former President Hoover in having the worst economy in the Nation's history. And, of course, if you just go out and talk to Mr. and Mrs. Smith or Mr. and Mrs. Gonzalez or many others, they will tell you that a recession is on the way.

This budget acknowledges the needs of our Nation. It provides the honor to our veterans by increasing that budget for health care, benefits and educational opportunities $60.9 billion. Today we honored the wounded warriors. We spoke to some of them, who said that we are now being assessed for our benefits.

This is what this budget does: it provides more dollars for Community Development Block Grants going into our community for nutrition programs and housing programs by $27.4 billion. I can tell you that the City of Houston has 1,500 senior citizens on a waiting list to rehab their homes that need this budget.

In addition, this administration has had the worst civil rights enforcement ever in the history of the United States. This budget ups the President's budget by $200 million to help those who have been discriminated against.

As you can see, this tells you about the income of Americans under this administration. It is now minus. Minus. Americans are losing money. They are now losing income. We are now in the red. Americans are struggling. If you listen to the Nation's reports about foreclosures, you will find out that Americans are losing their homes by the hundreds. You will find out that the foreclosure market is stalled to the extent that so many people are losing their homes and not trying to regain them. What does that mean? People are out in the streets looking for housing.

Let me applaud Mr. SCOTT and the CBC budget team for recognizing the concept of competitiveness. For in addition to reflecting the need for increased science activity, I am very glad that they have added moneys to aeronautics. They have likewise put in a $175 million plus-up on aeronautics research.

Right now as we stand here today, *Endeavor* is making its way to the international space station. It is there now putting forward outstanding research that will bring about jobs. And that is maintained.

Let me also thank them in my concluding remarks to recognize that we must continue to provide for the soldiers, but we want those troops home. We have in this budget language that suggests that any dollars given to the administration must be used to redeploy our troops home. These are the same troops in Iraq and Afghanistan who have been redeployed once, twice, three times, four times. Their families are suffering. This bill provides us with an outlet for these returning soldiers by increasing the educational budget and providing, of course, more for health care, and, yes, fighting the international drudge of HIV/AIDS.

So I am grateful for a budget that does not stand on I's and me's. It stands on the we's and the us of America. It gives the Americans, Mr. and Mrs. America, the opportunity to dig out of a hole, to stand above this terrible income gap, and to be able to stand again in a great Nation.

This is a great budget. I ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC) Budget Substitute for the Fiscal Year Budget for 2009, introduced by my distinguished colleague from Michigan, Representative CAROLYN CHEEKS KILPATRICK and my colleague from Virginia, Representative ROBERT C. ''BOBBY'' SCOTT.

While I support the Budget as put forth by our majority on the Budget Committee. I believe there is more that needs to be done when this country is on the verge of a recession, the housing market is at one of its worst points in history, and we have a growing population of uninsured Americans.

CBC BUDGET RESCINDS TAX CUTS

The CBC budget rescinds tax cuts for the top two income tax rates and rescinds capital gains and dividend tax cuts in addition to closing other loopholes. By rescinding these tax cuts, the CBC budget fully funds No Child Left behind (NCLB), the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP), and it provides additional funding for the fight against global AIDS, Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) and higher education among other items.

BALANCES THE BUDGET

Even after funding these priorities, the CBC alternative budget still manages to balance the budget after FY12 and in fact creates a surplus of $141 billion. The Democratic budget is also in surplus in FY12, but does not fund the priorities of the American people at the same levels as the CBC budget. In comparison, the President's budget deficit in the FY12 is −31 billion.

Moreover, in FY08–FY12, the CBC budget's total cumulative deficit is $107 billion better than the Democratic budget and $339 billion better than the President's budget. As a result, over the next five years, the CBC budget saves $18.3 billion on interest on the national debt compared to the Democratic budget and 27.7 billion compared to the Presidents budget.

The bottom line is that the CBC budget chooses programs important to the American people over tax cuts for those who need it least. At the same time, it reduces the deficit and reaches a surplus in FY 2012.

ADVANCING THE PRIORITIES OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

We must not only be economically healthy, but assist in balancing it with the health, education, and security of our citizens. The CBC budget will advance the priorities of the American people by:

Covering all eligible children with health insurance through funding SCHIP, with $119.3 billion more than the President's budget and $84.6 billion more than the Democratic budget to help one of our most vulnerable populations—children;

Ensuring No Child Left Behind (NCLB) has increased funding for Head Start programs, IDEA, college access programs, college loan programs and job training with $162.7 billion more than the President's budget and $101.2 billion more than the Democratic budget;

Honoring our veterans by increasing funding for health care, benefits and educational opportunities with $60.9 billion more than the President's budget, and $17.7 billion than the Democratic budget;

Making more local communities with support through increases to Community Development Block Grants, nutrition programs and housIng programs with $27.4 billion more than the President's budget and $20 billion more than the Democratic budget; and

Contributing to the global community by investing in child survival and, health, international family planning and the global effort to fight AIDS with $11.5 billion more than the President's budget and $16.9 billion more on international affairs than the Democratic budget.

HEALTH INITIATIVES

The CBC budget under the Health Function 550 included a program that I continually push for increased funding, and that is the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation. Hope for juvenile diabetes cure lies in research. Real progress is being made, thanks largely to government funding of the Special Diabetes Program. However without the renewal of the program, federal support for Type I Diabetes will be reduced by 35 percent

The health and health care spending in the CBC budget alternative is the fiscally, socially and morally appropriate and responsible response to the President's FY 09 healthcare budget proposal, which showcases grave cuts to every office and agency, as well as to every program that is integrally important to efforts to eliminate health disparities and improve the health, well being and life opportunities of all Americans.

The CBC budget alternative, unlike the President's FY 09 budget, strengthens our nation's overwhelmed and under-resourced health care system, champions the critically important health care needs of health care seekers, and fills the gaps in health care access and quality that detrimentally affect our nation's health care providers and the overall health care system.

The CBC budget alternative makes a more than $174 billion additional investment in the health, health care, well being and thus life opportunities of not only African Americans, but all Americans. Additionally, the budget makes this very wise investment as it generates monies to reduce the nation's deficit.

The CBC budget alternative strengthens and expands the State Children's Health Insurance Program to ensure that the majority of the nation's 9 million uninsured children have access to health care. This is of particular relevance to the CBC because a disproportionate number of the 9 million uninsured children today are African American or Hispanic. Without reliable access to quality health care, children are in poorer health, are less productive in school and in their communities, and are less likely to fulfill their life's potential.

HEALTH EQUITY FUND

The CBC budget alternative creates the Health Equity Fund, which will help ensure that this nation take a giant step forward in efforts to reduce and eliminate all health disparities and achieve health equity.

STRENGTHENS MEDICARE

The CBC budget alternative strengthens Medicare—a critically important program that ensures that our nations' senior citizens, as well as those living with disabilities, have access to the health care services and treatments they need to live longer, healthier and fuller lives.

The CBC budget alternative also: saves Title VII (health professions training) programs, which are integral to strengthening and

expanding tomorrow's health care workforce; funds the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program in a manner that allows it to expand ADAP, the efforts of National Minority AIDS Education Training Centers, and the other important services and treatments offered to our most vulnerable with HIV infection; funds the Minority AIDS Initiative in a manner that will build the needed capacity in racial and ethnic minority communities throughout the nation to respond and address HIV/AIDS;

It is our children that will bring forth a thriving future. We need to invest in tomorrow by investing in them today. This starts with their physical well-being. Children, who cannot see the doctor when they are sick, research programs that are not adequately funded to find a cure for diseases such as diabetes, hurt our future generations, and not help lay a foundation for a bright future.

EDUCATION AND AFRICAN AMERICANS IN TEXAS

A quality education continues to be the best pathway to social and economic mobility in this country. As a Member and Senior Whip of the Congressional Black Caucus, I have consistently advocated for the maintenance of Historically Black Colleges and Universities. This budget provides greater funding to our nation's schools and colleges than even our Democratic budget supplies.

For African Americans health and education concerns spill beyond budgetary issues into the criminal justice consequences. In Texas, over 87,000 African-Americans are incarcerated compared to approximately 48,000 African-Americans attending college or university.

The disparity between the percentages of our youth in prison versus the number of young people in college, particularly in the African-American community, is disturbing to say the least. Higher education continues to be one of the main pathways to social and economic mobility, particularly in the African-American and Hispanic communities.

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET SUBSTITUTE

Under the Republican Budget the national debt continues to explode. The gross federal debt reached $9.0 trillion at the end of 2007. The CBO projects that the debt will rise by a total of $3.9 trillion at the end of 2008. This unprecedented rise in debt puts our President in the history books. During the seven years of the current Administration, the government has posted the highest deficits in this nation's history. The President's 2009 Budget continues the failed policies that brought us to this point.

CBC BUDGET COMPARED TO THE PRESIDENT'S AND DEMOCRATIC BUDGETS

The CBC budget improves the deficit by $564 billion over the President's budget and $152 billion over the Democratic budget.

The CBC budget saves on interest on the national debt $48.1 billion compared to the President's budget, and $22.7 billion compared to the Democratic budget.

The CBC budget spends more over five years on healthcare, veterans, education and justice than either the President's budget or the Democratic budget. The CBC budget also addresses the President's shortfalls in funding critical Homeland Security programs such as the Port Security Grant Program and grants for First Responders.

PORT OF HOUSTON AND SECURITY MEASURES

Just yesterday, I had the pleasure of meeting with the Port Authority of Houston. They were here to discuss their security measures but also their need for continued federal dollars. The Bush Administration claims they want to secure our nation but cuts funding in areas that are important to our local security such as the ports in Houston, Texas. The CBC seeks to cure that shortfall.

PAY-GO AND SUNSET PROVISIONS

The President's budget and the Republican alternatives violate pay-go and the fiscal responsibility that reconciliation is intended to achieve, by proposing tax cuts that are not offset.

The sunsets for the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts were part of the tax legislation which Republicans voted for and passed. The expiration of the tax cuts is their policy. The Democratic budgets actually calls for the extension of many of these tax cuts, but responsibly requires that tax cut extensions, like other policies, must be fiscally sound, and not make the deficit worse.

CONCLUSION

This important piece of legislation gives us a budget that is balanced fiscally and morally. It does not sacrifice the great many programs and services that this nation needs for a War that the President seems never to end.

Defense of our nation is important, however, we must not support only one portion of the budget to the detriment of everything else. The CBC budget makes tough choices that result in a fiscally and morally responsible budget that will fund essential programs and services vital to our communities and the American people as a whole.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Congressional Black Caucus Budget Substitute for FY2009.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the ranking member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I don't know what kind of statistical contortion must have gone through producing that last chart. We just finished 52 consecutive months of job growth, the largest expansion in our Nation's history.

But more to the point is this issue of whether we are raising taxes here or not, because we need to be honest with the American people. The underlying Democratic budget, don't take my word for it, it raises taxes. Take the Senate's word for it. Because just this morning on a 99–1 vote in the U.S. Senate, they rejected the logic of this budget. They said we want to preserve the middle-class tax cuts, which they define as the kid credit and the marriage penalty and 10 percent bracket and some others. But they changed the budget by $341 billion to prevent $341 billion of the $683 billion tax increase from taking place.

So don't take my word for it, but the Democrats and the Republicans in the Senate. All but one person said we should not raise taxes as much as the House Democrats are raising taxes; let's raise taxes half as much.

So the point is this: our friends on the other side of the aisle can come up with reserve funds and senses of Congress and preferences and hopes and dreams and aspirations. But what counts is what you put in the budget. And if you are coming to the floor and saying you are balancing the budget, by the way this budget is written, it only does so by giving us the largest tax increase in American history. No sense of Congress, no empty reserve fund can change that fact.

Don't listen to me. Listen to the fact that the Senate looked at this same budget and said, that is not what we want to do. We want to preserve some of these tax cuts, and they just voted 99–1 to do just that. They decided to raise taxes half as much as the Democrats here in the House are doing.

So what really matters are budgets, because that is the numbers. They don't lie. This budget that we are voting on, this underlying budget, gives us the largest tax increase in American history. Let me read a few of them:

Some 116 million taxpayers will see an average tax increase of more than $1,800 per year.

More than 6 million low-income individuals and couples who currently pay no taxes will be no longer exempt.

A family of four earning $50,000 will see their taxes increase by $2,100.

Approximately 48 million married couples will face an average tax increase of $3,000 per year.

Low-income families with one or two children will no longer be eligible for the refundable child tax credit.

Roughly 12 million single women with children will see their taxes increase by $1,100 a year.

About 18 million seniors will be subjected to tax increases of more than $2,100 a year.

Tax bills for an estimated 27 million small business owners will increase by more than $4,000 each.

That is what the underlying Democratic budget does. It was rejected in the Democratically controlled Senate. It ought to be rejected in this House here today.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN).

□ 1245

I want to thank the gentleman, Mr. SCOTT, for his leadership on the CBC budget.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget offered today. The CBC budget once again proposed to change a 7-year Republican policy that I have called Reverse Robin Hood, stealing from the poor to give tax breaks to the rich.

You might ask why the Democratic budget, which I support, needs improvement. The Democratic budget needs improvement because when America has a cold, the African American community has pneumonia. The CBC budget reversed the deep cuts that have been made to the programs that

serve the neediest Americans. This year's Congressional Black Caucus budget covers all eligible children with health care insurance through funding for CHIP, $84 billion more than the Democratic budget and $119 billion more than the President's; ensures no child is left behind by funding education and providing increased funding for Head Start, college access programs, college loans, and job training programs, $101 billion more than the Democratic budget and $162 billion more than the President's; honors our veterans by increasing funding for health care, benefits, and educational opportunities, $17 billion more than the Democratic budget and $60 billion over the President's budget; makes local community more secure by fully funding justice, gang prevention, and local law enforcement programs, as well as ensuring every voice counts by funding the Help America Vote Act.

We talk about a stimulus, and the only stimulus is the investment in our people, in education, in health care, in job training, so support economic and fiscal recovery. Vote ''yes'' on the budget. I encourage us to vote for the economic recovery by voting for the CBC budget.

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I once again want to commend our colleagues from the CBC. They have done a lot of work to put this budget together. It is not an easy task to do. It takes a lot of work, not only from the members, from their staffs, so I want to commend them for putting together a work product that I know they spent a lot of time and a lot of effort on, and they must be commended for that.

Obviously, as you have heard today, we have some huge disagreements. This amendment would raise taxes by more than $1.1 trillion, that's trillion with a ''T,'' over the next 5 years.

It's $427 billion above and beyond the already $683 billion in tax increases in the underlying Democratic budget that, frankly, was pretty much just rejected in a very strong vote in the Senate, 99–1.

The reason there was a 99–1 vote was because the Senators on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, do not want to support eliminating all of these middle class tax cuts, the tax cuts on families, the tax cuts per child, et cetera, et cetera, which is why they rejected that and adopted an amendment to have half the size of the tax increase that the underlying budget has. Half that size of an increase in taxes is still way too high.

However, the underlying budget that the House is looking at, again, would raise taxes on the American people by $683 billion over the next 5 years, and this amendment goes even further than that by increasing taxes $1.1 trillion over the next 5 years.

For those reasons and many others, I respectfully would ask to vote against this amendment. But I do want to end one more time by commending the gentleman from Virginia and all his colleagues for doing a lot of work and putting together a work program that requires a lot of effort and a lot of work, even though, again, when it came out, obviously it's a $1.1 trillion tax increase, which is why, among other reasons, we cannot support it.

I would respectfully then ask my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I just want to make a couple of closing comments. First on defense, the number on defense, we keep the same number on the defense budget. However, we have different priorities. Those priorities will be debated in a different forum.

The $70 billion for the war we restrict to redeployment. We want those troops back as soon as practicable, consistent with our national security interests.

On waste, fraud, and abuse, we just don't talk about waste, fraud, and abuse. We spend $300 million to implement the GAO's studies and recommendations for how you can reduce fraud, waste, and abuse in the military. We make them spend the money to actually implement those recommendations.

Our budget eliminates the fees and copays that the President's budget has for our veterans. It is insulting to try to balance the budget on the backs of our courageous veterans. We do have entitlement reform, $150 billion in entitlement reform, by reducing the subsidies to private corporations who provide Medicare Advantage. Those that provide, those are the subsidies that you get nothing for. Medicare could do it cheaper, $150 billion cheaper, and that's the reform that we have.

A lot has been said about tax cuts. We repeal what got us in the ditch. We protect those tax cuts that primarily affect that portion of your income under $200,000.

In summary, this is where we are, back in the ditch. We repeal the tax cuts that got us into the ditch. One of those tax cuts that we want to repeal is a $20 billion tax cut referred to as PEP and Pease, affecting personal exemptions and standard deductions. The only people that get this essentially are millionaires. If you make over $1 million you get this much tax cut; $200,000 to $1 million, you get that much tax cut; $100,000 to $200,000 you don't need ink to draw the bar; and $100,000, out of this $20 billion, you get, on average, zero. All of those tax cuts, we have said, had the greatest expansion in recent history.

Let's talk about the arithmetic. Arithmetic fact, worst job growth since Herbert Hoover. Look at the job growth of all the Presidents down to President Hoover; worst, this administration, and they are bragging about it.

We have a responsible budget that reduces the deficit, goes into surplus. It's a responsible budget that also funds many of our priorities: education, health care, veterans, justice. It is a responsible budget, and I would ask for the House to adopt this budget.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the CBC FY09 alternative budget. I'm particularly excited today, because last night the Second Chance Act of 2007, a bipartisan piece of legislation, unanimously passed the Senate. I look forward to President Bush signing the legislation and the appropriation of money in DOJ to fund vital programs which the bill promotes.

Indeed, currently, the Administration FY09 budget proposes to: Merge 30 grant programs under State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance for a reduction in funding of $1.008 billion; collapse 14 Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) for a reduction in funding of $587.2 million; consolidate Weed and Seed programs for a reduction in funding of $32.1 million; collapse 7 juvenile justice grants into 1 grant program for a reduction in funding of $198.5 million; and lastly, merge current formula and discretionary grant programs into 1 program for a reduction in funding of $120 million, for an overall collapse of 70 DOJ programs into 5 programs and a reduction in funding totaling $1.5 billion.

These cuts come as America's prisons reach an alltime high and State incarceration costs are bursting at the seams. According to the latest study, between 1987 and 2007, States spent more than double on corrections (+127 percent) while higher education spending has been moderate (+21 percent).

It's with this in mind that I categorically support CBC's proposed budget, which includes $4 billion dollars to these vital DOJ programs. The CBC has made tough choices, established right priorities while exercising fiscal and moral responsibility to reduce recidivism and State incarceration costs.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Congressional Black Caucus, CBC, Budget Substitute for the Fiscal Year Budget for 2009, introduced by my distinguished colleague from Michigan, Representative CAROLYN CHEEKS KILPATRICK and my colleague from Virginia, Representative ROBERT C. ''BOBBY'' SCOTT.

While I support the Budget as put forth by our majority on the Budget Committee, I believe there is more that needs to be done when this country is on the verge of a recession, the housing market is at one of its worst points in history, and we have a growing population of uninsured Americans.

CBC BUDGET RESCINDS TAX CUTS

The CBC budget rescinds tax cuts for the top two income tax rates and rescinds capital gains and dividend tax cuts in addition to closing other loopholes. By rescinding these tax cuts, the CBC budget fully funds No Child Left Behind, NCLB, the State Children's Health Insurance Program, SCHIP, and it provides additional funding for the fight against global AIDS, Community Development Block Grants, CDBG, and higher education, among other items.

BALANCES THE BUDGET

Even after funding these priorities, the CBC alternative budget still manages to balance the budget after FY12 and in fact creates a surplus of $141 billion. The Democratic budget is also in surplus in FY12 but does not fund the priorities of the American people at the same

levels as the CBC budget. In comparison, the President's budget deficit in the FY12 is −31 billion.

Moreover, in FY08–FY12, the CBC budget's total cumulative deficit is $107 billion better than the Democratic budget and $339 billion better than the President's budget. As a result, over the next 5 years, the CBC budget saves $18.3 billion on interest on the national debt compared to the Democratic budget and $27.7 billion compared to the President's budget.

The bottom line is that the CBC budget chooses programs important to the American people over tax cuts for those who need it least. At the same time, it reduces the deficit and reaches a surplus in FY 2012.

ADVANCING THE PRIORITIES OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

We must not only be economically healthy but assist in balancing it with the health, education, and security of our citizens. The CBC budget will advance the priorities of the American people by:

Covering all eligible children with health insurance through funding SCHIP, with $119.3 billion more than the President's budget and $84.6 billion more than the Democratic budget to help one of our most vulnerable populations—children;

Ensuring No Child Left Behind, NCLB, has increased funding for Head Start programs, IDEA, college access programs, college loan programs and job training with $162.7 billion more than the President's budget and $101.2 billion more than the Democratic budget;

Honoring our veterans by increasing funding for health care, benefits and educational opportunities with $60.9 billion more than the President's budget, and $17.7 billion than the Democratic budget;

Making more local communities with support through increases to Community Development Block Grants, nutrition programs and housing programs with $27.4 billion more than the President's budget and $20 billion more than the Democratic budget; and

Contributing to the global community by investing in child survival and health, international family planning and the global effort to fight AIDS with $11.5 billion more than the President's budget and $16.9 billion more on international affairs than the Democratic budget.

HEALTH INITIATIVES

The CBC budget under the Health Function 550 included a program that I continually push for increased funding, and that is the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation. Hope for juvenile diabetes cure lies in research. Real progress is being made, thanks largely to Government funding of the Special Diabetes Program. However without the renewal of the program, Federal support for Type I Diabetes will be reduced by 35 percent.

The health and health care spending in the CBC budget alternative is the fiscally, socially and morally appropriate and responsible response to the President's FY09 health care budget proposal, which showcases grave cuts to every office and agency, as well as to every program that is integrally important to efforts to eliminate health disparities and improve the health, well-being and life opportunities of all Americans.

The CBC budget alternative, unlike the President's FY09 budget, strengthens our Nation's overwhelmed and under-resourced health care system, champions the critically important health care needs of health care seekers, and fills the gaps in health care access and quality that detrimentally affect our Nation's health care providers and the overall health care system.

The CBC budget alternative makes a more than $174 billion additional investment in the health, health care, well-being and thus life opportunities of not only African-Americans, but all Americans. Additionally, the budget makes this very wise investment as it generates monies to reduce the Nation's deficit.

The CBC budget alternative strengthens and expands the State Children's Health Insurance Program to ensure that the majority of the Nation's 9 million uninsured children have access to health care. This is of particular relevance to the CBC because a disproportionate number of the 9 million uninsured children today are African-American or Hispanic. Without reliable access to quality health care, children are in poorer health, are less productive in school and in their communities, and are less likely to fulfill their life's potential.

HEALTH EQUITY FUND

The CBC budget alternative creates the Health Equity Fund, which will help ensure that this Nation take a giant step forward in efforts to reduce and eliminate all health disparities and achieve health equity.

STRENGTHENS MEDICARE

The CBC budget alternative strengthens Medicare—a critically important program that ensures that our Nation's senior citizens, as well as those living with disabilities, have access to the health care services and treatments they need to live longer, healthier and fuller lives.

The CBC budget alternative also: saves Title VII (health professions training) programs, which are integral to strengthening and expanding tomorrow's health care workforce; funds the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program in a manner that allows it to expand ADAP, the efforts of National Minority AIDS Education Training Centers, and the other important services and treatments offered to our most vulnerable with HIV infection; funds the Minority AIDS Initiative in a manner that will build the needed capacity in racial and ethnic minority communities throughout the Nation to respond and address HIV/AIDS.

It is our children that will bring forth a thriving future. We need to invest in tomorrow by investing in them today. This starts with their physical well-being. Children who cannot see the doctor when they are sick, research programs that are not adequately funded to find a cure for diseases such as diabetes, hurt our future generations, and do not help lay a foundation for a bright future.

EDUCATION AND AFRICAN-AMERICANS IN TEXAS

A quality education continues to be the best pathway to social and economic mobility in this country. As a Member and Senior Whip of the Congressional Black Caucus, I have consistently advocated for the maintenance of Historically Black Colleges and Universities. This budget provides greater funding to our Nation's schools and colleges than even our Democratic budget supplies.

For African-Americans, health and education concerns spill beyond budgetary issues into the criminal justice consequences. In Texas, over 87,000 African-Americans are incarcerated compared to approximately 48,000 African-Americans attending college or university. The disparity between the percentages of our youth in prison versus the number of young people in college, particularly in the African-American community, is disturbing to say the least. Higher education continues to be one of the main pathways to social and economic mobility, particularly in the African-American and Hispanic communities.

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET SUBSTITUTE

Under the Republican Budget the national debt continues to explode. The gross Federal debt reached $9.0 trillion at the end of 2007. The CBO projects that the debt will rise by a total of $3.9 trillion at the end of 2008. This unprecedented rise in debt puts our President in the history books. During the 7 years of the current Administration, the Government has posted the highest deficits in this Nation's history. The President's 2009 Budget continues the failed policies that brought us to this point.

CBC BUDGET COMPARED TO THE PRESIDENT'S AND DEMOCRATIC BUDGETS

The CBC budget improves the deficit by $564 billion over the President's budget and $152 billion over the Democratic budget.

The CBC budget saves on interest on the national debt $48.1 billion compared to the President's budget, and $22.7 billion compared to the Democratic budget.

The CBC budget spends more over 5 years on health care, veterans, education, and justice than either the President's budget or the Democratic budget. The CBC budget also addresses the President's shortfalls in funding critical Homeland Security programs such as the Port Security Grant Program and grants for First Responders.

PORT OF HOUSTON AND SECURITY MEASURES

Just yesterday, I had the pleasure of meeting with the Port Authority of Houston. They were here to discuss their security measures but also their need for continued Federal dollars. The Bush administration claims they want to secure our Nation but cuts funding in areas that are important to our local security such as the ports in Houston, Texas. The CBC seeks to cure that shortfall.

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE

Under the proposed CBC budget, there is a greater emphasis on the administration of justice and the protection of all Americans. The CBC budget funds programs that the President's budget had severely reduced or not funded at all. These programs must be funded. The CBC budget funds the Justice Assistance Grant Program, Juvenile Justice Programs, the Byrne Weed and Seed Program, Office of Violence Against Women, COPS and JAG programs. All of these programs help keep American communities safe and provide for greater law enforcement at the Federal, State, and local enforcement levels. The CBC budget reinvests in DOJ Prisoner Reentry Program. In addition, the CBC budget invests in our children by requiring funding for Boys and Girls clubs. This investment in our communities and in our children helps keep our youths safe and out of the prison system.

GENERAL SCIENCES, SPACE AND TECHNOLOGY

The CBC budget proposes to invest heavily in our Nation's development in science, space, and technology. The CBC budget invests $31 million in NASA educational programs and $8 million in HBCU–UP. The CBC budget also invests in the NSF Education and Research Programs, with a special emphasis on minority post doctorates. The CBC budget not only invests in minorities, it also invests in women by

providing over $500,000 for Graduate Research Fellowships for Women in Engineering and Computer Science.

ENERGY

The CBC budget addresses the environment, energy, and natural resources. The CBC budget provides for $250 million to the weatherization assistance and it provides for $400 million for the energy efficiency and renewable energy programs. These programs are of particular interest to the people of Texas and I think it is necessary for America to remain a vital, energy efficient country. With respect to natural resources and the environment, the CBC budget provides $100 million for EPA funding and $1 billion for the HBCU Historic Preservation Program.

EDUCATION, TRAINING, EMPLOYMENT, AND SOCIAL SERVICES

The proposed CBC budget puts greater emphasis on education, training, employment, and social services. These are critical to the needs of Americans and minority populations in general.

The CBC budget provides funding for the No Child Left Behind Act. Included in that act is funding for Title I, Safe and Drug Free Schools, 21st Century Learning Centers, and Teacher Quality Programs. We must continue to invest in our children because they represent the future of America.

The CBC budget also recognizes that there must be investment in Head Start, mentoring, and dropout prevention. The proposed CBC budget provides $50 million to vocational programs and increases the funding of HBCUs by $200 million. The CBC budget provides for $50 million in investment in minority science and engineering improvement. The CBC budget provides $2 million for Thurgood Marshall Legal Fund, which is a very important measure for educating minority qualified minority lawyers. In addition, the CBC budget invests in adult employment and training activities.

PAY-GO AND SUNSET PROVISIONS

The President's budget and the Republican alternatives violate pay-go and the fiscal responsibility that reconciliation is intended to achieve, by proposing tax cuts that are not offset.

The sunsets for the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts were part of the tax legislation which Republicans voted for and passed. The expiration of the tax cuts is their policy. The Democratic budgets actually calls for the extension of many of these tax cuts, but responsibly requires that tax cut extensions, like other policies, must be fiscally sound, and not make the deficit worse.

CONCLUSION

This important piece of legislation gives us a budget that is balanced fiscally and morally. It does not sacrifice the great many programs and services that this Nation needs for a war that the President seems never to end.

Defense of our Nation is important, however, we must not support only one portion of the budget to the detriment of everything else. The CBC budget makes tough choices that result in a fiscally and morally responsible budget that will fund essential programs and services vital to our communities and the American people as a whole.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Congressional Black Caucus Budget Substitute for FY2009.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget alternative.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle have criticized this proposal because they say that it raises taxes and spending.

The fact is, our Republican colleagues have different priorities than we do. In these perilous economic times, the Congressional Black Caucus believes our priority should be to help those Americans who are losing their jobs and their homes, who can't afford health care, higher education, and job training, who have to decide between paying the gas bill or paying for prescription drugs.

The Republicans want to know where the cuts are in the CBC budget. Their budget slashes Medicare, Medicaid, the Low Income Heating and Energy Assistance Program and countless other critical social service programs. They think these programs are unnecessary; their priority is to preserve the Bush tax cuts, more than 99 percent of which go to people making more than $225,000 per year. More than 85 percent of the money we lose due to these cuts goes to households with incomes above $500,000 per year; 65 percent goes to households with incomes above $1 million. In fact, $51 billion next year alone will go to tax breaks for millionaires.

By rescinding Bush's tax cuts, the Congressional Black Caucus increases funding for needed social programs while reducing the deficit even more than the Republicans do.

It would seem the Republicans' concern is not fiscal responsibility, but preserving tax cuts for the rich, even if this grows the national debt. And, of course, we aren't even discussing the President's war today, which spends $12 billion dollars a month, more than most of these social service programs spend in a year, or 5 years, or 10 years. The debate today is clear. It's about priorities. We believe in keeping working Americans in their homes; the Republicans want to make sure the rich can stay in their mansions and yachts.

I want to draw particular attention to some of my personal priorities within the CBC budget alternative. I am happy that the CBC accepted my proposal to add $10 million to the National Health Service Corps to help train the next generation of doctors to go into underserved communities without being crippled by educational debt.

The CBC budget also includes several of my proposals to increase funding for Department of Justice programs.

The highly successful COPS program focuses on local strategies to fight crime and has been praised by federal, state, and local law enforcement and political officials. The President's budget terminates the COPS program. In contrast, the CBC fully funds COPS at $500 million for FY 2009.

I also recommended, and the CBC budget includes, increased funding for other vital local law enforcement programs, including Drug Courts and the Byrne Justice Assistance Grants. In addition, we significantly increase funding for programs serving juveniles who have entered our justice system, in an effort to break the cycle of crime and violence and to help these children to become productive members of our society.

It's about priorities, and the choice today is clear. Supporting the CBC budget means prioritizing the basic needs of the American people. Supporting the Republicans' proposal means continuing our current course, where the rich keep getting richer, while the needs of the poor and middle class are neglected.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 126, noes 292, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 137]

AYES—126

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Baldwin
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Castor
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costello
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Delahunt
DeLauro
Doyle
Ellison
Emanuel
Engel
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kucinich
Langevin
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matsui
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Price (NC)
Richardson
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Solis
Stark
Sutton
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Wynn

NOES—292

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Arcuri
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards

Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Fossella
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Gene
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Keller
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lampson
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Ortiz
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sanchez, Loretta
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—16

Bordallo
Boustany
Cubin
Davis (IL)
Hooley
Hunter
LaHood
Lewis (GA)
Oberstar
Rangel
Renzi
Rush
Space
Tancredo
Woolsey
Young (AK)

□ 1316

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

Messrs. EMANUEL, CLEAVER, COHEN, PALLONE and Ms. KAPTUR changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. SPACE. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably detained during rollcall vote 137. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. LEE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 110–548.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 2 offered by Ms. LEE:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009.

The Congress determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008 is revised and replaced and that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2009, including appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2010 through 2018.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2018:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $1,895,099,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,133,180,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,325,649,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,531,506,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,671,192,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,772,290,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $2,958,205,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,077,843,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,229,982,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3.392,139,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,565,088,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be adjusted are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $4,441,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $36,056,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $142,785,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $103,481,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $17,877,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $17,550,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $49,669,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $49,578,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $49,647,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $49,781,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $49,781,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $2,673,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,616,978,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,715,278,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,867,630,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,931,558,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $3,115,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,254,760,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,391,086,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,574,696,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,696,318,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,804,202,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $2,555,301,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,633,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,742,901,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,868,360,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,906,718,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $3,098,022,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $3,237,564,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $3,369,163,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $3,556,338,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $3,672,919,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $3,784,879,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $680,203,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $500,309,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $417,252,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $336,854,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $235,527,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $325,732,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $299,359,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $291,320,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $326,356,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $280,780,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $219,791,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the debt subject to limit are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $9,665,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $10,261,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $10,786,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $11,228,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $11,595,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $12,035,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $12,446,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $12,846,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $13,259,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $13,637,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $13,963,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $5,494,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $5,815,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $6,043,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $6,172,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $6,185,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $6,284,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014: $6,351,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015: $6,405,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016: $6,495,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017: $6,541,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018: $6,528,000,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2009 through 2013 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $590,686,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $576,173,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $447,581,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $511,354,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $459,368,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $480,072,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $472,272,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $476,871,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $485,586,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $475,791,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $499,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $490,585,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $513,212,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $503,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $527,678,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $518,179,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $542,899,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $537,546,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $558,342,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $548,691,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $574,487,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $559,777,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $32,648,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $32,843,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $78,708,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $80,799,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $69,354,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $82,696,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $84,581,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $78,716,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $86,082,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $82,004,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $88,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,742,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $90,302,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,752,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $92,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $87,813,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $94,708,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $89,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $96,989,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $91,849,000,000.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $27,407,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,456,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $27,934,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $28,472,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,507,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $29,071,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,297,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $29,679,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,917,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $30,290,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,026,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $30,930,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,417,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $31,576,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,991,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $32,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,754,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $32,933,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,288,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $33,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,956,000,000.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $3,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,681,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $33,874,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,831,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $33,832,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,716,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $33,880,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,901,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $33,950,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,073,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $34,022,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,681,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $33,989,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,695,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $345,096,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,850,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $34,203,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,917,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $34,318,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,019,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $34,443,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,167,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $45,960,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $42,952,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $46,290,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,834,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $47,182,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,922,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $48,070,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,656,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $48,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,384,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $49,890,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,111,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $44,106,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,623,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $45,045,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,838,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $47,484,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,643,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $49,976,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,972,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $52,998,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,603,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $22,456,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,528,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $21,529,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,279,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $21,719,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,680,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $21,891,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $22,263,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,621,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,816,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $23,003,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,180,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $22,278,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,483,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $22,605,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,754,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $23,102,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,136,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $23,445,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,443,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $11,216,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $9,899,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,998,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $13,887,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,886,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $8,998,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,197,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $9,246,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,742,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $9,642,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,651,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $9,742,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,366,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $9,677,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $985,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $9,360,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $442,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $19,282,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,249,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $14,300,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,138,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $98,594,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $87,772,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $97,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,321,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $86,607,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,871,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $90,527,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,670,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $95,470,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $103,030,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $99,456,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $108,070,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $94,588,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $107,880,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $97,628,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $109,579,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $100,659,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $112,823,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $103,685,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $116,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $95,302,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $119,603,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $20,029,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,819,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $20,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,473,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $20,470,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,372,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $20,804,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,173,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $21,149,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,076,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $21,483,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,109,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $21,843,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,045,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $22,202,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,368,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:

(A) New budget authority, $22,577,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,726,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $22,960,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $23,352,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,512,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $100,077,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $93,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $152,938,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $114,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $159,402,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $154,790,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $163,118,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $160,122,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $166,089,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $162,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $160,703,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $161,936,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $163,075,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $160,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $165,862,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $162,859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $168,896,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $165,817,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $172,108,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $168,982,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $175,190,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $172,248,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $315,101,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $316,688,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $325,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $322,038,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $342,990,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $342,678,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $364,074,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $362,827,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $387,180,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $385,634,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $412,555,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $410,734,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $461,751,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $459,405,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $490,571,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $488,275,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $522,027,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $519,484,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $560,796,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $558,123,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $598,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $595,600,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $390,458,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $390,454,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $420,086,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $419,880,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $445,118,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $445,247,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $494,261,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $494,084,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $491,241,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $490,999,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $552,274,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $552,389,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $592,257,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $592,056,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $634,929,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $634,673,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $712,077,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $712,180,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $740,467,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $740,257,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $767,646,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $767,378,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $435,615,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $435,150,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $474,208,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $472,869,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $488,352,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $486,209,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $505,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $502,945,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $498,262,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $495,754,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $519,205,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $517,057,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $532,617,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $531,454,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $547,151,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $545,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $567,206,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $565,806,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $576,948,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $575,380,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $587,245,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $585,652,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $19,378,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $21,208,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,220,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $23,692,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,696,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $27,226,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,226,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $30,235,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,236,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $33,053,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,053,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $36,065,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,066,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $39,363,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,364,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $43,054,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,054,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $47,046,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,046,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $51,400,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,400,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $86,365,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $94,258,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,762,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $96,246,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,493,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $100,984,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $101,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $97,137,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $97,053,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $138,057,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $137,573,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $139,850,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $139,467,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $141,742,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $141,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $147,423,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $147,195,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $145,847,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $145,682,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $144,051,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $143,814,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $46,237,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,282,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $45,858,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,610,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $44,784,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,744,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $45,924,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,897,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $47,107,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,069,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $48,349,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,990,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $49,617,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,236,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $53,261,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,875,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $55,606,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,180,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $57,212,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,799,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $58,887,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,413,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $56,407,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,920,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $23,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,171,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $20,273,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,289,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $21,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,008,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $21,853,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,856,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:

(A) New budget authority, $22,527,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,301,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $23,285,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,044,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $23,728,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,650,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $24,430,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,444,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $25,115,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $25,848,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,566,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $350,038,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $350,038,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $336,143,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $336,143,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $372,731,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $372,731,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $411,018,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $411,018,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $437,665,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $437,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $456,148,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $456,148,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $478,881,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $478,881,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $499,189,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $499,189,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $517,770,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $517,770,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $533,414,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $533,414,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $548,262,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $548,262,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $108,056,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,901,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $5,760,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,491,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $0,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,291,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $0,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,032,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $0,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,302,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $0,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,478,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $0,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $805,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $0,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $445,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $0,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $327,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $0,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $302,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $0,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $177,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $−86,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−86,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $−67,060,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−67,060,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $−70,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−70,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $−73,364,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−73,364,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $−76,104,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−76,104,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $−79,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−76,691,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $−82,234,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−82,234,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $−85,193,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−85,193,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $−88,338,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−88,338,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $−96,941,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−96,941,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $−101,681,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $−101,681,000,000.
(21) Overseas Deployments and Other Activities (970):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $_____,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $_____,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $_____,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $_____,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $_____,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $_____,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $_____,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $_____,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $_____,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $_____,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $_____,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $_____,000,000.
Fiscal year 2014:
(A) New budget authority, $_____,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $_____,000,000.
Fiscal year 2015:
(A) New budget authority, $_____,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $_____,000,000.
Fiscal year 2016:
(A) New budget authority, $_____,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $_____,000,000.
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, $_____,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $_____,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $_____,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $_____,000,000.

SEC. 4.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1036, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Along with my colleague from California, Congresswoman LYNN WOOLSEY, I cochair the Congressional Progressive Caucus. And let me just take a moment to acknowledge our cochair, Congresswoman WOOLSEY, whose hard work, whose brilliant intellect, and whose soaring spirit really is with us today, even though she's at home recuperating very well from back surgery. She'll be back very soon to continue to fight to bring our young men and women home from Iraq.

I rise today to offer the Congressional Progressive Caucus budget. We call it our antipoverty, pro-opportunity, peace, and security budget.

Budgets really are moral documents. They provide a road map to identify and invest in our Nation's values and our priorities. The CPC alternative budget reflects our American mainstream values by making the right investments to fight poverty, to grow our economy, to assist survivors of Hurricane Katrina, to bring common sense to our national security budget, and to redeploy our troops and military contractors from Iraq.

Our budget does this in a way that not only balances our priorities but balances the Federal budget. Our budget stands in stark contrast to the President's very cynical proposal that he presented to us last month.

The Progressive budget rejects the President's budget and its attack on working families, minority communities, and many of our most vulnerable populations, like seniors and low-income individuals.

The Progressive budget rejects the President's ongoing occupation of Iraq that's costing taxpayers $12 billion, $12 billion each month. And the Progressive budget rejects the President's $200 billion cuts to Medicare and Medicaid that would raise premiums for our Nation's seniors and cut payments to the doctors and hospitals who serve them.

Our budget is different. It faces the poverty crisis in America head on, starting with redress and reconstruction for gulf coast victims of Hurricane Katrina. It is designed to reverse the Iraq recession by providing a vital stimulus to jump-start the economy. It is the only budget that brings common sense to national security by reinvesting the President's bloated defense funding request for the Pentagon, the highest since World War II.

The Progressive alternative will provide at least $551 billion for domestic, nonmilitary discretionary spending in fiscal year 2009, $131.9 billion above the President's request. As part of this increase in domestic discretionary spending, the Progressive Caucus budget also includes $73 billion to develop a sustained, coordinated, public private sector strategy that recommits America to a renewed war on poverty. This will cut the poverty rate in America in half in a decade. This goal is in line with H. Con. Res. 198, a resolution that I introduced which passed unanimously in the House in January.

We have budgeted the dollars to bring millions of children out of poverty by expanding the earned income tax credit for larger families and making the child tax credit fully refundable for any family earning more than $3,000. It will also finally begin to fully redress the continuing plight of the survivors of Hurricane Katrina.

Our alternative would provide the funds for the housing and the health care, education, and infrastructure investment, and the vital social services needed to bring people back to Louisiana and Mississippi.

Our budget would also immediately provide $118 billion to fund the most effective stimulus programs available to the government. We extend unemployment insurance, food stamp benefits, and critical Medicaid payments to States that will not only help keep State governments solvent, but keep more workers healthy and productive. The economic stimulus package will include assistance for low-income and unemployed people that were ignored by the first stimulus.

Additionally, the CPC budget provides foreclosure relief and includes new investments to rebuild our Nation's schools, fix our highways and bridges, and build new affordable housing. These initiatives will create jobs that will help keep more families in their homes.

Now, all of these vital programs will be a down payment on our rebuild and reinvest in America initiative. This long-term, sustainable project will create green jobs, reinvigorate our schools, and foster a new commitment to excellence in our students. We will repair our water, power, and transportation systems so that America cannot only compete in the global economy, but once again lead.

The Progressive budget also brings common sense to national security spending, providing $468 billion, which is $68 billion under the President's bloated request. Our budget cuts government waste, fraud, and abuse, and eliminates outdated and ineffective Cold War air weapons systems that were developed to fight an enemy that really no longer exists.

Most importantly, the CPC budget will end the occupation of Iraq by rapidly and safely redeploying our troops and military contractors. We have wasted far too much money on this occupation already, over a half trillion dollars to date. We cannot afford to spend another $3 trillion that some have estimated this will take.

So this budget achieves all these goals and brings the Federal budget, mind you, into budget by fiscal year 2012 and, upon the completion of our reinvest and rebuild America initiative, back into balance in 2018. I urge this body to reject the President's draconian cuts to vital programs for working American families and to support the CPC's alternative budget.

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

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, there are three different budgets that are offered by our friends on the other side of the aisle, the Democrats, today. They have many common elements. This one, perhaps, though, is the worst. It's the worst in that it raises taxes by the highest amount on working families all across America, especially at a time when they're trying to stretch their paychecks to make sure that they can keep a roof over their head, to make sure that they can fill up their cars and their pickup trucks, to make sure that maybe for the first time they're able to send somebody to college.

Now, we know that the main Democrat alternative, the one that ultimately will be voted on by the majority of our friends on the other side of the aisle, that has over a $600 billion tax increase included in it. That's roughly $3,000 for every family in America. That's the average tax increase that will be imposed upon families over the next 5-year period.

Now, this particular budget increases taxes by almost a third more. So I haven't, Mr. Chairman, quite had the time to do the back-of-the-envelope calculation, but who knows, maybe they're raising taxes by $4,000 per family.

And not unlike all the other Democrat budgets we hear, they're saying, well, we don't really want to raise taxes on working families, and we really want to give them tax relief.

But what I don't see, Mr. Chairman, is any effort whatsoever for people to put their vote where their rhetoric is.

If I've done my homework properly, over the last 6 years there have been 21 different votes on the House floor to stop these huge automatic tax increases that are part of current law. And yet, my guess is, and I don't have the list in front of me, that most of my friends on the other side of the aisle kept those tax increases, and so now they're going to be imposed on working people.

Now we're told, well, it's not really a tax increase. It's just the expiration of tax relief. Well, that's kind of interesting, because I can tell you that is a fine distinction that's going to be lost on the working men and women of the Fifth Congressional District of Texas.

If you wake up one day and your paycheck, if you're making the same salary next year that you made last year, and all of a sudden your taxes are higher, I can tell you, to the school teacher in Mesquite, Texas, that's a tax increase. To the rancher in Mineola, Texas, that's a tax increase. To a factory worker in Garland, that's a tax increase. So I know that it's very common and seems to be favorable within the Halls of Congress to say, well, there's no tax increase; we're just letting tax relief expire. Well, ultimately, especially in 2011 when the full brunt of this tax increase occurs, working families all across America will be hit, and it will impact, again, their ability to keep a roof over their head, their ability to send someone to college.

The Republican budget doesn't have any tax increases in it. It also, on the other hand, has no tax cuts in it. But what it does do is it prevents automatic tax increases that are part of current law from occurring.

Now, a second part of this budget, which is common with all the Democrat budgets, is it does nothing, nothing about the proliferation of earmarks. There's been a huge debate in the United States Congress about what to do about earmarks.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I'll admit not all earmarks are bad, but the system is bad. And our friends on the other side of the aisle told us they would come here and clean them up. They said they'd cut them in half. But last year we had the second highest amount of earmarks that we've ever had.

We were told there would be transparency, yet we had almost 300 of what we call air-dropped earmarks that just somehow appear mystically out of the heavens into these bills that nobody knows they're there and no opportunity to come to the House floor to debate.

And so here we have on the one hand, Mr. Chairman, we have working families struggling, struggling to stretch their paychecks, and yet our friends on the other side of the aisle want to perpetuate the status quo of earmarks, which many Americans are now waking up to the fact that all too often someone in Congress is taking a bite out of their paycheck so that some Member of Congress can keep theirs. It's not fair to them, particularly in tough, challenging economic times.

□ 1330

So in the Republican budget, we declare a year-long moratorium on earmarks. And we give that money to the taxpayer. We say, You know what, it's more important that you are able to pay your heating bill, and it is more important that you be able to put gasoline in your car than it is to fund some kind of monument to me as has been done for the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. It's more important that you have $2 million than some Member of Congress get a monument to himself.

We say it's more important, again, that the rancher in Mineola, Texas, is able to send a kid to college than it is to send $100,000 to make sure we have proper landscaping in the L.A. fashion district.

These are two very distinct differences. So we are having the largest tax increase in American history to pay for more congressional earmarks, and clearly this budget and every other Democrat budget needs to be summarily rejected by this body.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. LEE. I would like to yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK), the Chair of the Financial Services Committee, who has had a very good handle on what it takes to bring our economy back.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thought the Republican

budget deficits that we have seen since they took power in 2001 were pretty big, but the rhetoric deficit between what they say and economic reality is even bigger. There are zero tax increases or cuts in any of these budgets. The tax situation at the end of the year, the end of this fiscal year, will be the same.

Now, the gentleman from Texas is worried about people who will be facing tax increases later on. By the way, he says tax increases that are in current law, that's current law that the Republicans passed.

I didn't vote for the current law, so they don't like what they put into the law. But the people I talk with, working people in my district, no, they are not worried about estate taxes on $20 million. They're not worried about incomes over $200,000.

The gentleman did make an accurate point. He said, What about the person whose paycheck will be exactly the same next year? Well, before the Republicans took over, her paycheck wasn't exactly the same. They used to go up. Paychecks used to increase. Only with the Republicans in power have we seen this freeze on real pay, in fact, a decrease in real pay.

Let me tell you why I am for the Progressive budget, because I do believe we ought to save the taxpayers money. I am prepared to say that when the Republicans were in power, we won the Cold War. They apparently don't recognize that, because they've got a budget that's still fighting it. In addition to the enormous waste of lives and American prestige and everything else that is involved in the Iraq war and the enormous waste of money there, we are still funding weapons in this budget. Now, many of these weapons are great weapons, but they have one defect: they have no enemy. A weapon without an enemy is a pretty silly thing to have.

So I like the Progressive budget because, among other things, it brings under control this enormous increase in Pentagon spending, and apparently according to my right-wing Republican colleagues, spending on weapons that we don't need is good spending. Spending to pay for health care for children is bad spending. I think they get it exactly opposite and the Progressive budget is the way to fix that.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would yield 5 minutes to the distinguished ranking member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I wish my friend from Massachusetts would have stayed at the mike.

I simply want to ask if the Democratic budget balances the budget, if it achieves balance. Would the gentleman care to answer the question if the Democratic budget achieves balance in 2012?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield to me, I haven't looked at that part. I was addressing the assertion that it raises taxes in this current year.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. My question was, Does the budget achieve balance in 2012?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I will give the answer.

No. I don't think it does, anymore than the President's does or yours does.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Oh, well, that's different than what the Budget chairman says.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Well, if the gentleman has me confused with the chairman, I would like to hear from the chairman.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Reclaiming my time from the chairman of Financial Services, I'm not sure if he's on the same page as the chairman of the Budget Committee. The chairman of the Budget Committee is claiming that their budget balances the budget by 2012. I'll take him at his word, and actually it's correct. The Congressional Budget Office certifies that the Democratic budget does indeed balance in 2012. Here is how they certify it balances in 2012: by raising taxes.

They simply cannot say on the one hand they're balancing the budget, and then on the other hand not raising taxes. Because the only way their budget balances is only by raising taxes.

So, Mr. Chairman, don't listen to me. Listen to the 99 Senators who just voted this morning to validate everything I just said. Ninety-nine Senators, just a couple hours ago, voted for the Baucus amendment, the Democratic chairman of the Finance Committee's amendment, that said the tax increases in this budget are just a little too big; let's cut them in half. Let's reduce the tax increases by $341 billion. So it's only about a $300 billion tax increase. The Senate budget now has half the tax increase in it that this budget here does.

My friends, the Progressives, I want to compliment them because they're bringing a budget to the floor that reflects the principles that respect their values, and they are putting their rhetoric where their mouth is by bringing a budget to the floor, and I want to commend my Progressive friends for doing that. That's what we all should be doing.

You hear me criticizing the underlying budget. You hear me criticizing the Progressive budget. But we will be bringing our own budget to the floor in just a few minutes to show what we stand for; and what we stand for is controlling spending, is doing an earmark moratorium and saving that money. By just saying ''no'' to earmarks for a year, as our budget proposes to do, we can pay for making the child tax credit permanent, making the marriage penalty repeal permanent. Just those two things.

So at the end of the day, Mr. Chairman, it's about choices. It is about values. Do we want pork, or do we want more money in paychecks of Americans? Pork or paychecks? We are going to vote for paychecks. And the reason we're going to vote for putting more money in people's paychecks, for protecting their paychecks, is because people's paychecks aren't stretching as far as they used to.

You have high gas prices, high home health heating prices, high health care prices, high food prices. The last thing the American workers need today, the last thing American families need today is an average $3,000 tax increase. We shouldn't be taxing people because they're married. We shouldn't be raising taxes $500 per child. We shouldn't be making small businesses pay a higher tax rate than the largest corporations in America. Yet, that is exactly what the Democratic budget does.

It's what the Progressive budget does as well. It's what the Congressional Black Caucus budget does as well. It's a difference of opinion. It's a difference of values. We think Washington spends too much money. And my friend from California, she was right when she said it is about morals; it is about values. And we have different ideas.

We believe that the engine of economic growth, what makes America great, is its people, are the families, the workers, the small businesses, the entrepreneurs of America.

We also believe we have a moral imperative to make right by future generations. You know, my parents told me that the legacy of America is you leave the next generation better off. You make them safer, more prosperous, and will to them a higher standard of living.

We may sever that relationship because of the unsustainable past of our entitlement programs which each of these budgets makes worse. The Democratic budget, just in two programs, sends two programs, Medicare and Social Security, $14 trillion deeper in debt. That's wrong. That's giving our children and grandchildren a huge debt, a higher debt.

We think we need to go the other direction. We need to reform these programs so it can fulfill the mission of health and retirement security, but do so while still guaranteeing our children and grandchildren get a better future, a more prosperous future, a higher standard of living. That's why we should vote ''no'' on all of these budgets.

Ms. LEE. I yield myself 30 seconds.

First of all, the Democratic budget does balance by 2012. The Congressional Black Caucus budget balances by 2012. The Congressional Progressive Caucus budget balances by 2012. There are people in this country making over $1 million, $1 million, and all that we do is we provide the tax cuts which will expire in 2010 for the people in our country who make over $1 million. That's the top 1 percent, mind you, 1 percent of taxpayers, and that brings us at least $222 billion.

I yield now 3 minutes to the gentlelady from California (Ms. WATERS), who chairs the Housing and Community Opportunity Subcommittee of the Financial Services Committee and who has helped us put together this budget, especially the Rebuild America's Communities budget, who has worked on our housing issues, Katrina issues and so many issues for so many years. And this section of this budget is a remarkable section, and I hope everyone will listen to her so they can understand exactly what we did in our Progressive Caucus budget.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Congresswoman BARBARA LEE and Congresswoman LYNN WOOLSEY for their leadership on the Progressive Caucus for all of the work that they do, not only putting this alternative budget together, but the leadership they have provided to this Congress and trying to get this Congress moving in the right direction and representing all of the people.

I certainly did not want to take my time responding to the gentleman from Wisconsin, but we need to understand the definitions. When he talks about raising taxes, what he's really talking about is the fact that both of these budgets, the Congressional Black Caucus budget and the Progressive Caucus budget simply will eliminate the tax giveaways to the richest corporations in America. And that's what he calls raising taxes, the very people who are responsible for getting us in this subprime mess that we are in now where we have people who are losing their homes to foreclosures.

Having said all of that, I have already spoken about my support for the Congressional Black Caucus. And I'm offering today my very, very strong support for the Progressive Caucus budget.

Many of the priorities are the same in these two budgets, including vastly increasing funds for housing and community development, veterans education, health programs, and energy independence. I strongly support these increases.

As I said, when I talked about the Congressional Black Caucus budget, they had eliminated HOPE VI, a program that would provide decent housing for the most vulnerable people in our society in a responsible way. They tried to reduce the CDBG program, the program that goes to these small cities and to these towns that are using them for infrastructure and helping senior citizens and youth. And this budget would put the money back in to make them continue to be credible programs.

Let me talk a little bit about the economic stimulus. The components of the economic stimulus package included in the Progressive Caucus budget, for which we have been advocating for many weeks now, are certainly needed to help those Americans hardest hit by the worsening economic situation.

Most importantly, stimulation will come from increased funds for housing assistance and community development. The economic downturn came from the devastating housing market, and that is where we need to focus our resources.

The Progressive Caucus also targets unemployment, insurance, food stamps, FMAP and health care aid and large infrastructure projects in each of our States to invest in our cities and create new jobs. With well-founded fears of a recession being discussed at dinner tables across the country, these investments are absolutely necessary to support our constituents and stimulate our economy.

The Progressive Caucus also focuses on cutting the fat from our bloated Pentagon budget. Our military is still preparing to fight the Cold War against the USSR. I won't go any further than that.

I thank the gentlewoman for the time, and I'd like to express my support for the Progressive Caucus.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining on each side?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has 19 minutes. The gentlewoman from California has 18 minutes.

□ 1345

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is very important for all the American people who are following this debate, we always hear these claims that all we're going to do is somehow tax the rich. Well, again we've heard the gentlelady from California say that this budget balances, but according to the Congressional Budget Office, headed up by a Democrat, their appointee, the only way that that budget balances or any of the Democrat budgets balance is by huge automatic tax increases that will take place over the next few years. And under the tax increases that will take place in current law, you're going to have 116 million taxpayers see an average tax increase of $1,800 a year.

More than 6 million low-income individuals and couples who currently pay no tax, no tax, will no longer be exempt. Approximately 48 million married couples will face an average tax increase of $3,000 a year. Low-income families with one or two children will no longer be eligible for the refundable child tax credit in 2011. Roughly 12 million single women, and we know that often to be poor in America is to be a single mother, 12 million single women will see their tax increases by $1,100 per year. And again, don't take my word for it, go to the Congressional Budget Office and look at the numbers and their impact on all the different tax brackets. Those who are at the lowest bracket today, the 10 percent bracket, are going to see their taxes increase 50 percent to a 15 percent bracket.

So I hope the American people are watching this debate very closely, because every time we hear the Democrats say, oh, we're just going to tax the wealthy, we're going to tax the wealthy, that's a sign for any working American to hold on to their wallet, Mr. Chairman. That's what that sign is.

And we're also debating today the AMT, the alternative minimum tax, which would have been more aptly named the ''absolute maximum tax.'' Well, when that was brought to the floor by Democrats in the first place, Mr. Chairman, we were told that's going to only impact 150 high-income Americans, and yet today we know it threatens 25 million Americans with an additional tax payment of over $2,000 a year.

So our friends on the other side of the aisle can't have it both ways. Either you do not balance the budget, or if you do, you certainly have no spending discipline in your budget, then you're doing it through the tax increases. And look at the numbers of your Congressional Budget Office. They say you will impose the single largest tax increase in American history. And it's not just aimed for the wealthy; it's aimed at all.

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman DENNIS KUCINICH.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Progressive Caucus budget because it includes home foreclosure relief. The foreclosure crisis is at the epicenter of our economic slowdown, and northeast Ohio is among the hardest hit in the Nation.

Hardworking American families deserve financial security. Foreclosure undermines the physical, emotional, and financial security of America's families, has a detrimental effect on the greater community. Neighborhoods with foreclosed properties are likely to experience declining property values. Cuyahoga County, which includes Cleveland, my hometown, had 11,000 foreclosures in 2005, more than triple the number a decade earlier.

My home State of Ohio has the ninth highest rate of foreclosures, and fourth nationwide for the number of preforeclosure and foreclosure filings. So I'm urging my colleagues to support this budget for that reason. But there's another reason, too.

We can talk about the transfer of wealth, which is a lot of the discussions that go on. This whole government is an engine to transfer the wealth of the country upwards. We have to recognize it. If there is one engine that's transferring the wealth upwards with great acceleration it's the war. Because this war would be as if every American family took out a checkbook and wrote out a check already for $16,000 and handed it over to the government. Already it has cost each family in this country $16,000. And if we continue this war, if you read Joseph Stiglitz, the Nobel Prize winning economist, the war is going to cost $3

trillion, and by the time we get over it, it will be upwards of $5 trillion.

Let's talk about how this budget is being used to accelerate the wealth of the Nation. Now, portend, it's the Progressive budget which offers an alternative which says, end the war, stop funding the war, stop funding wasteful military spending. We want a secure Nation, but we cannot secure our Nation on lies. The war is based on lies. We're on the fifth anniversary of this war. We went into war based on lies at a cost of $3 trillion now, 4,000 of our troops, a million innocent Iraqis, the morality of the United States, our position in the world all under attack because the truth wasn't told.

This budget is the truth. This budget gives the American people an opportunity to finally have their basic needs met. And those needs are going to continue to be neglected as long as we stay riveted to a war that is based on lies.

Bring those troops home. The Progressive budget does it. Stop the war. The Progressive budget does it. Take a new direction with our international policy. The Progressive budget does it. Take care of things here at home. The Progressive budget does it. Vote for the Progressive budget.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I will yield 4 minutes again to the distinguished ranking member of the Budget Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I thank the gentleman for all the work he has done on making us fiscally secure, being fiscally responsible, and bringing fiscal sanity to Congress. He's one of the leaders.

Mr. Chairman, the problem in Washington is not that we have too little tax money coming in. The problem in Washington is spending is too high.

Let me show you what this chart shows. It's a little complicated. The red line shows you the Democrats' line of higher taxes. The blue line shows you the revenue line that our budget will do, which is lower taxes. That's the difference of the marriage penalty, the child tax credit, income tax rates across the board, capital gains, dividends, the death taxes. The green line is the current spending trajectory that we are on. Let me describe what it looks like in just one program, as foreseen in the Democratic budget.

Under the Democratic budget, the Medicare program today has an unfunded liability of $34 trillion. What does that mean per household, per family? Three hundred thousand dollars. Right now, every family in America would have to put in $300,000 just to make Medicare secure, just to make Medicare viable and solvent. Under the Democratic budget, they increase that debt by $11 trillion in just 5 years. This 5-year budget says that in 5 years, by the time their budget expires, it will be about a $400,000 burden to every single household in America. You can buy a pretty darn nice house for $400,000.

Let me explain what this looks like across the board. And that's just one program where they're raising the debt by $11 trillion. This is the one that counts the most, Mr. Chairman.

For the last 40 years, the Federal Government has been pretty consistent in how much money it has had to tax to pay for the Federal Government. Washington had had to tax about 18.3 cents on the dollar for every dollar made in America. About 18.3 cents of the dollar made in America went to pay for Washington. Well, because of the baby boomers, because of their retirement, this isn't a Democrat thing or a Republican thing. It's just what's happening in America, because we are doubling the amount of retirees we have in this country, we're going from 40 million retirees to 78 million retirees. And these programs are what we call pay-as-you-go, where current workers pay a current tax to finance the benefits for current beneficiaries.

So I'm paying my payroll taxes and my income taxes for my mom, who's on Medicare and Social Security. That's the way the system works. And it works out well if you have an equal ratio of workers and beneficiaries, but we don't. The reason we don't is because our birth rates declined after the baby boomer generation. There's nothing wrong, nothing sinister about it. It's just that it is what it is.

And so we're increasing our tax-consuming generation. We're increasing the beneficiaries by 100 percent, but we're only increasing the taxpayers by 17 percent. That, in a nutshell, is why we have this fiscal train wreck. That, in a nutshell, is why we're staring at these enormous debts in our country's future.

What does that mean to the future of our country? What does that mean for our children and our grandchildren? I'll tell you what it means to my three children. My son Sam is 3, my son Charlie is 4, my daughter Liza is 6. By the time my three children are exactly my age, and I'm not the oldest guy around here, by the time they are my age, they will have to pay twice what we pay in taxes just to keep today's Federal Government going for them at that time.

Let me say it a different way. Instead of taking 18.3 cents out of every dollar made in America today, when my three kids are my age, they're going to have to spend 40 cents on every dollar made in America just to pay the bills to the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, we have real competition that we have staring us in the face. We have competition from India, from China. The age of the global economy is here with us whether we like it or not, it is here. You can't extend and give a prosperous Nation a higher standard of living to the next generation if we're doubling their taxes. If we say today it's 18 cents on the dollar and tomorrow it's 40 cents on the dollar, you can't give our children and grandchildren a chance at a great career at a higher standard of living in this new competitive era we're in. If we do go down this path, we're going to give more and more jobs to China, to India, to other countries.

So we say what we ought to do is do what our employers want us to do. The people that sent us here to Congress want us to fix this problem. They want us to fulfill the mission of healthy retirement security and do it without bankrupting future generations, and do it so we can stay competitive in a global economy so that we can pass a better future on to future generations. That's why this budget should be defeated.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes now to the gentlelady from Texas, whose voice is heard loud and clear in terms of her priorities with regard to the Progressive Caucus budget, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON-LEE.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to listen to my good friends about the tax cuts that they believe will generate happiness in America. I want to remind my friends that the last 8 years have been governed by a Republican administration that has had as the definition of their viability in this country that they are the big tax cutters. And they're right. If you're making a million dollars or you're Warren Buffet, you're celebrating and dancing in the streets. That's the tax cuts that my friend is talking about. But if you're hardworking, middle class Americans that have looked toward the dream that Americans have offered, those who built cars with their hands or drive trucks, teachers and nurses, the very people who made America great, the kind of salt of the Earth that a Thomas Edison came from or a George Washington Carver, then you're not dancing in the street. In fact, you're trying to pick the pieces up and walk through the street.

Because if you look at what this administration has generated, $1.47 in 2001, now the average price per gallon $3.13, maybe going to $4, because right now the price per barrel of oil is $110 dollars a barrel. Not only hurting those hardworking Americans, but even in Texas, some of the refineries that hire blue collar workers can barely make it because they can't make a recovery when they're paying $110 a barrel for gas or for oil. They don't answer that question.

The Progressive budget is a budget that addresses the heartburn of America. What it says to his children and their grandchildren is that we believe in a domestic agenda that gets you out of the pits of depression and economic recession. We believe in helping children and parents work by improving and expanding early child care and increasing Head Start. If you've got a 1962 car, 1977, 1999, barely you can make it, trying to get to work and pay

child care. We get them out of the doldrums of the recession.

We understand that there are people who are now evicted who were homeowners. We give out 200,000 housing vouchers so that those in my district alone, 25,000 people on the waiting list for section 8 and other housing resources, not because they can't work, because there are no facilities for them and because the market is out of control. This is what the Progressive budget does.

And then it takes to the least of those, those children in the foster care system that circle around in the system. Who knows who they turn out to be. Maybe it's the unfortunate young men that found themselves on the streets of North Carolina to take the life of a coed.

There are tragedies out there, and this budget understands that investing in America and these workers will make a difference. That's why this budget supports an increase in the EITC to increase work incentives and reduce poverty. And it brings the troops home. That's where the money is going. And it doesn't stifle competition. It promotes the space program. It applauds science and math for young people to aspire to space, but it gives those whose pocket has a hole in it, it gives them opportunity.

□ 1400

It is a bill, a budget, that stamps out poverty, that recognizes that it is important to not ignore those who you can ignore because they're not in front of you.

I applaud Warren Buffett for his ingenuity and his greatness in terms of his economic prowess. But I also applaud Mrs. Jones who gets up every morning at 3 a.m. trying to get to work. This is what she's facing.

The domestic budget by the Progressive Caucus should be supported.

I rise today in support of the budget substitute offered by the Congressional Progressive Caucus. I support this budget proposal because it represents the mainstream values of our great nation, providing crucial boosts in domestic spending by eliminating expenditure on outdated and obsolete military technologies.

SECOND ECONOMIC STIMULUS

This budget includes funding for a second economic stimulus package, designed to infuse $119.9 billion into our struggling economy. While I was very pleased to see the passage earlier this year of an economic stimulus package injecting $145.9 billion into the economy in 2008, I continue to be concerned about a number of important provisions that were omitted from the package. The ''Economic Stimulus #2'' package included in the Progressive Caucus budget includes more effective stimulus tools to meet the outstanding needs of the American people.

The Progressive Caucus budget extends Federal spending for unemployment insurance and food stamp benefits, and it increases Federal spending on Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) Medicaid payments to states. In addition, this budget recognizes the crisis posed by rising home foreclosure rates, and it provides home foreclosure relief and housing assistance. The Economic Stimulus #2 package also includes the creation of jobs repairing the nation's schools, transportation infrastructure, and public housing.

ANTI-POVERTY PLATFORM

In addition to the inclusion of the second economic stimulus package, this alternative budget is also unique because it includes a focused and concerted anti-poverty platform. The Progressive Caucus's ''Anti-Poverty and Opportunity Initiative'' is committed to cutting the poverty rate in America in half over the next ten years, and we will begin to do so under this budget. This alternative budget invests $73.05 billion in FY09 and increases to $129.3 billion in FY 18 for a sustained, coordinated public-private sector strategy.

POVERTY AND THE PEOPLE

This morning Tavis Smiley shared with the Tom Joyner Morning Show, his thoughts and the American people's thoughts, on what is really going on in America. He shared how we have easily gotten side-tracked with nonessential staff and consultants to the CLINTON and OBAMA campaigns and to the exploits of Governor Spitzer; all the while forgetting the issues of importance to the people.

Eradicating poverty is something the Progressive Caucus is addressing with its funding of anti-poverty legislation.

CHILDREN AND THE BUDGET

As Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus and the Progressive Caucus, I am proud to support this budget alternative because it contains provisions designed to help our children succeed.

This budget improves and expands early child care and it increases Head Start funding. It will help parents and families by making the Child Tax Credit fully refundable and expanding the EITC for larger families. It also fully funds Community Development Block Grants and distributing grants to families with disabled members and as such promises to lift every child out of deep poverty. Furthermore, this budget provides for the improvement of Child Support Distribution as well as helping abused and neglected children by improving the Foster Care system.

Specifically the Progressive budget:

Iraq—projects complete U.S. military redeployment out of Iraq before the end of FY09—savings of at least $135 billion and replicated in subsequent years.

Target waste, fraud, and abuse, starting with Pentagon savings—projects enactment of the Common Sense Budget Act, which would save at least $60 billion/year on largely obsolete Cold War-era weapons systems plus tens of billions more in waste, fraud, and abuse in DOD spending identified by the nonpartisan Government Accounting Office, GAO—savings of at least $687 billion over ten years;

Repeal of Bush tax cuts for the top 1 percent of taxpayers—due to expire in 2010 regardless and beyond—savings of at least $222 billion;

Crackdown on corporate welfare—increased revenue of at least $18–50 billion/year throughout the next decade from the elimination of some of the many corporate tax loopholes throughout the tax code, including but not limited to special tax breaks for the oil and gas industry and other extraction industries;

SMART Security Alternative to Preemption Doctrine—shifts some spending and increases other non-military spending to enhance homeland security and fight the root causes of terrorism—21st century diplomacy and meeting basic human needs (e.g. HIV/AIDS/TB/Malaria, universal basic education for all);

Global Warming and Energy Independence—funding for immediate, cost-effective steps to redress global warming and the rapid acceleration of renewable energy development and commercialization;

Education for All—fully fund the ESEA and IDEA and improve Teacher Corps and job training;

Medicare for All—affordable, accessible, quality health care for all Americans, starting with fully funding of the SCHIP program to ensure that every American child eligible is covered for basic health insurance;

Guaranteed Veterans' Health Care—ensure whatever federal funding is needed to provide health care (including mental health care) for All America's veterans (including but not limited to veterans of the Iraq and Afghanistan military operations;

Fairness for Middle-Class—increase funding to protect fundamental worker rights, enforce fair credit and lending practices, and promote livable wages and safe workplaces;

Renew the Social Contract and 21st Century Safety Net—substantially increase funding for decent affordable housing, anti-hunger programs, and more quality child care for low-income and impoverished Americans (including Hurricane Katrina victims); and

Rebuild America's Communities—increase funding for Community Development Block Grants, Hurricane Katrina relief and reconstruction, community policing, and priority clean-up of leaking underground storage tanks that threaten the drinking water of nearly half of all Americans—a down payment on the implementation of other urgently needed environmental justice programs.

PENTAGON AND DEFENSE SPENDING

The Progressive Caucus Budget will be the only budget substitute offered in this debate that will actually cut even one penny from the Pentagon budget below the full amount that President Bush requested for Fiscal Year 2009—a 7.4 percent increase boost over last year (not counting Iraq and Afghanistan operations).

UNIFIED SECURITY BUDGET

If Congress fully funds President Bush's military budget request of $707 billion (including Iraq operations more accurately at $170 billion and Afghanistan operations) for next fiscal year, our Nation will spend more on our armed forces next year than at any time since World War II. As Bush administration officials defend their latest defense spending request before congressional committees, they and their supporters are also arguing for a substantial increase above this amount in future years, even as they disingenuously project spending on the current operations in Iraq and Afghanistan to go down.

A consistent theme of these presentations is that military spending currently represents a relatively low percentage of our national Gross Domestic Product. We should spend more, according to this argument, because we can. The fallacy of this argument is readily apparent as we fall deeper into debt.

The Bush Administration's national security doctrine of pre-emptive warfare, drawn up before the current wars were launched, prescribes an expansive, global role for the U.S. military, one that even current levels of spending and manpower don't come close to covering. After five years of failed tests, it's time to ask: Does the Bush doctrine of preemptive warfare and its costs make sense? What we must ask ourselves is does it make us safer and more secure?

No Member of this Congress can claim credibly to be fiscally responsible and not tackle head-on the soaring, unsustainable financial costs of the Iraq debacle. Accordingly, we hope virtually all of our Republican colleagues and most Blue Dog Democrats will stop paying for this foreign policy disaster with a credit card that seemingly has no limits.

SAVINGS

The Progressive Caucus Budget is the most transparent and accurate, when it comes to scoring the fiscal impact of on-going U.S. military operations in Iraq. We can save at least $135 billion if we end the U.S. military occupation of Iraq by the end of FY09.

The Progressive budget will save at least $135 billion over the subsequent nine fiscal years if we change the Bush policy, end the U.S. military occupation of Iraq, don't establish permanent military bases in Iraq, and bring virtually all U.S. troops and military contractors no later than September 30, 2009.

Let me state that we already approved $70 billion of the $170 billion in President Bush's supplementary request for FY08. The remainder to be voted upon in April 2008 or soon thereafter should be strictly fenced, so that it can only be used for the safe and orderly redeployment of U.S. troops and military contractors.

CUTTING OUTDATED AND UNNEEDED WEAPONS SYSTEMS ($60 BILLION/YEAR)

The Defense Department is wrought with waste, fraud, and abuse as it continues to spend in excess of $60 billion a year on hold-over Cold War era weapons systems.

It's time that we bring some common sense back to the budget process and see to it that the basic human needs of all Americans come before the needs of the military industrial complex. The Progressive Caucus budget targets weapons programs that are either outdated or poorly conceived from the very beginning for elimination. Despite what a handful of giant defense contractors would have us believe, this inexcusable waste actually makes us less safe.

COMBATING GLOBAL HIV/AIDS, TUBERCULOSIS, AND MALARIA ($5.412 BILLION)

It is also in our national security interest for America to do more to meet the world's growing humanitarian crises. Let me cite just one example from our Progressive Caucus Budget.

Over the last five years the United States has achieved significant progress in fighting the global HIV/AIDS pandemic. Direct funding provided to developing countries heavily impacted by HIV/AIDS through the Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief has supported treatment for over 1.45 million people with life saving anti-retroviral medications.

Additionally, U.S. contributions to the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria have supported AIDS treatment for another 1.4 million people, while also providing treatment for tuberculosis to over 3.3 million people, and distributing 46 million insecticide treated bed nets to protect against malaria.

In line with pending legislation in the House and Senate to reauthorize the Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, and to continue U.S. involvement with the Global Fund, this increase in funding will fully fund our efforts to combat the global HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria pandemics for the next five years.

This increase in funding will help reach the goal of preventing 12 million new HIV infections; treating at least 3 million people living with HIV/AIDS—including 450,000 children; providing care for 12 million individuals affected by HIV/AIDS—including 5 million orphans and vulnerable children in communities affected by HIV/AIDS; and training and retaining at least 140,000 new health care professionals for HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment and care.

This overall level of funding will fundamentally help our programs achieve sustainability as we increase program linkages and strengthen country ownership of these important initiatives.

INVESTING IN CLEAN RENEWABLE ENERGY SOURCES

If we want a more peaceful, secure world, then America must act with a sense of urgency to end our growing dependency upon imported oil and bring on line the full range of renewable energy technologies. We need a national commitment to accelerate the development and commercialization of renewable energy sources on the scale of the Manhattan Project during World War II or the moon shot of the 1960s. That is what we provide in the Progressive Caucus Budget.

It calls for spending $30 billion/year for the next decade to create 3 million new, clean energy jobs to free America from foreign oil dependence. We want to reinvest in the competitiveness of American industry, rebuild our cities, create good jobs for working families, and ensure good stewardship of both our national economy and the environment we share with the rest of the world.

INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS

Our Nation faces a crumbling transportation infrastructure that is being asked to handle ever-increasing loads. Between 1955 and 2005, the U.S. population grew by 130 million to 295 million. Over the next 50 years it is expected to grow by 140 million to 435 million. Over the next 30 years, 88 percent of that growth will occur in the south and west. By 2030, the population of people over 65 will have grown from 35 million to 70 million. More than 70 percent of the Nation's population growth and 80 percent of its economic growth are expected to take place in metropolitan areas. At the same time, rural States will face the enormous cost of preserving the network of roads they have built over the past 80 years. Congestion on our Nation's highways gets worse by the year as funding fails to keep pace.

The Progressive Caucus Budget reverses this trend with additional transportation funding over a ten-year period to strengthen our infrastructure and provide millions of new construction jobs. The Federal Highway Trust Fund is facing shortfalls that need to be met and this Budget addresses those needs by funding the gap between what we need to maintain the current system versus the degradation that is projected over the life of this Budget.

TRANSPORTATION STIMULUS ($18 BILLION IN FY09)

Every billion dollars spent on infrastructure creates 42,000 new jobs. States have identified 3,000 projects (see below) that could be up and running in 30–90 days for a total cost of $18 billion dollars. In a time when the economy is in trouble due to the over-inflated price of housing and the sub-prime mortgage market, the people in most need of jobs are construction workers. Funding transportation projects puts these people to work, in good paying jobs, which serve an overall benefit to the economy.

As a woman, a mother, a Member of Congress, and the Progressive Caucus, I am proud of the initiatives taken by the Progressive Caucus and morally compelled to support this budget.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure the hardworking men and women of America need a chart to know how expensive gasoline is, and I was interested in my friend from Texas's history lesson. But there is a more recent history lesson that I believe the American people could benefit from.

Elections have consequences. The Democrats took control of the Senate and took control of the House in January of 2007. They've been in control of the Nation's economy now for 15 months. This is what the price of oil was when the Democrats took control of this body. Here's where the price of oil is now. Roughly double.

Since the Democrats took control of this body, Mr. Chairman, job growth has been cut in half, and the economy has actually lost over 80,000 jobs in the most recent 2 months. The average family's grocery bill has increased about $70 per month since the Democrats took control of Congress. The stock market has lost about 10 percent of its value since the Democrats took control of Congress. Home prices have fallen roughly 8 percent since the Democrats took control of Congress. Consumer price inflation has increased over 4 percent, the largest calendar year increase since the early 1990s, since the Democrats have taken control of Congress. That is the more recent history lesson that the American people can profit from.

There is another aspect, though, of these Democrat budgets that, again, I believe deserve very special attention. I want to again thank the ranking member for his insight into the peril that these budgets present to future generations and really the threat to the retirement security of our children and grandchildren because these budgets compromise it.

We know that Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security won't be around for future generations unless they are reformed. But I want to focus again on the fact that this budget and every Democrat budget will raise taxes on hardworking American families by at least $3,000 a month.

And what do they do with that money? They keep alive an earmark system that far too many Americans have rightfully concluded that all too often represent the victory of secrecy over transparency and special interest

over the national interest and privilege over merit. So they're going to raise taxes on American families $3,000 a year. And what are they going to pay for? Well, they are going to pay for things like $2 million to study yoga in the Defense bill that was placed in by a Democrat Member of Congress. And perhaps they don't have a bridge to nowhere, but according to CBS News, we have an arch to nowhere. A Democrat Member of Congress wanted to rebuild an arch in a park.

We fund the Doyle Center for Manufacturing Technology, named after a Democrat Member of Congress. I have already mentioned the Charlie Rangel Center. They raise taxes on the American people, $3,000 a family, to pay for the Charlie Rangel Center for Public Service. I've already mentioned the fact that they are spending $100,000 for the L.A. fashion district for ''signage and streetscape improvements.'' One of the district's main thoroughfares, Robertson Boulevard, is known as a ''great place to spot celebrity shoppers.'' The Democrat budgets keep these earmarks alive and well and raise taxes on the American people $3,000 a year to pay for it.

There's $231,000 for something called the Lincoln Airport Commission, an airport in Illinois that does not even exist, the executive director of whom apparently is on the staff of a Democrat Member of the United States Congress.

In order to raise taxes $3,000 a year on American families, the Democrats also continue to fund earmarks like $300,000, requested for a Democrat Member, to help train future employees of Hollywood movie sets. I'm sure the movie studios are struggling as they make their multimillions at the box office. And $2 million for the ''paint shield'' for protecting people from micro-bio threats, which was given to one specific company. No competitive bid. They just handed the money to Sherwin-Williams and said no need to compete. No need to show merit. We're going to raise taxes on the American family $3,000 a year to pay for more earmarks. And the list goes on and on.

Two very different budgets, Mr. Chairman. The Republican budget says enough's enough; declare a year-long moratorium on earmarks and fix this broken system. Every single Democrat budget, Mr. Chairman, says the status quo is fine. Let's keep these earmarks acoming. Let's make sure we take from the family paychecks so some Member of Congress can keep theirs.

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

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, let me again thank Congresswoman BARBARA LEE and Congresswoman WOOLSEY for their steadfast commitment to addressing the concerns of the most heavily impacted Americans in this most disruptive economic season.

Let me remind my friends that we are speaking of a Congress Democratically led for a little over a year. In that time frame, we have, in fact, increased the minimum wage. We have waged a valiant fight for the Children's Health Insurance Program to insure 10 million children.

But what you have seen that has occurred, if you will, under this administration, which is really the definition of this Republican minority, they are the residents on the ship captained by this administration. So if they want to talk about what burdens are falling on the American people, the Democratic House and Senate leadership is no more than a year, but the helm of this government has been captained by a Republican administration. And we can clearly see that a surplus existed under the past administration, under the Clinton administration; but under this administration not only have we eaten up the surplus, thrown hardworking Americans under the bus, but it is growing and growing and growing. Now, that is with the so-called tax cuts that this administration insists on making permanent, that the Progressive budget recognizes cannot continue to eat away in the pockets of those who go out and work every day.

And to my good friend on the earmarks, let me suggest to him that he might read some of the studies that say that earmarks are fairly distributed.

This is the cause of our depression. The Progressive budget should be supported.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished ranking member on the Budget Committee.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Texas mentioned, we are not saying all earmarks are bad. Some of them are worthy. Some of them are vetted. Some of them fit within the proper role of the Federal Government. But a lot of them are bad. A lot of them are wasteful. A lot of them probably go outside of what most people think is the proper role of the Federal Government.

The point is we don't have all the answers on how to make it work right. That's why we think we ought to have a commission of an equal number of Democrats, an equal number of Republicans, the Kingston-Wolf Commission is what everybody calls it, to figure out how to make these things work right so that Congress can regain the trust and confidence of the American people. But in the meantime, let's say ''no'' to these earmarks for a year. Let's do a moratorium. That's what we do.

Do you know what we can accomplish by actually having a moratorium of earmarks for 1 year? By banking those savings, by saying ''no'' to earmarks for a year and carrying those savings in our budget, we can make sure that we're not going to cut the child tax credit in half; that we are not going to tax people for being married. We can make permanent the $1,000 per-child tax credit, the repeal of the marriage tax penalty.

Let me just read along this list of earmarks that we have: an ode to Tom Daschle, a nice guy, former Senate majority leader, a $1 million earmark to create a center for Tom Daschle in South Dakota. Or we could look at the Hippie Museum. This one's been pretty well known, $1 million to commemorate hippies at Woodstock. Or we can look at the sailing earmark, they call it, a 65-foot catamaran sailing around Monterey Bay. It sounds like a fun thing to do. Why should people in Wisconsin pay their Federal taxes to pay for that? Or we could take a look at all the lists and lists and lists that go on. One of my personal favorites is the ''ferry to nowhere.'' That came from our side of the aisle, $50 million for a Navy expeditionary marine craft, just a ferry to go to a peninsula that serves 40 people.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, we're not saying that Republicans are so much better than Democrats on all of this. We're saying Congress is broken in this area. Let's fix it. But in the meantime, let's save this money. Let's have a time out. Let's fix this problem so that we can regain the trust and take that money and do two really important things: let's not tax people for being married, and let's not raise taxes on American families by $500 per child. We can do those two things by simply saying ''no'' to earmarks this year. That's what our budget will do.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to now yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California, a very active and strong member of the Hispanic Caucus (Ms. SOLIS).

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Congressional Progressive Caucus budget.

As Chair of the Hispanic Task Force on Health and the Environment, this budget speaks to the growing need to create green collar jobs and reinvest in our country, and I am very proud that they were able to include that language in this proposed budget.

It also increases Federal spending for unemployment insurance and food stamps. And we know that Latinos are hard-pressed and hard hit when it comes to bad economic times in this country, and we are no different. Right now in my district in East Los Angeles, we see upwards of 7.2 percent of unemployment and foreclosures occurring almost every hour. In my district alone, 650,000 people have already lost their home. It's time for a change. It's time for a new direction.

This budget also increases Federal spending on Federal Medicaid assistance percentage payments to our States, which are sorely in need of that assistance right now, providing help, again, for foreclosures and housing assistance; reinvesting and creating jobs

in the near term repairing the Nation's schools, transportation, and infrastructure.

I also want to touch base on something that's very deeply of much concern with our community, and that is with respect to education and health care overall. And I'll tell you the temperature of the patient in terms of Latinos, African Americans, and people of color is not good. Right now what we see is 40 million people that don't have health care insurance. About 40 percent of those happen to be Latino children under the age of 6. We know there has to be a change. We need to promote a budget that will provide that kind of safety net for all Americans.

Our budget also increases veterans funding in 2009 by $3.6 billion, something that we should keep as an honorable deed when we say that we want to send our soldiers out there to defend, first and foremost, our liberties. Let's make sure that we take care of them when they come home. A high percentage tend to be those young men and women of color using the military because they have no other way of gaining access. When they come home, whether they are disabled or not, they need to have the kind of assistance that's ready made available for them where they don't have to trek 2 hours to get on a bus to go down to the nearest Veterans Administration to get help and assistance. We need to change that and this budget does that.

In terms of the environment and global warming, Latinos' low-income communities are always hard-pressed. We need to reverse that trend and make sure that EPA gets the full assistance that they need to enforce our current laws that will create a better level playing field for all Americans.

□ 1415

This budget addresses that issue.

Again, I would like to say that I am strongly supportive of the Congressional Progressive Caucus budget and would ask the Members of the House to support this budget in a new direction and new reform for this country.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is remaining on each side.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SERRANO). The gentleman has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. HENSARLING. At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), one of the prime authors of the Kingston-Wolf earmark moratorium bill.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to say from the beginning I am supporting the Republican budget. And I do find it ironic that a Congress that just distributed a one-time $1,200 per household tax credit is now going to turn around and raise taxes by $3,155 per household. It doesn't make sense. And for that reason, I'm planning to vote ''no'' on the Democrat tax increase budget and support the Republican alternative.

But also I wanted to speak specifically about the earmark portion. I'm a member of the Appropriations Committee, and I realize that if you are a member of one party, you might not always disagree with the members of the other party. For example, if you are a Democrat right now, you might not be in complete agreement with the Bush budget. Likewise, if you're a Republican, should a President from another party get elected, you might not agree with their budget all the time. Therefore, it is important for equal branches of government to have a say-so in the construction of a budget.

Within that framework, it is often important that Congress have the ability to earmark. However, I want to say that, as a Republican, earmarking got out of control under our Republican watch. We know that for a fact. Any Republican who is denying that probably has his head in the sand. And I want to give Democrats credit. They have tried to reform earmarks. However, unfortunately, the reforms haven't been apparent, they haven't been given the credit, and they haven't been enough. We still have work to do.

Therefore, I am supporting the Kingston-Wamp-Wolf approach, which is to call for a bipartisan, bicameral select committee to review earmarks, with a moratorium for the time period that the select committee is in existence. And I know that ours isn't, the moratorium is lifted when they come back, report back to Congress. In this bill there's a 1-year moratorium. But I think either way you can take a step back and look, what is the process and how can we improve it?

Because as an appropriator, we are always focused on appropriations earmarks, and yet the infamous Bridge to Nowhere did not come from an appropriations bill. It came from a transportation bill.

In December 2006, we passed a tax relief bill that had, I think, over 100 different types of earmarks on it. But because it was a tax bill, they weren't defined as earmarks. We see the same thing in trade bills. I believe that all earmarks should be put on the table and the process should be reviewed. And that should include the White House earmarks. That is why it is important for us, on a bipartisan, bicameral basis, to take a step back and see what we can do to improve this. We all agree earmarks should not increase a budget but work within the existing budget limits passed by Congress.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan, the Chair of the Judiciary Committee, Congressman CONYERS, and thank him for his leadership.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank the cochair of the caucus for allowing me to make it clear to our friends on the other side of the aisle that the budget, as a document of what it is we believe in, what we put our money down in support of, expresses in some greater way the values of the Nation. And so we come to this 2008 budget consideration in the midst of what some call an economic downturn, others call a recession and other things.

Now, what we have done, and if there are parts of the Progressive Caucus budget that are specifically objected to, I would like to invite our friends on the other side to let us know what they are so that we can continue our work on it, because the Progressive Caucus every year always introduces an alternative budget. We've been getting more support on it each year.

It's our hope that with your enlightened analysis of it, we will get more support. I'm looking for the day when we get a bipartisan vote on the Progressive Caucus budget. I think it's possible. I think it states our priorities that don't have ''Democratic'' or ''Republican'' stamped on them. What we are saying is let's look at these issues in the budget and point out which ones make your favorite, make the hit list, and which ones don't match the aspirations and viewpoints of the minority.

I thank you, Madam Floor Manager.

I rise today in support of the budget alternative offered by the Congressional Progressive Caucus, CPC.

We often say that the Federal budget is a moral document, expressing the values and priorities of our Nation.

During this economic downturn, when more families are facing unemployment, foreclosure and bankruptcy, our top priority should be protecting our most vulnerable citizens and keeping more Americans from falling into poverty.

The President, however, seems to have his priorities upside-down. In this final budget proposal of his presidency, he once again sacrifices services for low- and moderate-income families failing to provide adequate funding for health care, housing, child care, job training and a host of other programs.

Even though the President cuts these vital programs, his budget still makes the deficit worse, because it continues to give stunningly high tax cuts to the rich. Tax cuts for millionaires alone will cost $51 billion in FY '09.

The CPC alternative budget gets our priorities straight. In stark contrast to the President's proposal, the CPC budget puts the needs of the economically vulnerable ahead of the needs of millionaires.

The CPC budget proposal is the only one under consideration today that cuts wasteful cold war era defense spending, according to standards recommended by the GAO, so that we can employ our scarce resources to help people, not to keep feeding the military industrial complex for weapons we don't need.

I want to draw attention today to the efforts of the Congressional Out of Poverty Caucus, which I co-chair along with my colleagues Ms. LEE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BACA and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

Under Ms. LEE's leadership, the House recently passed by unanimous consent H. Con. Res. 198, which commits the Congress to cutting poverty in half in the next decade. With the passage of H. Con. Res. 198, the House went on record, with unanimous, bipartisan support, making the alleviation of poverty a priority for this government.

For the good of the Nation, it is imperative that we live up to our commitment. The Congress must take action to make good on this promise.

The CPC budget promotes policy initiatives that can move us toward this goal by expanding programs with a proven track record of success in reducing poverty, like the Earned Income Tax Credit. We don't need more war and tax breaks for the rich. We need jobs, job training and better access to health care, child care and education. The CPC budget provides these critical tools that can help Americans lift themselves out of poverty.

Let's get our priorities straight. Let's pass the CPC budget alternative.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, am I correct in assuming I have the right to close?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has the right to close.

Mr. HENSARLING. In that case, I reserve my time.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me say a couple of things as I close in response to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

First, let me just talk about the argument with regard to tax increases. Our budget provides for tax fairness. We want to bring back some real justice in the Tax Code. Let me just say to you that the Progressive Caucus believes that individuals earning $1 million or more a year, which is the top 1 percent of our country, that those tax breaks should be rolled back, the tax bracket should be rolled back to 39.6 percent. That raises at least $96 billion. I finally think that that $96 billion can be put into restoring some of the very draconian cuts in our budget to initiatives such as education and health care which the President has cut.

Secondly, we're talking about repealing capital gains and dividends tax breaks raises at least $74.4 billion. I think that that $74.4 billion can restore the 50 education programs, including student financial aid, which the President has sought to cut. We also want to roll back the estate tax break, raising at least $74 billion. I think that that $74 billion can go to restore those deep cuts to highway infrastructure or, of all things he is slashing, support for law enforcement. I think that those resources could better be used in those areas.

Also, we're talking about in terms of repealing all additional tax breaks for the top 1 percent. That means we have $177 billion. Maybe that could go to help restore the energy assistance for low-income families that the President cut. Or maybe it could go to restore the renewable energy and energy conservation programs that the President decided to cut.

And what about this when you talk about tax increases? How about what we want to do to eliminate the corporate tax incentives for offshore jobs? The Tax Code has a number of preferences that directly or indirectly encourages, mind you, encourages United States companies to relocate operations and jobs overseas. How about using those revenues to create some jobs and to invest in job training programs which, of course, the President wants to cut in his budget? That makes sense to me. That's about fairness. That's not about tax increases.

We're not talking about increasing taxes on middle-income individuals. We're talking about tax fairness, restoring some tax fairness to the Tax Code. And I don't believe that anyone in our country, if they knew the bogus nature, I think, of this argument with regard to what all of us are trying to do to bring some fairness into the Tax Code, I think the American people would say, what is wrong with raising revenue from those making over $1 million a year? They actually didn't really support that tax cut when they received it, so what's wrong with creating jobs in our own country rather than giving tax breaks for sending jobs offshore? I don't think the American people see that as being the wrong way to use our tax dollars. I don't think that they would worry at all about us repealing some of these estate taxes and individual tax breaks for the 1 percent.

And so I think that when you talk about tax increases, we need to be honest and say what we're really talking about, and that's giving tax breaks, continuing to give tax breaks for the very wealthy while our young people, our children, our senior citizens, the poor, low-income, middle-income individuals are struggling to just manage to survive through this recession that has been created, yes, by many of these tax cuts, but also by this deep hole that we are digging in terms of the Iraq war and the Iraq recession.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. I thank you so much. I just wanted to commend you before our debate closes on the Progressive Caucus proposal, because I'm hearing for the first time, we want to get beyond partisan positions, progressive partisan positions, progressive or conservative positions.

Ms. LEE. In fact, this is a moral document. A budget should be a moral document. We have bipartisan support from Catholic Charities, from many faith groups, from many organizations around the country.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate my friends on the other side of the aisle. Although we have very strong disagreements, I respect their principle and I respect the passion that they bring to the floor in this debate. We on this side of the aisle have our passion. We have our principles. And I think, Mr. Chairman, that it's important to note that no matter what Democrat budget you're talking about, there's really only one Democrat budget, and they differ from the Republican budget in many different ways. Theirs values the government budget. Ours values the family budget. Every Democrat budget, including this Progressive budget, will increase taxes on the American family, the largest single tax increase in American history, by over $3,000 per family. The Republican budget will prevent those tax increases while hardworking American families are trying to fill up their cars, send their kids to college, and put food on the table.

Second of all, every Democrat budget provides the highest amount of government spending we've ever seen. More government. If you think the answer to your problems is more government, then maybe you want this Democrat budget. If you think the answer to your problems is more freedom, more opportunity, a secure paycheck, and greater career opportunities, then you want the Republican budget.

The Democrat budgets are silent, silent on earmark reform. They want to preserve the status quo. They will continue to take a bite out of people's paychecks again so that some Member of Congress might keep theirs.

But for as bad as what these budgets do, they are even worse for what they don't do. They are stone cold silent on the number one fiscal challenge in the land, and that is out-of-control entitlement spending. Mr. Chairman, Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security will not be here for future generations unless we reform them. We are on the verge of being the first generation in American history to leave the next generation with a lower standard of living, double their taxes with just the government we have today. I will not sit idly by, nor will any Republican, and let that happen.

Defeat the Democrat budget. Vote for less government, more freedom, and our children's future.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, CPC, PC fiscal year 2009 alternative budget. In an attempt to meet head on the administration's proposed fiscal year 2009 upside-down budget priorities, the CPC budget calls for a more humanitarian approach addressing the current deficit and economic downturns.

Indeed, CPC's alternative budget:

Funds a second economic stimulus package designed to pump $118.9 billion into our declining economy and help the hardest hit low- and middle-income Americans;

Repeals the President's tax cuts for the top 1 percent of taxpayers;

Leaves no child behind by fully funding NCLB and IDEA while improving Teacher Corps and job training;

Provides Medicare for all with affordable, accessible quality health care for all Americans;

Renews the Social Contract and 21st Century Safety Net by substantially increasing funding for decent affordable housing, anti-

hunger programs, and more quality childcare; and foremost

Rebuilds America's communities that are being plagued by the aftermath of Katrina by substantially increasing funding for Community Development Block Grants, community policing, and priority cleanup of leaking underground storage tanks that threaten the drinking water of nearly half of all Americans.

Collectively, these provisions reflect a commitment to addressing socioeconomic woes affecting middle- to-lower class Americans across the country. I commend CPC for their pledge to cut the poverty rate in America in half during the next decade and for a progressive budget that appropriates funding to much needed programs.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 98, noes 322, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 138]

AYES—98

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Baca
Baldwin
Becerra
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Castor
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (IL)
Delahunt
Doyle
Ellison
Engel
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hare
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Hirono
Holt
Honda
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kaptur
Kilpatrick
Kucinich
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lynch
Maloney (NY)
Markey
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Miller, George
Moore (WI)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Olver
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Scott (GA)
Serrano
Slaughter
Solis
Stark
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wynn

NOES—322

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fortuño
Fossella
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Harman
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Israel
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kanjorski
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Obey
Ortiz
Pascrell
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Bordallo
Boustany
Garrett (NJ)
Hooley
Hunter
LaHood
Oberstar
Rangel
Renzi
Rush
Tancredo
Weller
Woolsey
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes left on this vote.

□ 1453

Mr. MORAN of Virginia changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. KAGEN and BECERRA changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARNEY) having assumed the chair, Mr. SERRANO, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 312) revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2010 through 2013, had come to no resolution thereon.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

MARCH 12, 2008.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a facsimile copy of a letter received from Mr. Matthew Tusing, Deputy Secretary of State, Office of the Secretary of State of Indiana, indicating that, according to the unofficial returns of the Special Election held March 11, 2008, the Honorable André D. Carson was elected Representative to Congress for the Seventh Congressional District, State of Indiana.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk.

Enclosure.

MARCH 12, 2008.

Hon. LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk, House of Representatives,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. MILLER: This is to advise you that the unofficial results of the Special Election held on Tuesday, March 11, 2008, for Representative in Congress from the Seventh Congressional District of Indiana show that André D. Carson received 45,598 or 54.04% of the total number of votes cast for that office.

It would appear from these unofficial results that André D. Carson was elected as Representative in Congress from the Seventh Congressional District of Indiana.

To the best of our knowledge and belief at this time, there is no contest in this election.

If you have additional questions, please contact my office.

Sincerely,

MATTHEW TUSING,
Deputy Secretary of State,
Office of the Indiana Secretary of State.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE ANDRÉ CARSON, OF INDIANA, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana, the Honorable ANDRÉ CARSON, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

His certificate of election has not yet arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will the Representative-elect and the members of the Indiana delegation present themselves in the well.

Mr. CARSON appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations. You are now a Member of the 110th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE ANDRÉ CARSON TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I know Julia Carson, who was a beloved Member of all of us in this body, is looking down from heaven today and is very, very proud of ANDRÉ. He was the apple of her eye, her grandson, and if there was one thing she wanted, she wanted him to succeed her in the Congress of the United States. I am sure she is very, very happy today.

André has a background in law enforcement. He worked with the State police, he worked with Homeland Security in the area of terrorism watching and controlling. He is a past member of the City-County Council of Indianapolis, and I presume they are going to have to pick somebody else to fill your seat now.

He will be a welcome Member of this body. We congratulate you on your election and we look forward to working with you.

Madam Speaker, I yield to my colleague from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

□ 1500

Mr. BUYER. Madam Speaker, I would like everyone to know that we all enjoyed Julia very much. But I want you to know this, what just happened in the well is ANDRÉ responded to the Speaker with two words that would make Julia very proud. His first two words as a new Member of Congress, he turned and said, ''Yes, ma'am.''

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. ANDRÉ's wife, I presume, is here with him today, Mariama. They are the proud parents of a 1-year-old daughter, Salimah. I am sure when she is a little older, she will be very proud as well.

I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I appreciate the biographical information. That is very important for all of us to recognize as far as ANDRÉ's achievement. I do think today as he is sworn in, he is probably best known as Julia Carson's grandson. Henceforth, he will be ANDRÉ CARSON, Member of Congress, and we welcome you.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, I yield to our new Member of Congress.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, my fellow colleagues, thank you for your warm welcome.

Today, I want to thank the people of Indiana's 7th Congressional District. I am truly and extremely humbled by the trust they have placed in me, grateful for their support, and committed to serving them each and every day.

I want to thank my wife, Mariama, who has stood with me every step of the way, and our 1-year-old daughter, Salimah, who inspires me to serve.

I also want to thank and honor and salute a great leader who I wish were here, my grandmother, Congresswoman Julia Carson.

Thank you.

For 11 years, she came to this floor as the people's champion. I am committed to building on her accomplishments and service to the people of the 7th Congressional District and the City of Indianapolis. I can think of no better way to honor her memory than by rolling up my sleeves and getting to work on day one.

Our working families, our seniors, our children and our troops are counting on us to stand up and take responsibility for the changes we need in our country. In Indianapolis and across America, working families are struggling in our failing economy. As we are all painfully aware, in February alone, 63,000 Americans lost their jobs, many of them in the great Hoosier State of Indiana.

Overseas, we must honor and care for our brave troops. And the best way to honor them is to change our direction in Iraq, end this war, and bring our troops home.

Solving these problems won't be easy, but together we can make real changes and offer real solutions. We can start by giving middle-class families property tax relief. That is why I am proud that today, as my first official legislative action, I am signing on to my colleague Congressman BARON HILL's bill to provide property tax relief. This will help families in Indianapolis and those who have been hit hard with high taxes.

As we move forward, I look forward to meeting with working with all of you, Republicans and Democrats, to strengthen our economy, create good jobs, and invest in our children.

Thank you, Indiana; thank you, 7th Congressional District; and thank you all. God bless.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from Indiana, the whole number of the House is 431.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a call of the House is ordered.

There was no objection.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 139]

Ackerman	Butterfield	Diaz-Balart, M.
Aderholt	Buyer	Dicks
Akin	Calvert	Dingell
Alexander	Camp (MI)	Doggett
Allen	Campbell (CA)	Donnelly
Altmire	Cannon	Drake
Andrews	Cantor	Dreier
Arcuri	Capito	Duncan
Baca	Capps	Edwards
Bachmann	Capuano	Ehlers
Bachus	Cardoza	Ellison
Baldwin	Carnahan	Ellsworth
Barrett (SC)	Carney	Emanuel
Barrow	Carson	Engel
Bartlett (MD)	Castle	English (PA)
Barton (TX)	Castor	Eshoo
Bean	Chabot	Etheridge
Becerra	Chandler	Everett
Berkley	Clarke	Fallin
Berman	Clay	Farr
Berry	Cleaver	Fattah
Biggert	Clyburn	Ferguson
Bilbray	Coble	Filner
Bilirakis	Cohen	Flake
Bishop (GA)	Conaway	Forbes
Bishop (NY)	Conyers	Fortenberry
Bishop (UT)	Cooper	Fossella
Blackburn	Costa	Foster
Blunt	Costello	Foxx
Boehner	Courtney	Franks (AZ)
Bonner	Crenshaw	Frelinghuysen
Boozman	Crowley	Gallegly
Boren	Cubin	Garrett (NJ)
Boswell	Cuellar	Gerlach
Boucher	Culberson	Giffords
Boyd (FL)	Cummings	Gilchrest
Boyda (KS)	Davis (AL)	Gillibrand
Brady (PA)	Davis (CA)	Gonzalez
Brady (TX)	Davis (IL)	Goode
Braley (IA)	Davis (KY)	Goodlatte
Broun (GA)	Davis, David	Gordon
Brown (SC)	Davis, Lincoln	Granger
Brown, Corrine	Deal (GA)	Graves
Brown-Waite, Ginny	DeGette	Green, Al
Buchanan	Delahunt	Green, Gene
Burgess	DeLauro	Grijalva
Burton (IN)	Dent	Gutierrez
	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hall (NY)

Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Marchant
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

□ 1524

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ELLISON). On this rollcall of the House, 384 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device, a quorum.

Under the rule, further proceedings under the call are dispensed with.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1036 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 312.

□ 1525

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 further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 312) revising the Congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008, establishing the Congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2010 through 2013, with Mr. SERRANO (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 110–548 by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 110–548.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute No. 3 offered by Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009.

(a) DECLARATION.—The Congress determines and declares that the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008 is revised and replaced and that this is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2009, including appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2010 through 2013.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2009.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

TITLE III—EARMARK REFORM

Sec. 301. Moratorium on earmarks.
Sec. 302. Joint select committee on earmark reform.

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 401. Enhance accountability by requiring a separate vote on an increase in the public debt.
Sec. 402. Same-day consideration of reports.
Sec. 403. Two-thirds requirement for certain waivers under the Rules of the House.
Sec. 404. Two-thirds requirement for availability of certain measures on the Internet.
Sec. 405. Cost estimates for conference reports and unreported measures.
Sec. 406. Roll call votes for new spending.
Sec. 407. Nondefense, nonterrorism related spending point of order.
Sec. 408. Limitation on long-term spending proposals.
Sec. 409. Limit on new direct spending in reconciliation legislation.
Sec. 410. Restrictions on advance appropriations.
Sec. 411. Policy statement on hanford and nuclear clean-up.
Sec. 412. Policy statement on war funding.
Sec. 413. Policy statement on medical liability.
Sec. 414. Policy statement on the Medicare ''trigger''.
Sec. 415. Program integrity initiatives.
Sec. 416. Policy statement on the alternative minimum tax.
Sec. 417. Policy statement on health care spending.

TITLE V—EMERGENCY RESERVE FUND

Sec. 501. Nondefense reserve fund for emergencies.
Sec. 502. Emergency criteria.
Sec. 503. Development of guidelines for application of emergency definition.
Sec. 504. Committee notification of emergency legislation.
Sec. 505. Up-to-date tabulations.
Sec. 506. Contingency operations related to the global war on terrorism and for unanticipated defense needs.

TITLE VI—LEGISLATIVE LINE ITEM VETO AUTHORITY

Sec. 601. Presidential recommendations.
Sec. 602. Procedures in the United States Congress.
Sec. 603. Identification of targeted tax benefits.
Sec. 604. Additional matters.
Sec. 605. Abuse of proposed cancellations.

TITLE VII—PAY-AS-YOU-GO

Sec. 701. Strengthening pay-as-you-go.

TITLE VIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 801. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 802. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.
Sec. 803. Compliance with section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.
Sec. 804. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: $1,873,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,017,033,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,104,764,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,198,889,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,291,296,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,352,645,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be adjusted are as follows:

Fiscal year 2008: -$6,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: -$80,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: -$78,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: -$229,136,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: -$362,019,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: -$402,095,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:
Fiscal year 2008: $2,546,649,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,429,637,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,409,712,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,514,762,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,523,758,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,619,267,000,000.
(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:
Fiscal year 2008: $2,461,810,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $2,478,438,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $2,476,911,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $2,523,601,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $2,504,363,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $2,594,191,000,000.
(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:
Fiscal year 2008: $588,270,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $462,405,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $372,147,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $324,712,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $213,067,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $241,546,000,000.
(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the appropriate levels of the debt subject to limit are as follows:
Fiscal year 2008: $9,572,826,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $10,179,229,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $10,745,093,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $11,281,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $11,746,433,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $12,233,839,000,000.
(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:
Fiscal year 2008: $5,402,148,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009: $5,733,577,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010: $6,002,163,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011: $6,225,463,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012: $6,337,014,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013: $6,482,741,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2008 through 2013 for each major functional category are:
(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $693,273,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $604,289,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $612,497,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $645,433,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $550,414,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $607,032,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $557,026,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $577,925,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $565,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $561,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $576,223,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $570,503,000,000.
(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $38,072,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,588,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $33,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $35,118,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,808,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $35,956,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,327,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $36,684,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,274,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $37,028,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,967,000,000.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $27,407,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,456,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $27,934,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,645,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $28,472,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,507,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $29,071,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,297,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $29,679,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,917,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $30,290,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,026,000,000.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $3,548,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,681,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $3,874,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,928,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $3,832,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $3,880,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,656,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $3,950,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,984,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $4,022,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,212,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $32,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,440,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $32,890,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,424,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $33,782,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,328,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $34,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $35,568,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,169,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $36,490,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,896,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $22,456,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,528,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $21,529,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,279,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $21,719,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,680,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $21,891,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $22,263,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,435,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $22,621,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,816,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $11,216,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $8,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $8,687,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,448,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $8,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,244,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $9,246,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,637,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $9,642,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,535,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $79,794,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $77,795,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $74,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $80,350,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $76,607,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,694,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $77,527,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,807,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $78,470,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $87,808,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $79,456,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,112,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $20,029,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,819,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $14,553,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,251,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $14,826,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,816,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $15,134,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,874,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $15,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,817,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $15,755,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,561,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $90,077,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $90,729,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $92,835,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $89,831,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $98,754,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $94,527,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $101,693,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $99,246,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $103,814,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $100,416,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $97,578,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $99,411,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $285,101,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $286,688,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $305,795,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $304,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $322,751,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $323,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $343,709,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $342,746,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $366,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $365,286,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $391,993,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $390,267,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $390,458,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $390,454,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $420,086,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $419,880,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $445,118,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $445,247,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $494,261,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $494,084,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $491,241,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $490,999,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $552,274,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $552,389,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $389,865,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $394,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $410,152,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $412,970,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $414,946,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $416,690,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $424,315,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $425,038,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $410,706,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $410,707,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $426,299,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $426,036,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $19,378,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $21,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,308,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $23,794,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,794,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $27,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $30,342,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,342,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $33,162,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,162,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $86,365,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $83,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $94,268,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $92,943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $96,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,210,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $101,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $101,475,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $99,115,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $105,094,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $104,266,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $46,237,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,282,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $50,024,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,520,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $48,972,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,384,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $47,218,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,912,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $48,425,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,887,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $49,692,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,540,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $56,407,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,920,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $22,970,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $19,402,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,449,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $20,039,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,938,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $20,733,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,753,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $21,407,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,194,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, $349,335,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $349,335,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, $333,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $333,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, $367,501,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $367,501,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, $403,836,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $403,836,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, $429,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $429,556,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, $445,455,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $445,455,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, -$8,599,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$274,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, -$84,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$72,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, -$129,273,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$124,124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, -$155,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$168,315,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, -$195,848,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$205,425,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, -$229,181,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$246,124,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2008:
(A) New budget authority, -$86,330,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$86,330,000,000.
Fiscal year 2009:
(A) New budget authority, -$68,110,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$68,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2010:
(A) New budget authority, -$71,710,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$71,710,000,000.
Fiscal year 2011:
(A) New budget authority, -$77,424,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$77,424,000,000.
Fiscal year 2012:
(A) New budget authority, -$78,136,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$78,136,000,000.
Fiscal year 2013:
(A) New budget authority, -$86,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$86,033,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSION TO PROVIDE FOR THE REFORM OF MANDATORY SPENDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than July 29, 2008, the House committees named in paragraph (2) shall submit their recommendations to the House Committee on the Budget. After receiving those recommendations, the Committee on the Budget shall report to the House a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without substantive revision.

(2) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(A) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The Committee on Agriculture shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending $9,321,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

(B) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—The Committee on Armed Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending $1,292,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

(C) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR.—The Committee on Education and the Labor shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending $15,926,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

(D) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The Committee on Energy and Commerce shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending $115,812,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

(E) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The Committee on Financial Services shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending $73,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

(F) COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Foreign Relations shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending $250,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

(G) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending $3,450,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

(H) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending $3,721,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

(I) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending $4,679,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

(J) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending $4,672,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

(K) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The Committee on Ways and Means shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce direct spending $253,204,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

(b) REVENUE RECONCILIATION.—The House Committee on Ways and Means shall report a reconciliation bill not later than July 29, 2008, that consists of changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce revenues

by not more than $1,151,441,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2009 through 2013.

(c) SUBMISSION OF REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—

(1) Upon the submission to the Committee on the Budget pursuant to subsection (a), or the reporting of a measure pursuant to subsection (b), a recommendation that has complied with its reconciliation instructions pursuant to section 310(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chairman of that committee may file with the House appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of such Act and revised functional levels and aggregates.

(2) Upon the submission to the House of a conference report recommending a reconciliation bill or resolution in which a committee has complied with its reconciliation instructions solely by virtue of this section, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may file with the House appropriately revised allocations and aggregates under such Act.

(3) Allocations and aggregates revised pursuant to this subsection shall be considered to be allocations and aggregates established by the concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 301 of such Act.

TITLE III—EARMARK REFORM

SEC. 301. MORATORIUM ON EARMARKS.

(a) HOUSE.— In the House, for the remainder of the 110th Congress, it shall not be in order to consider a bill, joint resolution, or conference report, containing a congressional earmark, limited tax benefit, or limited tariff benefit, as such terms are defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(b) SENATE.—In the Senate, [to be supplied]

SEC. 302. JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON EARMARK REFORM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND COMPOSITION.— There is established a Joint Select Committee on Earmark Reform. The joint select committee shall be composed of 16 members as follows:

(1) 8 Members of the House of Representatives, 4 appointed from the majority by the Speaker of the House and 4 from the minority by the minority leader; and

(2) 8 Members of the Senate, 4 appointed from the majority by the majority leader of the Senate and 4 from the minority by the minority leader. A vacancy in the joint select committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint select committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection.

(b) STUDY AND REPORT.—

(1) STUDY.—The joint select committee shall make a full study of the practices of the House, Senate, and executive branch, regarding earmarks in authorizing, appropriation, tax, and tariff measures. As part of the study, the joint select committee shall consider the efficacy of—

(A) the disclosure requirements of clause 9 of rule XXI and clause 17 of rule XXIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, House Resolution 491, and rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, and the definitions contained therein;

(B) requiring full transparency in the process, with earmarks listed in bills at the outset of the legislative process and continuing throughout consideration;

(C) requiring that earmarks not be placed in any bill after initial committee consideration;

(D) requiring that Members be permitted to offer amendments to remove earmarks at subcommittee, full committee, floor consideration, and during conference committee meetings;

(E) requiring that bill sponsors and majority and minority managers certify the validity of earmarks contained in their bills;

(F) recommending changes to earmark requests made by the executive branch through the annual budget submitted to Congress pursuant to section 1105 of title 31, United States Code;

(G) requiring that House and Senate amendments meet earmark disclosure requirements, including amendments adopted pursuant to a special order of business;

(H) establishing new categories for earmarks, including—

(i) projects with national scope;

(ii) military projects; and

(iii) local or provincial projects, including the level of matching funds required for such project.

(2) REPORT.—

(A) the joint select committee shall submit to the House and the Senate a report of its findings and recommendations not later than 6 months after adoption of this concurrent resolution.

(B) no recommendation shall be made by the joint select committee except upon the majority vote of the members from each House, respectively.

(C) notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, any recommendation with respect to the rules and procedures of one House that only affects matters related solely to that House may only be made and voted on by members of the joint select committee from that House and, upon its adoption by a majority of such members, shall be considered to have been adopted by the full committee as a recommendation of the joint select committee. In conducting the study under paragraph (1), the joint select committee shall hold not fewer than 5 public hearings.

(c) RESOURCES AND DISSOLUTION.—

(1) The joint select committee may utilize the resources of the House and Senate.

(2) The joint select committee shall cease to exist 30 days after the submission of the report described in subsection (a)(2).

(d) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''earmark'' shall include congressional earmarks, congressionally directed spending items, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as those terms are defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives and rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate. Nothing in this subsection shall confine the study of the joint select committee or otherwise limit its recommendations.

TITLE IV—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 401. ENHANCE ACCOUNTABILITY BY REQUIRING A SEPARATE VOTE ON AN INCREASE IN THE PUBLIC DEBT.

(a) PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT.—In the House, a joint resolution prepared pursuant to the adoption of a concurrent resolution on the budget, or any revision to such concurrent resolution, under the procedures set forth in rule XXVIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives shall reflect an increase in the statutory limit on the public debt of zero.

(b) STATEMENT.—The report of the Committee on the Budget on a concurrent resolution and the joint explanatory statement of the managers on a conference report to accompany such concurrent resolution shall

(1) include the language of the joint resolution described in rule XXVIII, which will reflect no increase in the statutory limit on the public debt;

(2) contain a clear statement that an increase in the statutory limit on the public debt requires a separate roll call vote of all Members of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 402. SAME-DAY CONSIDERATION OF REPORTS.

A report on a rule, joint rule, or the order of business may not be called up for consideration on the same calendar day, or less than 17 hours after that, it is presented to the House except—

(1) when so determined by a vote of two-thirds of the Members voting, a quorum being present;

(2) in the case of a resolution proposing only to waive a requirement of clause 4 or of clause 8 of rule XXII concerning the availability of reports; or

(3) during the last three days of a session of Congress.

SEC. 403. TWO-THIRDS REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN WAIVERS UNDER THE RULES OF THE HOUSE.

It is not in order to consider a rule or order that waives—

(1) the layover requirement of clause 8 of rule XXII concerning the availability of reports;

(2) clause 8(a)(1) of rule XXII;

(3) the scope requirement of the last sentence of clause 9 of rule XXII;

by a vote of less than two-thirds of the Members voting, a quorum being present.

SEC. 404. TWO-THIRDS REQUIREMENT FOR AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN MEASURES ON THE INTERNET.

(a) AVAILABILITY OF COMMITTEE REPORTED MEASURES.—Except as specified in subparagraph (2) of clause 4(a) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, it shall not be in order to consider in the House a measure or matter reported by a committee until the third calendar day (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day) on which each report of a committee on that measure or matter has been available and until the third such calendar day on which the underlying measure or matter has been made available by the Committee on Rules on its Internet site.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF CONFERENCE REPORTS.—Except as specified in subparagraph (2) of clause (a) of rule XXII of the House of Representatives, it shall not be in order to consider a conference report until—

(1) the third calendar day (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such a day) on which the conference report and the accompanying joint explanatory statement have been available, published in the Congressional Record and until the third such calendar day on which such conference report and joint explanatory statement have been made available by the standing committee of the House with subject matter jurisdiction over the underlying legislation on its Internet site; and

(2) copies of the conference report and the accompanying joint explanatory statement have been available to Members, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner for at least two hours,

(c) POINT OF ORDER.—It is not in order to consider a rule or order which would waive subsections (a) or (b) by a vote of less than two-thirds of the Members voting, a quorum being present.

SEC. 405. COST ESTIMATES FOR CONFERENCE REPORTS AND UNREPORTED MEASURES.

It shall not be in order to consider a conference report or an unreported bill or joint resolution unless an estimate of costs as described in clause 3(d)(2) of rule XIII has been printed in the Congressional Record at least one day before its consideration.

SEC. 406. ROLL CALL VOTES FOR NEW SPENDING.

The yeas and nays shall be considered as ordered when the Speaker puts the question on passage of a bill or joint resolution, or on

adoption of a conference report, for which the chairman of the Budget Committee has advised the Speaker that such bill, joint resolution or conference report authorizes or provides new budget authority of not less than $50,000,000. The Speaker may not entertain a unanimous consent request or motion to suspend this section.

SEC. 407. NONDEFENSE, NONTERRORISM RELATED SPENDING POINT OF ORDER.

(a) NONDEFENSE AND NONTERRORISM-RELATED SPENDING.—It shall not be in order to consider any supplemental appropriation measure that primarily provides funding for war-related defense needs and for the global war on terrorism, that also provides funding for domestic discretionary programs, projects or activities designated as emergencies.

(b) LISTING OF NONDEFENSE AND NONTERRORISM-RELATED PROVISIONS.—Prior to the consideration of any appropriation bill or joint resolution referred to in subsection (a), the Committee on the Budget of the House shall transmit to the Speaker, the Majority Leader, the Minority Leader, and the Ranking Member of the Committee on the Budget, and, to the extent practicable, publish in the Congressional Record, a list of any nondefense and nonterrorism related provisions designated as emergency included in that bill or joint resolution.

SEC. 408. LIMITATION ON LONG-TERM SPENDING PROPOSALS.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ANALYSIS OF PROPOSALS.—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall, to the extent practicable, prepare for each bill or joint resolution reported from committee (except measures within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations), or amendments thereto or conference reports thereon, an estimate of whether the measure would cause, relative to current law, a net increase in direct spending in excess of $5 billion in any of the four 10-year periods beginning in fiscal year 2016 through fiscal year 2055.

(b) DIRECT SPENDING LIMITATION.—In the House, it shall not be in order to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that would cause a net increase in direct spending in excess of $5 billion in any of the four 10-year periods beginning in 2016 through 2055.

SEC. 409. LIMIT ON NEW DIRECT SPENDING IN RECONCILIATION LEGISLATION.

In the House, it shall not be in order to consider any reconciliation bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report, in relation to, a reconciliation bill pursuant to section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, that produces an increase in outlays, if—

(1) the effect of all the provisions in the jurisdiction of any committee is to create gross new direct spending that exceeds 20 percent of the total savings instruction to the committee; or

(2) the effect of the adoption of an amendment would result in gross new direct spending that exceeds 20 percent of the total savings instruction to the committee.

SEC. 410. RESTRICTIONS ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), an advance appropriation may not be reported in a bill or joint resolution making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation, and may not be in order as an amendment thereto.

(2) Managers on the part of the House may not agree to a Senate amendment that would violate paragraph (1) unless specific authority to agree to the amendment first is given by the House by a separate vote with respect thereto.

(b) ADVANCE APPROPRIATION.—In the House, an advance appropriation may be provided for the fiscal years 2010 and 2011 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this resolution under the heading ''Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations'' in an aggregate amount not to exceed $23,565,000,000 in new budget authority in each year.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''advance appropriation'' means any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2009 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2009.

SEC. 411. POLICY STATEMENT ON HANFORD AND NUCLEAR CLEAN-UP.

It is the policy of this resolution that the United States Government must meet its responsibility in cleaning up nuclear waste sites created in the name of our Nation's defense by our World War II and Cold War era nuclear weapons production and is an obligation of the Federal Government, not an option. The Environmental Management program responsible for cleaning up these wastes requires a sufficient level of funding so as not to cause legal cleanup milestones and obligations to be missed.

SEC. 412. POLICY STATEMENT ON WAR FUNDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) there are currently more than 183,000 troops in the theater supporting Operations Iraqi and Enduring Freedom;

(2) in February of 2007, the President submitted a war request for supplemental funding to support these troops and their ongoing operations in the global war on terrorism;

(3) more than a year later, Congress has only acted to partially fund that request by providing less than half of the funding required by the troops;

(4) this policy assumes Congress will act on war funding requests in a timely manner so as to avoid—

(A) not having sufficient funds to pay United States soldiers, serving at home or abroad;

(B) not having sufficient funds to pay civilian Army personnel;

(C) significant disruption in base budget activities, which may result in delaying or foregoing contracts and activities (e.g., training) that ultimately may increase cost; and

(D) losing the ability to use the Commanders Emergency Response Program, which is critical to the success of United States and Coalition Forces in Iraq and Afghanistan.

(b) POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON WAR FUNDING.—It is the policy of the House that funding for troops in Operations Iraqi and Enduring Freedom should be provided in a timely manner so as not hinder their performance or needlessly place them in harms way.

SEC. 413. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICAL LIABILITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) medical liability and the resulting practice of defensive medicine continue to plague the medical profession in the United States, reducing access for patients, increasing the cost of medical care generally, and increasing the cost of government programs such as Medicare and Medicaid for the United States taxpayer; and

(2) as the medical liability crisis grows, a large fraction of these dollars will be spent on wasteful health care services provided solely to shield providers from a lawsuits.

(b) POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICAL LIABILITY.—It is the policy of this resolution that it assumes effective medical liability reform which will contribute to the overall goal of domestic entitlement reform, constraining the growth of vital programs such as Medicare and Medicaid and helping to ensure their long-term viability.

SEC. 414. POLICY STATEMENT ON THE MEDICARE ''TRIGGER''.

This resolution assumes that the committees of jurisdiction, in complying with the reconciliation instruction set forth in section 20, will submit to the Committee on the Budget language that locks in any savings resulting from Medicare funding warning legislation designed to reduce the program's general revenue spending exceeding 45 percent. By directing savings solely to deficit reduction, this provision will help Medicare fulfill its mission for the long term.

SEC. 415. PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.

(a) ADJUSTMENTS TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—

(1) CONTINUING DISABILITY REVIEWS AND SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME REDETERMINATIONS.—In the House, prior to consideration of a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2009 that appropriates $264,000,000 for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations for the Social Security Administration, and provides an additional appropriation of up to $240,000,000, and the amount is designated for continuing disability reviews and Supplemental Security Income redeterminations for the Social Security Administration, the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of the additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2009.

(2) INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TAX COMPLIANCE.—In the House, prior to consideration of a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2009 that appropriates $6,997,000,000 to the Internal Revenue Service and the amount is designated to improve compliance with the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and provides an additional appropriation of up to $490,000,000, and the amount is designated to improve compliance with the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of the additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2009.

(3) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL PROGRAM.—In the House, prior to consideration of a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2009 that appropriates up to $198,000,000 and the amount is designated to the health care fraud and abuse control program at the Department of Health and Human Services, the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2009.

(4) UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM INTEGRITY ACTIVITIES.—In the House, prior to consideration of a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2009 that appropriates $10,000,000 for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor and provides an additional appropriation of up to $40,000,000, and the amount is designated for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor, the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2009.

(b) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the House, prior to consideration of a bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make the adjustments set forth in subsection (a) for the incremental new budget authority in that measure and the outlays resulting from that budget authority if that measure meets the requirements set forth in subsection (a), except that no adjustment shall be made for provisions exempted for the purposes of titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 under section 404 of this resolution.

(2) MATTERS TO BE ADJUSTED.—The adjustments referred to in paragraph (1) are to be made to—

(A) the allocations made pursuant to the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(B) the budgetary aggregates as set forth in this resolution.

(c) PRESIDENT'S BUDGET.—In determining whether an adjustments may be made pursuant to this section, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall take into consideration, the recommendations made in President's budget related to such adjustments.

SEC. 416. POLICY STATEMENT ON THE ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX.

This resolution assumes that the Committee on Ways and Means, in complying with the reconciliation instruction set forth pursuant to section 201(b) of this resolution, will prepare legislative language which will phase out the alternative minimum tax.

SEC. 417. POLICY STATEMENT ON HEALTH CARE SPENDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) Medicare's unfunded liability will grow from $34 trillion to $45 trillion in the next 5 years;

(2) health care spending is expected to reach nearly 20 percent of GDP by 2017;

(3) half of the Nation's $2.4 trillion in annual health care spending comes from taxpayer dollars; and

(4) the only way to ensure health care entitlement programs survive and continue to fulfill their missions in the 21st century is through fundamental reform.

(b) POLICY STATEMENT ON HEALTH CARE SPENDING.—This resolution assumes that the committees of jurisdiction over health care spending issues will report legislation to reduce health care costs and expand coverage, in part, by removing distortions in the health care market. The removal of these distortions may be accomplished by increasing personal ownership and improving health care quality and information through the sharing of information, including the passage of H.R. 1174 and H.R. 3370.

TITLE V—EMERGENCY RESERVE FUND

SEC. 501. NONDEFENSE RESERVE FUND FOR EMERGENCIES.

(a) NONDEFENSE SET ASIDE.—In the House:

(1) Except as provided by subsection 506, if a bill or joint resolution is reported, or an amendment is offered thereto (or considered as adopted) or a conference report is filed thereon, that provides new discretionary budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom), and such provision is designated as an emergency pursuant to this section, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make adjustments to the allocations and aggregates set forth in this resolution up to the amount of such provisions if the requirements set forth in section 504 are met, but the sum of all adjustments made under this paragraph shall not exceed $7,300,000,000 for fiscal year 2009.

(2) If a bill or joint resolution is reported or a conference report is filed thereon, and a direct spending or receipt provision included therein is designated as an emergency pursuant to this paragraph, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make adjustments to the allocations and aggregates set forth in this resolution.

(b) ADDITIONAL ADJUSTMENT PROCEDURES.—In the House, before any adjustment is made pursuant to this section for any bill, joint resolution, or conference report that designates a provision an emergency, the enactment of which would cause the total amount of the set aside fund set forth in subsection (a)(1) for fiscal year 2009 to be exceeded:

(1) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall convene a meeting of that committee, where it shall be in order, subject to the terms set forth in this section, for one motion described in paragraph (2) to be made to authorize the chairman to make adjustments above the maximum amount of adjustments set forth in subsection (a). If the Chairman does not call such a meeting within 24 hours of a committee reporting such a measure, any member of the Committee may call such a meeting.

(2) The motion referred to in paragraph (1) shall be in the following form: ''I move that the chairman of the Committee on the Budget be authorized to adjust the allocations and aggregates set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2009 by the following amount: $_____,000,000 for fiscal year 2009.'', with the blank being filled in with amount determined by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget. For any measure referred to in subsection (a)(1), such amount shall not exceed the total amount for fiscal year 2009 designated as an emergency in excess of the applicable amount remaining in the set aside fund.

(3) The motion set forth in paragraph (2) shall be open for debate and amendment, but any amendment offered thereto is only in order if limited to changing an amount in the motion.

(4) Except as provided by paragraph (5), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may not make any adjustments under subsection (a) or subsection (b) unless or until the committee filing a report or joint statement of managers on a conference report on a measure including an emergency designation fulfills the terms set forth in section 504.

(5) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make any adjustments he deems necessary under this section if he determines the enactment of the provision or provisions designated as an emergency is essential to respond to an urgent and imminent need, the chairman determines the exceptional circumstances referred to in rule 3 of the rules of the committee are met and the committee cannot convene to consider the motion referred to in this section in a timely fashion.

(c) APPLICATION OF ADJUSTMENTS.—The adjustments made pursuant to subsection (a) or (b) shall

(1) apply while that bill, joint resolution, conference report or amendment is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that legislation; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

SEC. 502. EMERGENCY CRITERIA.

As used in this title:

(1) The term ''emergency'' means a situation that—

(A) requires new budget authority and outlays (or new budget authority and the outlays flowing therefrom) for the prevention or mitigation of, or response to, loss of life or property, or a threat to national security; and

(B) is unanticipated.

(2) The term ''unanticipated'' means that the underlying situation is—

(A) sudden, which means quickly coming into being or not building up over time;

(B) urgent, which means a pressing and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(C) unforeseen, which means not predicted or anticipated as an emerging need; and

(D) Temporary, which means not of a permanent duration.

SEC. 503. DEVELOPMENT OF GUIDELINES FOR APPLICATION OF EMERGENCY DEFINITION.

In the House, as soon as practicable after the adoption of this resolution, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall, after consultation with the chairmen of the applicable committees, the Ranking Member of the Committee on the Budget, and the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, prepare additional guidelines for application of the definition of an emergency and shall issue a committee print from the Committee on the Budget for this purpose.

SEC. 504. COMMITTEE NOTIFICATION OF EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.

(a) COMMITTEE NOTIFICATION.—Whenever a committee of the House (including a committee of conference) reports any bill or joint resolution that includes a provision designated as an emergency pursuant to this title, the report accompanying that bill or joint resolution (or the joint explanatory statement of managers in the case of a conference report on any such bill or joint resolution) shall identify all provisions that provide amounts designated as an emergency and shall provide an explanation of the manner in which the provision meets the criteria set forth in section 502.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.—If such a measure is to be considered by the House without being reported by the committee of jurisdiction, then the committee shall cause the explanation to be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

SEC. 505. UP-TO-DATE TABULATIONS.

The Committee on the Budget of the House shall publish in the Congressional Record up-to-date tabulations of amounts remaining in the set aside fund set forth in section 501, or authorized in excess thereof, as soon as practicable after the enactment of such amounts designated as emergencies.

SEC. 506. CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS RELATED TO THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM AND FOR UNANTICIPATED DEFENSE NEEDS.

(a) EXEMPTION OF CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS RELATED TO THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM AND FOR UNANTICIPATED DEFENSE NEEDS.—In the House, if any bill or joint resolution is reported, or an amendment is offered thereto or a conference report is filed thereon, that makes appropriations for fiscal year 2009 for contingency operations directly related to the global war on terrorism, and other unanticipated defense-related operations, then the new budget authority, new entitlement authority, outlays, or receipts resulting therefrom shall not count for purposes of titles III or IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(b) CURRENT LEVEL.—Amounts included in this resolution for the purpose set forth in this section shall be considered to be current law for purposes of the preparation of the current level of budget authority and outlays and the appropriate levels shall be adjusted upon the enactment of such bill.

TITLE VI—LEGISLATIVE LINE ITEM VETO AUTHORITY

SEC. 601. PRESIDENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS.

(a) PROPOSED CANCELLATIONS.—If, within 45 calendar days after the enactment of any bill or joint resolution providing any discretionary budget authority, item of direct

spending, limited tariff benefit, or targeted tax benefit, the President proposes, in the manner provided in subsection (b), the cancellation of any dollar amount of such discretionary budget authority, item of direct spending, or targeted tax benefit, such recommendation shall be introduced as a free-standing measure consistent with the terms of this title and shall be eligible for the expedited procedures set forth herein. If the 45 calendar-day period expires during a period where either House of Congress stands adjourned sine die at the end of a Congress or for a period greater than 45 calendar days, the President may propose a cancellation under this section and transmit a special message under subsection (b) on the first calendar day of session following such a period of adjournment.

(b) TRANSMITTAL OF SPECIAL MESSAGE.—

(1) SPECIAL MESSAGE.—

(A) CONTENTS OF SPECIAL MESSAGE.—Each special message shall specify, with respect to the discretionary budget authority, items of direct spending proposed, limited tariff benefits, or targeted tax benefits to be canceled—

(i) the dollar amount of discretionary budget authority, the specific item of direct spending (that OMB, after consultation with CBO, estimates to increase budget authority or outlays as required by section 1017(9)), the limited tariff benefit, or the targeted tax benefit that the President proposes be canceled;

(ii) any account, department, or establishment of the Government to which such discretionary budget authority is available for obligation, and the specific project or governmental functions involved;

(iii) the reasons why such discretionary budget authority, item of direct spending, limited tariff benefit, or targeted tax benefit should be canceled;

(iv) to the maximum extent practicable, the estimated fiscal, economic, and budgetary effect (including the effect on outlays and receipts in each fiscal year) of the proposed cancellation;

(v) to the maximum extent practicable, all facts, circumstances, and considerations relating to or bearing upon the proposed cancellation and the decision to propose the cancellation, and the estimated effect of the proposed cancellation upon the objects, purposes, or programs for which the discretionary budget authority, item of direct spending, limited tariff benefit, or the targeted tax benefit is provided;

(vi) a numbered list of cancellations to be included in an approval bill that, if enacted, would cancel discretionary budget authority, items of direct spending, limited tariff benefit, or targeted tax benefits proposed in that special message; and

(vii) if the special message is transmitted subsequent to or at the same time as another special message, a detailed explanation why the proposed cancellations are not substantially similar to any other proposed cancellation in such other message.

(C) DUPLICATIVE PROPOSALS PROHIBITED.—The President may not propose to cancel the same or substantially similar discretionary budget authority, item of direct spending, limited tariff benefit, or targeted tax benefit more than one time under this Act.

(D) MAXIMUM NUMBER OF SPECIAL MESSAGES.—The President may not transmit to the Congress more than 5 special messages under this subsection related to any bill or joint resolution described in subsection (a), but may transmit not more than 10 special messages for any omnibus budget reconciliation or appropriation measure.

(2) ENACTMENT OF APPROVAL BILL.—

(A) DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Amounts of budget authority, items of direct spending, limited tariff benefit, or targeted tax benefits which are canceled pursuant to enactment of a bill as provided under this section shall be dedicated only to reducing the deficit or increasing the surplus.

(B) ADJUSTMENT OF LEVELS IN THE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET.—Not later than 5 days after the date of enactment of an approval bill as provided under this section, the chairs of the Committees on the Budget of the Senate and the House of Representatives shall revise allocations and aggregates and other appropriate levels under the appropriate concurrent resolution on the budget to reflect the cancellation, and the applicable committees shall report revised suballocations pursuant to section 302(b), as appropriate.

(C) TRUST FUNDS AND SPECIAL FUNDS.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), nothing in this title shall be construed to require or allow the deposit of amounts derived from a trust fund or special fund which are canceled pursuant to enactment of a bill as provided under this section to any other fund.

SEC. 602. PROCEDURES IN THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS.

(a) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The majority leader or minority leader of each House or his designee shall (by request) introduce an approval bill as defined in section 1017 not later than the third day of session of that House after the date of receipt of a special message transmitted to the Congress under section 1011(b). If the bill is not introduced as provided in the preceding sentence in either House, then, on the fourth day of session of that House after the date of receipt of the special message, any Member of that House may introduce the bill.

(2) CONSIDERATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(A) REFERRAL AND REPORTING.—Any committee of the House of Representatives to which an approval bill is referred shall report it to the House without amendment not later than the seventh legislative day after the date of its introduction. If a committee fails to report the bill within that period or the House has adopted a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment sine die at the end of a Congress, such committee shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the bill and it shall be placed on the appropriate calendar.

(B) PROCEEDING TO CONSIDERATION.—After an approval bill is reported by or discharged from committee or the House has adopted a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment sine die at the end of a Congress, it shall be in order to move to proceed to consider the approval bill in the House. Such a motion shall be in order only at a time designated by the Speaker in the legislative schedule within two legislative days after the day on which the proponent announces his intention to offer the motion. Such a motion shall not be in order after the House has disposed of a motion to proceed with respect to that special message. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is disposed of shall not be in order.

(C) CONSIDERATION.—The approval bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against an approval bill and against its consideration are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on an approval bill to its passage without intervening motion except five hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent and one motion to limit debate on the bill. A motion to reconsider the vote on passage of the bill shall not be in order.

(D) SENATE BILL.—An approval bill received from the Senate shall not be referred to committee.

(3) CONSIDERATION IN THE SENATE.—

(A) MOTION TO PROCEED TO CONSIDERATION.—A motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill under this subsection in the Senate shall not be debatable. It shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion to proceed is agreed to or disagreed to.

(B) LIMITS ON DEBATE.—Debate in the Senate on a bill under this subsection, and all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith (including debate pursuant to subparagraph (D)), shall not exceed 10 hours, equally divided and controlled in the usual form.

(C) APPEALS.—Debate in the Senate on any debatable motion or appeal in connection with a bill under this subsection shall be limited to not more than 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled in the usual form.

(D) MOTION TO LIMIT DEBATE.—A motion in the Senate to further limit debate on a bill under this subsection is not debatable.

(E) MOTION TO RECOMMIT.—A motion to recommit a bill under this subsection is not in order.

(F) CONSIDERATION OF THE HOUSE BILL.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—If the Senate has received the House companion bill to the bill introduced in the Senate prior to the vote required under paragraph (1)(C), then the Senate may consider, and the vote under paragraph (1)(C) may occur on, the House companion bill.

(ii) PROCEDURES AFTER VOTE ON SENATE BILL.—If the Senate votes, pursuant to paragraph (1)(C), on the bill introduced in the Senate, then immediately following that vote, or upon receipt of the House companion bill, the House bill shall be deemed to be considered, read the third time, and the vote on passage of the Senate bill shall be considered to be the vote on the bill received from the House.

(b) AMENDMENTS PROHIBITED.—No amendment to, or motion to strike a provision from, a bill considered under this section shall be in order in either the Senate or the House of Representatives.

SEC. 603. IDENTIFICATION OF TARGETED TAX BENEFITS.

(a) STATEMENT.—The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate acting jointly (hereafter in this subsection referred to as ''the chairmen'' shall review any revenue or reconciliation bill or joint resolution which includes any amendment to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that is being prepared for filing by a committee of conference of the two Houses, and shall identify whether such bill or joint resolution contains any targeted tax benefits. The chairmen shall provide to the committee of conference a statement identifying any such targeted tax benefits or declaring that the bill or joint resolution does not contain any targeted tax benefits. Any such statement shall be made available to any Member of Congress by the chairmen immediately upon request.

(b) STATEMENT INCLUDED IN LEGISLATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other rule of the House of Representatives or any rule or precedent of the Senate, any revenue or reconciliation bill or joint resolution which includes any amendment to the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 reported by a committee of conference of the two Houses may include, as a separate section of such bill or joint resolution, the information contained in the statement of the chairmen, but only in the manner set forth in paragraph (2).

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The separate section permitted under subparagraph (A) shall read

as follows: Section 1021 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 shall ''_____'' apply to ''_____.'' with the blank spaces being filled in with—

(A) in any case in which the chairmen identify targeted tax benefits in the statement required under subsection (a), the word ''only'' in the first blank space and a list of all of the specific provisions of the bill or joint resolution in the second blank space; or

(B) in any case in which the chairmen declare that there are no targeted tax benefits in the statement required under subsection (a), the word ''not'' in the first blank space and the phrase ''any provision of this Act'' in the second blank space.

(c) IDENTIFICATION IN REVENUE ESTIMATE.—With respect to any revenue or reconciliation bill or joint resolution with respect to which the chairmen provide a statement under subsection (a), the Joint Committee on Taxation shall—

(1) in the case of a statement described in subsection (b)(2)(A), list the targeted tax benefits in any revenue estimate prepared by the Joint Committee on Taxation for any conference report which accompanies such bill or joint resolution, or

(2) in the case of a statement described in section 13(b)(2)(B), indicate in such revenue estimate that no provision in such bill or joint resolution has been identified as a targeted tax benefit.

(d) PRESIDENT'S AUTHORITY.—If any revenue or reconciliation bill or joint resolution is signed into law

(1) with a separate section described in subsection (b)(2), then the President may use the authority granted in this section only with respect to any targeted tax benefit in that law, if any, identified in such separate section; or

(2) without a separate section described in subsection (b)(2), then the President may use the authority granted in this section with respect to any targeted tax benefit in that law.

SEC. 604. ADDITIONAL MATTERS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) APPROPRIATION LAW.—The term ''appropriation law'' means an Act referred to in section 105 of title I, United States Code, including any general or special appropriation Act, or any Act making supplemental, deficiency, or continuing appropriations, that has been signed into law pursuant to Article I, section 7, of the Constitution of the United States.

(2) APPROVAL BILL.—The term ''approval bill'' means a bill or joint resolution which only approves proposed cancellations of dollar amounts of discretionary budget authority, items of new direct spending, limited tariff benefits, or targeted tax benefits in a special message transmitted by the President under this part and

(A) the title of which is as follows: ''A bill approving the proposed cancellations transmitted by the President on _____,'' the blank space being filled in with the date of transmission of the relevant special message and the public law number to which the message relates;

(B) which does not have a preamble; and

(C) which provides only the following after the enacting clause: ''That the Congress approves of proposed cancellations: _____,'' the blank space being filled in with a list of the cancellations contained in the President's special message, ''as transmitted by the President in a special message on _____,'' the blank space being filled in with the appropriate date, ''regarding _____.'' the blank space being filled in with the Public Law number to which the special message relates;

(D) which only includes proposed cancellations that are estimated by CBO to meet the definition of discretionary budgetary authority or items of direct spending, or limited tariff benefits, or that are identified as targeted tax benefits pursuant to section 1014;

(E) if any proposed cancellation other than discretionary budget authority or targeted tax benefits is estimated by CBO to not meet the definition of item of direct spending, then the approval bill shall include at the end: ''The President shall cease the suspension of the implementation of the following under section 1013 of the Legislative Line Item Veto Act of 2006: _____,'' the blank space being filled in with the list of such proposed cancellations; and

(F) if no CBO estimate is available, then the entire list of legislative provisions proposed by the President is inserted in the second blank space in subparagraph (C).

(3) CALENDAR DAY.—The term ''calendar day'' means a standard 24-hour period beginning at midnight.

(4) CANCEL OR CANCELLATION.—The terms ''cancel'' or ''cancellation'' means to prevent

(A) budget authority from having legal force or effect;

(B) in the case of entitlement authority, to prevent the specific legal obligation of the United States from having legal force or effect;

(C) in the case of the food stamp program, to prevent the specific provision of law that provides such benefit from having legal force or effect;

(D) a limited tariff benefit from having legal force or effect, and to make any necessary, conforming statutory change to ensure that such limited tariff benefit is not implemented; or

(E) a targeted tax benefit from having legal force or effect, and to make any necessary, conforming statutory change to ensure that such targeted tax benefit is not implemented and that any budgetary resources are appropriately canceled.

(5) CBO.—The term ''CBO'' means the Director of the Congressional Budget Office.

(6) DIRECT SPENDING.—The term ''direct spending'' means—

(A) budget authority provided by law (other than an appropriation law);

(B) entitlement authority; and

(C) the food stamp program.

(7) DOLLAR AMOUNT OF DISCRETIONARY BUDGET AUTHORITY.—

(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term ''dollar amount of discretionary budget authority'' means the dollar amount of budget authority—

(i) specified in an appropriation law, or the dollar amount of budget authority or obligation limitation required to be allocated by a specific proviso in an appropriation law for which a specific dollar figure was not included;

(ii) represented separately in any table, chart, or explanatory text included in the statement of managers or the governing committee report accompanying such law;

(iii) required to be allocated for a specific program, project, or activity in a law (other than an appropriation law) that mandates the expenditure of budget authority from accounts, programs, projects, or activities for which budget authority is provided in an appropriation law;

(iv) represented by the product of the estimated procurement cost and the total quantity of items specified in an appropriation law or included in the statement of managers or the governing committee report accompanying such law; or

(v) represented by the product of the estimated procurement cost and the total quantity of items required to be provided in a law (other than an appropriation law) that mandates the expenditure of budget authority from accounts, programs, projects, or activities for which budget authority is provided in an appropriation law.

(B) The term ''dollar amount of discretionary budget authority'' does not include—

(i) direct spending;

(ii) budget authority in an appropriation law which funds direct spending provided for in other law;

(iii) any existing budget authority canceled in an appropriation law; or

(iv) any restriction, condition, or limitation in an appropriation law or the accompanying statement of managers or committee reports on the expenditure of budget authority for an account, program, project, or activity, or on activities involving such expenditure.

(8) ITEM OF DIRECT SPENDING.—The term ''item of direct spending'' means any provision of law that results in an increase in budget authority or outlays for direct spending relative to the most recent levels calculated consistent with the methodology used to calculate a baseline under section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and included with a budget submission under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, in the first year or the 5-year period for which the item is effective. Such item does not include an extension or reauthorization of existing direct spending, but only refers to provisions of law that increase such direct spending.

(9) LIMITED TARIFF BENEFIT.—The term ''limited tariff benefit'' means any provision of law that modifies the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States in a manner that benefits 10 or fewer entities (as defined in paragraph (12)(B)).

(10) OMB.—The term ''OMB'' means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(11) OMNIBUS RECONCILIATION OR APPROPRIATION MEASURE.—The term ''omnibus reconciliation'' or ''appropriation measure'' means—

(A) in the case of a reconciliation bill, any such bill that is reported to its House by the Committee on the Budget; or

(B) in the case of an appropriation measure, any such measure that provides appropriations for programs, projects, or activities falling within 2 or more section 302(b) suballocations.

(12) TARGETED TAX BENEFIT.—

(A) The ''term targeted tax benefit'' means any revenue-losing provision that provides a Federal tax deduction, credit, exclusion, or preference to ten or fewer beneficiaries (determined with respect to either present law or any provision of which the provision is a part) under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in any year for which the provision is in effect;

(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A)—

(i) all businesses and associations that are members of the same controlled group of corporations (as defined in section 1563(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) shall be treated as a single beneficiary;

(ii) all shareholders, partners, members, or beneficiaries of a corporation, partnership, association, or trust or estate, respectively, shall be treated as a single beneficiary;

(iii) all employees of an employer shall be treated as a single beneficiary;

(iv) all qualified plans of an employer shall be treated as a single beneficiary;

(v) all beneficiaries of a qualified plan shall be treated as a single beneficiary;

(vi) all contributors to a charitable organization shall be treated as a single beneficiary;

(vii) all holders of the same bond issue shall be treated as a single beneficiary; and

(viii) if a corporation, partnership, association, trust or estate is the beneficiary of a provision, the shareholders of the corporation, the partners of the partnership, the members of the association, or the beneficiaries of the trust or estate shall not also be treated as beneficiaries of such provision;

(C) For the purpose of this paragraph, the term ''revenue-losing provision'' means any provision that is estimated to result in a reduction in federal tax revenues (determined with respect to either present law or any provision of which the provision is a part) for a period of the—

(i) first fiscal year for which the provision is effective; or

(ii) five fiscal years beginning with the first fiscal year for which the provision is effective;

(D) the ''term targeted tax benefit'' does not include any provision which applies uniformly to an entire industry; and

(E) the terms used in this paragraph shall have the same meaning as those terms have generally in the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, unless otherwise expressly provided.

SEC. 605. ABUSE OF PROPOSED CANCELLATIONS.

The President, or any executive branch official, should not condition the inclusion or exclusion or threaten to condition the inclusion or exclusion of any proposed cancellation in any special message under this title upon any vote cast or to be cast by any Member of either House of Congress.

TITLE VII—PAY-AS-YOU-GO

SEC. 701. STRENGTHENING PAY-AS-YOU-GO.

(a) LIMITATION.—In the House, in determining the effect of a bill, joint resolution, amendment or conference report on the deficit or surplus for purposes of clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee on the Budget shall disregard provisions that are impermissible offsets.

(b) DEFINITION OF IMPERMISSIBLE OFFSETS.—A provision is an ''impermissible offset'' if the Committee on the Budget determines that it—

(1) is the same or substantially the same as a change in law reducing the deficit included in a bill, joint resolution, or conference report previously passed by the House but not enacted;

(2) causes a decrease in outlays within the first time period set forth in clause 10 of such rule XXI, but causes no change in outlays over the second time period included in the clause; or

(3) causes an increase in revenue within the first time period set forth in clause 10 of such rule XXI, but causes no change in revenues over the second time period included in the clause.

(c) TREATMENT OF DIRECT SPENDING PROVISIONS.—In the House:

(1) For purposes of enforcing clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, a provision included in a bill, joint resolution, or conference report increasing direct spending in any year may be deemed by the chairman of the Committee on the Budget to be structured such that it artificially disguises an increase in entitlement spending by use of expiration dates or reductions in entitlement or beneficiary levels.

(2) The chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall cause a clear statement for any bill, joint resolution or conference report as to whether a provision increasing mandatory budget authority or outlays has or has not been structured as described in paragraph (1), to be inserted in the Congressional Record if requested by the Speaker, the Majority Leader, the Minority Leader or the Ranking Member of the Committee on the Budget.

(d) STRENGTHEN PAY-AS-YOU-GO.—It shall not be in order to consider any bill, joint resolution, or conference report that increases the deficit in the budget year or the five-fiscal year period following the second period of fiscal years set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of the House Representatives. The effect of such measure on the deficit or surplus shall be determined on the same basis as set forth in such clause.

TITLE VIII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this resolution—

(1) the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the appropriate Committee on the Budget; and

(2) such chairman may make any other necessary adjustments to such levels to reflect the timing of responses to reconciliation directives pursuant to section 201 of this resolution.

SEC. 802. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

Upon the enactment of a bill or joint resolution providing for a change in concepts or definitions, the appropriate chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution in accordance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002).

SEC. 803. COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 13301 OF THE BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1990.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House and the Senate, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—In the House, for purposes of applying section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts provided for the Social Security Administration.

SEC. 804. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change those rules (so far as they relate to that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1036, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and a Member opposed each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 1 minute to the esteemed minority leader, Mr. BOEHNER.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague from Wisconsin for yielding and congratulate him and the Republican members of the Budget Committee for a job well done in putting this budget together.

I also want to thank our colleague from South Carolina, Mr. SPRATT, the chairman of the committee for their budget. Although I'll be critical of it, still, the gentleman did his work, and the House is considering the budget at the time of the year the House should be considering its budget, in March, and in early March, which has not always happened.

When we think about our budgets, it's not as complicated as people think. It's about revenue coming into the Federal Government and revenue going out of the Federal Government to provide benefits for the American people. And it's not just about numbers for this year. It's about numbers for next year and over the next 5 or 10 years that we need to look at so that there is a balance between revenues and expenses.

Clearly, over the last 40 years, there's been a big imbalance between what goes out and what comes in. And the fact is that in 36 of those 40 years, the Federal Government has run a deficit, at least 36. I think 36 of the 40 years we've run a deficit. We balanced the budget in the late 1990s when Republicans controlled the Congress by holding the line on spending while revenues to the Federal Government were growing in a healthy economy, held the line on spending at or near the rate of inflation, and revenues surpassed expenses for the first time in some almost 30 years.

But here we are again, back in a situation where we're spending more than what's coming in, mostly as a result of the attacks of 9/11, the aftershocks to our economy. But if you look at the revenue over the last 5 years, revenues have grown at 11 percent annually in each of the last 4 years, going back through 2006. And even in 2007, revenues to the Federal Government grew, estimated to grow at about 8 to 9 percent. And so revenue growth to the Federal Government, I think, has been healthy since we reduced taxes on capital gains and dividends, per child tax credit, and relief for the marriage penalty back in 2001 and 2003.

□ 1530

And so you can see that reducing tax rates doesn't mean less revenue to the Federal Government. Matter of fact, you can look back over the last 27 years, other than a couple of small exceptions, there has been a significant effort to lower tax rates, income tax rates, capital gain tax rates; and as a result, there has been more economic activity in our country, more people employed in our country, and more people paying taxes.

And so if you look at the marginal tax rates today as compared to 1980, you see that those tax rates are significantly lower. Yet the Federal revenue, the taxes that American families pay, continues to come into Washington at very high levels of growth on an annual basis

I would argue that making the capital gains tax rate permanent, making the rate on dividends permanent, would give more people reasons to invest in America's economy allowing those rates of growth in revenue to the Federal Government to continue.

And so Washington doesn't have a revenue problem. Washington has a spending problem. And when you look at the Washington spending problems, it really rolls down to several things: one is controlling the growth of domestic discretionary spending. I think, by and large, if you look at the budgets that we've seen over the last 15 years, we've done a fairly good job of controlling domestic discretionary programs and the spending that goes there. There are some exceptions, and there is certainly some room to eliminate some of what I would call wasteful Washington spending. But if you look at the increases, most of it has gone into the area of defense.

The real problem that we have is that we continue to have an older America. The number of Americans over 65 continues to grow and will grow significantly as I and other baby boomers begin to retire.

And so when you look at the problem today in terms of the spending problem, it is in the entitlement area. And the underlying budget that the majority has put forward does nothing to reform entitlement spending. I came here in 1990 because I thought that programs like Social Security and Medicare were unsustainable unless Congress was willing to act to protect those programs.

And here we are in my 18th year. We've nibbled around the edges of a couple of these programs, but have never really done anything that would make these programs sustainable for tomorrow and for succeeding generations. As I have said hundreds of times on this floor, our generation has made promises to ourselves that our kids and grandkids can't afford.

So if you look at the budget being presented by myself and our Republican colleagues, we assume that the capital gains rate of 15 percent will be made permanent. We assume that the rate on dividends at 15 percent is made permanent and the per-child tax credit is put in permanent law as is the marriage penalty, the tax cuts that were put in place on a temporary basis in 2001 and 2003.

So our budget balances over the next 5 years, and it balances because we go in and actually do something about the spending side of the equation.

Now, if you look at the Democrat budget, they assume that the 15 percent capital gains rate goes back to 20 percent. They assume that the 15 percent rate on dividends goes to whatever the marginal tax rate for that taxpayer would be, probably an average tax rate of about 30 percent on dividends, or double that tax, that the marriage penalty comes back in for all Americans and that the $1,000 per-child tax credit goes away.

And I forgot one, of all things: the death tax that we want to see go away completely in 2010. The death tax, under the Democrat proposal, comes back in full force putting the Federal Government back into a competition with the heirs over the balance that we have in people's estates.

But the real issue in the Democrat budget is spending. If you look at the chart I'm holding here, the Democrat budget assumes all of these tax cuts go away. So you have a $683 billion tax increase in their budget, the largest one in American history; and they have it in because if you look at their spending levels, they do nothing about reforming entitlement programs or putting a lid on the growth of domestic discretionary spending.

So I think that the budget that the Republicans are putting forward here is a responsible budget, and I think, frankly, a majority of the American people would agree with me. We ought to keep tax rates low. We ought to encourage economic activity and more economic growth in America that would provide more opportunity for more jobs and better paying jobs in America, and to get the balance, do something constructive about Social Security and Medicare, especially, to modify those programs so that we can save them for future generations.

At some point, we are going to have to ante up to the piper, and the sooner we begin to address the long-term problems in Social Security and Medicare, the better off we will be.

So I would encourage my colleagues to look closely at the budget put together by Mr. RYAN and his Republican colleagues on the Budget Committee, and I ask all of our Members to consider supporting it.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SERRANO). The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 6½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think it bears remembering that 8 short years ago the budget of this government was $236 billion in surplus. Since 2001, we have experienced, on the watch of this administration, the largest deficits, nominal deficits, in American history, and an accumulation of debt that's enough to blow the mind. The debt of this country was $5.7 trillion when Mr. Bush came to office. When he leaves office, it will be $10 trillion. So that explains why we are skeptical, if you will, and even more skeptical and dubious when we look at the substitute resolution that has been brought to the floor, about which the leader barely spoke until he got to the very end of his presentation a few minutes ago.

To find the real numbers in this resolution, the leader said that this is addressed to deal with a spending problem, not a revenue problem. So as we look through the spending side of the resolution, we have to go all the way to an obscure account called function 920 Allowances to find where the real action is.

Now, this function is typically an allowance function where we have things we haven't decided how to assign yet and put into allowances because we know it is a catch-all account until some decision is made as to how to treat it.

Typically, therefore, you find smaller amounts in this account; but in this particular case, in this particular resolution, $817 billion in additional cuts are called for.

If you look at the Republican resolution, initially it seems to be providing current services for just about every function. But then you get to function 920 and you see that what has been provided is taken back. And when you ask where these cuts are distributed, who bears the brunt of $817 billion in cuts over a 5-year period of time, there is no real answer because they're unallocated. We've heard them say they've added a billion dollars to veterans health care; but once they begin allocating the $817 billion, that billion dollars is likely to be wiped out.

The same can happen to defense and nondefense programs. We can't say, because $817 billion is left unresolved tucked away in this account called function 920. This is the first black hole in this budget.

This budget then goes on. You can do a little arithmetic and figure out that $405 billion is assigned to cuts in domestic discretionary spending, $417 billion is assigned to mandatory cuts. Mandatory cuts are entitlement programs like Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid; and if you look at the accounts here, you will find that basically it appears that the Ways and Means Committee is being directed to save $253 billion, is presumably out of Medicare; the Energy and Commerce Committee is being asked, told, directed to save that $116 billion out of Medicaid. These are not just small cuts, minor adjustments that you would normally find in function 920. These are emasculating cuts for programs that are critically important.

Then when we come to the reconciliation provisions, we find that the Republicans' substitute anticipates at least another $1.1 trillion in tax reduction. How that's allocated, we can't tell for sure; but the tax cuts have to be reconciled against the mandatory spending cuts. When you do that, what we find is the tax cuts equal $1.1 trillion; the mandatory spending cuts equal $412 as a $739 billion addition to the deficit. It worsens the deficit rather than improving the deficit. That's the second black hole in this particular budget.

Reconciliation actually works as a problem instead of improves it. We know that the other side intends to repeal the alternative minimum tax after 3 years. We know also that they intend to extend the tax cuts that were enacted in 2001 and 2003. The total of these would come to $2.5 trillion easily over a period of 5 to 10 years; and if that's the case, the third hole, the third hole that this resolution leaves is a big hole in the bottom of the budget.

So what we've got here is work that is not really a completed product. It is not a finished product because function 920 leaves $817 billion still to be distributed, still to be determined. By whom? Apparently by the appropriators or someone like this, but not today on the floor. When you vote for this today, it has tremendous consequences.

Let me just offer one illustration of what the consequence might be.

After the cuts in Medicare and Medicaid, which are truly sizable, they are starkly large, there is a cut called for of $115 billion in savings by the Education and Labor Committee. Now, where would the Education and Labor Committee go to get such cuts? They would go to student loans.

We have just done something phenomenal. In last year's budget, we were able to make some rearrangements and reduce the interest rate over time and subsidize student loans from 6.8 percent to 3.4 percent. A phenomenal accomplishment. This indicates that the reduction in interest would be abolished, reversed, as one way of achieving that direction to save $115 billion.

We just passed a College Cost Reduction and Access Act. One of the things it did would take Pell Grants up to $5,400 over time. That, too, would have to be repealed in order to meet $115 billion.

So watch out for the black holes. Watch out for the things that won't easily appear as you read the language here. If anyone votes for this, we are voting, in effect, in my opinion, to go back to where we were over the last 7 years in a period of endless deficits and mountainous debts. This is not the way to go. This is not good work. This is not a finished product, and we should not support this as an amendment to the base bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to yield 2 minutes to our minority whip, Mr. BLUNT.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the budget he brings to the floor. I think it's clear, looking at that budget, that the specific cuts that have just been suggested don't have to be the cuts that are made. That's up to those committees.

Now, I personally, as a former university president, would not go to student loans as the first thing to look at of all of the things that are in the Education and Labor Committee to decide what the Federal Government's doing that it could be doing better. This is a budget that's willing to take that kind of responsibility. This is a budget, a budget that's being presented by Mr. RYAN, that's willing to look at the things that otherwise will overwhelm us in the future.

The mandatory spending in the Federal Government is going to be overwhelming if it is not dealt with. This budget deals with it. I had people yesterday, reporters, asking, well, how could you slow the growth of these mandatory programs from 5.2 percent to 3.8 percent? That would be $400 billion over 5 years.

□ 1545

Now, the key is slow the growth. The other key is they would still grow by 3.8 percent. And the final key is we're going to have to look at these programs and not just think about them in terms of whether we care based on how much money we spend, but whether we care based on the service we provide.

And we can look at these programs, as this budget anticipates we will, in a way that makes us look at health care so that people have more rights to have choices in health care, so they have more rights to their information in health care. We can look at health care. We can look at Social Security. We can look at things that provide a better service in a better way for taxpayers and recipients.

Just simply not exceeding inflation as our goal doesn't mean we're going to provide worse service. It means we're going to really look at these programs seriously. This budget has the courage to do that. I rise in support of it and hope that my colleagues will join me.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this week, the House has in front of it two well-thought-out but starkly different visions of where to take the country. We have put forward a budget that is true to our principles. We believe that you grow the economy and create opportunity for people by stopping the practice of running the government on borrowed money, by investing in the education, health care, and development of our people, and by expanding opportunities for economic development both here and around the world.

The minority, true to its principles, has introduced a budget which follows its strategy. I think this is a sincere and well-thought-out budget whose principles are just wrong. And if anything, I think that this budget is nostalgic because it does remind us of the 6 years in which the minority had the majority in both the House and the Senate and the White House. And it follows a tried and true, but failed, strategy, which is to say that you reduce taxes by more than you cut spending, and you borrow the difference.

Now, if I add this up correctly, in reading the minority's budget, it calls for spending cuts in the area of $800 billion over 5 years. Perhaps there's a different interpretation, but it would seem to me that there is entitlement spending reduction there and also discretionary. And it calls for reductions in revenue over a 5-year period in the vicinity of $1.2 trillion. So it would appear to me that there is about a one-third or $400 billion difference between the reduction in revenues that is called for and the reduction in spending that is called for. That is, if nothing else, traditional to the practice of borrowing money to run the government.

Second, I have a concern about the specificity of the spending cuts that are put forward. Our friend from Missouri, the minority whip, just talked about the instructions to cut spending in the Education and Labor Committee's area. And our friend said that, as a former university president, he would not first look to cut student loans as a way to deal with the cuts that are required under the minority's budget. Well, I would respectfully say to him, Mr. Chairman, through you, that to my knowledge there is only two other places one could look to find those cuts: The first would be in the pensions of Americans through the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, and the second would be through the school nutrition program, through school breakfasts or lunches.

So, one can say that you don't want to cut student loans, but if you do, then you've got to turn either to the school lunch or breakfast program, or the pensions of Americans.

We, frankly, disagree with that approach. We took a very different approach on student loans, as the chairman said. What we did was to cut student loan rates in half and expand opportunities for Pell Grants and other scholarships, and we did so without borrowing money. What we did was to go after what we felt were unjustifiably high subsidies for the student loan banking industry. So, this example, I think, shows the difference in philosophies.

In order to finance tax cuts which are skewed toward the wealthiest in our country, the minority would borrow a substantial amount of money on top of the debt it has already run up, and it would pay for it in part by cutting either student loans, by raising interest

rates to students, or cutting school lunches and school breakfast programs, or somehow getting money out of the Pension Guaranty Corporation. We would not do that. What we did was to cut student loan rates in half, increase Pell Grants and other scholarship opportunities, and pay for it without borrowing money by reducing what we view as a corporate welfare subsidy to the student loan banking industry.

This is a very big difference. It's a legitimate difference. We think it's why the gentleman's amendment should be rejected.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield myself 6 minutes, and I'm going address the House in the well.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to start off by thanking my friends from New Jersey and South Carolina. They did put together a credible budget that adds up. We did, too.

Budgets are about priorities; they're about values; they're about what way you think the country should go on a fiscal ship. Let me walk through our budget and how it's different.

Number one, my friend from New Jersey and the chairman himself said that by calling our budget that makes today's tax policy a permanent tax cut, I want to thank them for saying that. By keeping tax rates where they are today, which is what we propose, a tax cut, then the opposite of that is a tax increase. They have proven my point. Their budget raises taxes.

Now, let me simply show you, Mr. Chairman. This red line is the baseline that the Democrats have chosen to adopt for their budget. This blue line is the baseline we've chosen on revenues to adopt for our budget. The blue line says, make the child tax credit permanent, repeal the marriage penalty forever, make the income tax rate not go up, keep the death tax repealed, keep the lowered tax rate on capital gains and dividends. What does the Democrat budget do? It raises taxes $683 billion on everybody, not just rich people.

What do we do on the alternative minimum tax? Here's what the Democratic budget proposes to do: It proposes to patch it for a year by swapping it out with another tax increase. Then, by 2009, about 30 million people are going to get hit by it; 2010, 31 million people. On and on and on. We propose to make sure no new people get hit by the alternative minimum tax, then we phase it out completely. That's point two of what our budget achieves.

Point three, and I think you're going to hear this a lot, we cut, cut, cut, cut, cut, cutting here, cutting there. You hear this sort of legislative gobbledygook about function 920. Well, as we looked at the Democratic budget, we really couldn't find any savings, but we did, we found a sliver of savings in the budget. Where was that sliver of savings kept? Function 920.

What matters in a budget resolution are two numbers, the discretionary number, the 302(a) we call that, we do that, and the direction to the committees, we do that. We do it just like the Democrats did it. That's how we wrote our budget. But there's a difference. You may not be able to see this. For those who are watching on TV, you may have to zoom in. The CBO baseline is the red line. The Republican substitute is the blue line. Not a huge gap of difference in spending. We are simply saying let's not spend that money as fast, and by controlling the growth and the increase in spending, we can make sure we don't raise taxes on the American people. We can repeal the alternative minimum tax. That's the difference in values between the two of us.

Let me give it to you in a different way. What we Republicans are proposing to do is, instead of spending $15.82 trillion over the next 5 years, let's instead spend $15.32 trillion over the next 5 years. Don't spend 15.8, spend 15.3. What's the difference? We're not cutting the child tax credit in half. We're not bringing back the marriage tax penalty. We're not raising every single income tax payer's tax rates across the board. We're not raising the tax on pensions and 401(k)s by raising the tax on dividends and capital gains, and we're not going to keep taxing people when they die. At the end of the day, though, what are we doing for our children and our grandchildren? That's what we should be talking about in budgeting.

Budgets are moral documents. There is a moral imperative before this country, before this Congress, and that moral imperative is, what are we doing for future generations? In just one program, in just one program, the Medicare program, one of the most important programs in the history of the Federal Government, the Democrats' budget proposes to increase its debt by $11 trillion. The debt for Medicare right now stands at $34 trillion; that's the unfunded liability. What are the Democrats doing by doing nothing, by going 5 years with blinders on? $45 trillion. That breaks down to $395,000 per household, each household would owe to make Medicare whole.

What are we doing? We're reforming the program. We're making it work better. We're giving it changes that are needed so that we can make it sustainable, so we can save the program for the baby boomers.

We lower the Medicare debt and unfunded liability by $11 trillion to 23. The Democrats raise the debt to Medicare alone by $11 trillion; we reduced it by $11 trillion. At the end of the day, it's about priorities.

We also call for a 1-year moratorium on earmarks. We're simply saying, let's just take a time-out from pork for a year in Congress. What do we achieve with that? By not doing earmarks for 1 year and by saving that money in this budget, we can make sure we don't raise taxes on every household by $500 per child. We can make sure we don't return to the days of taxing people when they're married. Just those two things can be accomplished by saying ''no'' to earmarks for a year, having a time-out, saying let's have Democrats and Republicans from both parties from both the Senate and the House get together and figure out how to clean up this system and, in the meantime, save the money. So we don't tax people for having kids and we don't tax people for being married.

At the end of the day, you're going to hear all this rhetoric about cuts, about devastation, about how wrong it is and how immoral it is. We're simply saying, instead of spending $15.8 trillion, spend $15.3 trillion. We're still increasing spending, but let's not increase it as fast as Washington has been spending it so we can save that money, so we can make sure we don't raise taxes on Americans. That's what our budget does.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL).

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Chairman, this week, or just today, rather, it was found out, we discovered and it was reported, that the United States is running a $176 billion deficit in February alone. Earlier this week, we also found out that the Iraqis have a surplus of over $50 billion.

We also know that the American taxpayers have paid for 20 Iraqi hospitals to be refurbished and 80 health clinics to have been built and 60 more planned. And the Republican budget, in the area of health care, cuts $370 billion from Medicare and Medicaid.

The Iraqis, due to the American taxpayers, will get 6,700 schools rehabbed. The Republican budget eliminates the Pell Grant increases that Congress proposed this year.

We're also increasing our funding and training of the Iraqi teachers. The Republicans plan to reduce the military retirement and health care benefits by $1.3 billion. And while Iraq is running a surplus and not spending their resources on improving their country, the entire deficit over the entire period of time that the Republican budget has is a little over $700 billion.

President Kennedy once said, ''To govern is to choose,'' and my friends on the other side have made some choices. While the Iraqis run a surplus, they've made sure that America runs a deficit. While Iraq and American taxpayers are asked to make sure that we rebuild schools and hospitals in Iraq, here in the United States their budget cuts those very investments.

In fact, the Democratic budget turns this ship around of inheriting $3.8 trillion in new debt that has accumulated over the last 6 years and ensures that we invest in American schools, in American hospitals, in American health clinics, and in American teachers. And it ensures, also, that we have a middle class tax cut. So, it makes sure that, while we are doing what we are supposed to do in Iraq, we don't do

it at the expense of what we need to do here at home. We have invested in Iraq, and our budget ensures that we invest in America.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds just to simply say to my friend from Illinois, cutting military benefits? Where did that one come from? Not true, not even anywhere in our budget. You know what? Medicare goes up, spending goes up. Education? Spending increases. I don't know where these cuts are coming from that he's talking about, but that's not in our budget.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia, our assistant minority whip, Mr. CANTOR.

Mr. CANTOR. I thank the gentleman.

First of all, let me respond to some of the assertions made by our friend from Illinois. He tries to portray this as a choice, a budget document that represents a choice between the Iraqi people and the American people. I beg to differ with the gentleman.

This budget document is not a choice about that. This budget document represents a choice about the future of where we're going in this country. This represents a choice about whether we here in Washington are actually going to do something for the American people.

You know, if you think about the American people right now when they're watching us on TV, you know, I don't blame them when they look at the TV in disgust and say, you know, they just don't get it up in Washington.

□ 1600

They believe, and they're right, that Washington is broken and we have got to do something to fix it. Frankly, we have got to get the Federal Government working for the people again. But that means we have got to spend less.

The gentleman from Wisconsin talked about the fact that there is absolutely no treatment, no curtailment of anything having to do with the earmark question. Earmarks are just the tip of the iceberg as far as our spending culture is here in Washington. Let's go ahead and take the first step. Let's reform that process because we have got to spend less.

Let's face it: gas prices, they're too high. The American public is sick and tired of excuses coming out of Washington. But the way to fix it is not to put more burden on the American family while they are already facing the prospects of $4-a-gallon gas this summer. That's just not what we do. People across this country are worried about their health care. They're worried about their jobs. This stuff about we're going to provide you with middle-class tax cuts, have you looked to see what's in this document? This document will lead us to the largest tax increase in American history.

The choice here is not between whether we are going to provide for our national security and the people of America. The choice here is whether we are going to trust in the people to control their own destiny.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, we have to remind ourselves exactly where we are with the policies that took place in 2001 and 2003 and what has happened to our budget. You will see that we dug ourselves out of a ditch from 1993 to 2001, and it had a surplus. And overnight that surplus has absolutely collapsed. And we need a chart because there is a lot of partisanship on the floor. If you tried to describe this, people would think you're being partisan because they can't believe that you could do this to the budget.

In fact, in the 10 years after 2001, we had a projected surplus of $5.5 trillion. After the policies of 2001 and 2003, it looks like we are going to have a $3 trillion deficit, not a surplus, a swing of $8.8 trillion.

Now, a $5.5 trillion surplus. Everybody knows that the Social Security program is in trouble. In 2001 we had a shortfall of $4 trillion in the Social Security program. If we had $4 trillion in the bank in 2001, we could pay Social Security for 75 years without reducing benefits. We had a surplus of $5.6 trillion, not just the $4 trillion we needed to solve all of the problems in Social Security.

When we started in 2001, one of the questions that Chairman Greenspan had to answer was, what's going to happen when we pay off the national debt? Because by 2013 we would have paid off the national debt and put all the money back in the trust funds. Zero debt, zero interest on the national debt. Now it looks like in 2013 we're going to have to pay $300 billion a year in interest on the national debt because we messed up the budget. And $300 billion at $30,000 each is enough to hire everybody now drawing unemployment with money to spare with a $30,000-a-year job. That's $30,000 a year for everybody drawing unemployment. You've got money left over before you run out of people.

Now, we have heard that by cutting all these taxes, we increase revenues. Well, let me just show you this chart that shows the income tax revenues over the past years going back to 1960. The color code says that green is a year in which you had a record revenue. Red is a year in which you did not have a record revenue. You look back since 1960 through recessions, depressions, good times, bad times, high taxes, low taxes. We had record revenues every year but two, and the following year you had a record revenue. So we always get record revenues. Whoops, excuse me. Until 2001 and 2003, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 consecutive years without record revenues. So we didn't get record revenues.

And we hear that people are bragging about jobs that were created during this time. Let's look at the chart, get rid of the arithmetic. The worst job performance in this administration since Herbert Hoover. You've got to go back to Herbert Hoover to find job performance any worse that this.

So we've gotten into the ditch. We're trying to get out of the ditch. The Democratic budget makes the responsible decisions to try to get us out of the ditch. We've had tough decisions.

And other things like earmarks, we have heard this thing about earmarks: just cut out the earmarks and we will save some money. Let's have a word about how these earmarks work. If you have an appropriation of $200 million and I have got a little earmark for $1 million for a program in my district, that comes out of the $200 million. If I don't get an earmark, $200 million. If I get an earmark, $200 million. Get rid of the earmarks, and you're not saving the taxpayers any money. What this Republican budget does is it has a fantasy of about $800 billion in unspecified cuts. We don't know where these cuts are coming from. It might be health care. It might be student loans, school lunches, food safety, airline inspections, homeland security, port security grants, public safety. We've already tried to cut back on the COPS program.

This budget makes no sense unless you actually name the cuts, because the fact of matter is you're probably not going to cut student loans. You're probably not going to cut the school nutrition program. You say you're going to cut, and you don't do it. And so you've had the tax cuts. You got us in the ditch. And then when the spending cuts come around, nothing happens. So until they start naming what will be cut, this entire budget proposal substitute makes no sense.

I would hope that we would adopt the Democratic budget. I would have hoped that we had had the Congressional Black Caucus budget, but the Democratic budget makes a responsible attempt to reduce the deficit, go into surplus, and make the expenditures on the priorities that we desperately need.

We should reject this substitute and adopt the underlying bill.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to make three points.

The gentleman's revenue chart makes our point. After the dot-com bubble, we went into recession and revenues went down. After the tax cuts, and his own chart makes the point clear, revenues went up.

Point number two, this budget, the Democratic budgets, has the single largest increase in the national debt in any given year in the history of the country.

Point number three, Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman just acknowledged more or less, their budget raises taxes. We don't believe we should be raising taxes at a time when people are paying a lot just to live in a time when we're about to go into recession.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina, the vice-ranking member of the Budget Committee (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Republican substitute. And there is a clear difference between the two proposals on the table.

The key to managing, and budgeting, is to set priorities. Everybody knows that that has had a family or run a business. You have to do this. You have to make tough choices, and you can't have everything you want when you want it.

But the Democrats have refused to set priorities, Mr. Chairman. They simply want to spend more on everything and everyone within the reach of the Federal Government. And to pay for all this new spending, well, they simply want to raise taxes, this time by $683 billion, the largest tax increase in American history.

If you want me to bring it home in South Carolina terms so all my folks in South Carolina can understand it, this is a $2,500 tax increase for the average South Carolina home, $2,500.

The Republican substitute achieves a balance by 2012 without raising taxes. Also, this substitute attempts to repeal another looming tax increase by completely repealing the AMT, the alternative minimum tax, by 2013.

Our country's on the verge of a financial crisis, Mr. Chairman. The total unfunded entitlement liability, Medicare and Social Security, this country faces is $53 trillion. Former Comptroller General David Walker said, ''You are not going to tax your way out of this problem. You are not going to grow your way out of this problem. You are not going to do it by constraining spending. You are going to have to do it by a combination of things, and the biggest thing you are going to have to do is entitlement reform, Social Security and Medicare being the greater challenge. And we need to start soon because time's working against us. That $53 trillion number is going up between 2 and $3 trillion a year by doing nothing.''

The Republican substitute reduces the $53 trillion unfunded liability by $11 trillion. It makes an attempt to secure the future existence and benefits of major entitlement programs, especially Medicare and Medicaid, which are currently on an unsustainable path to spending.

Mr. Chairman, therefore, I not only firmly support this Republican substitute but insist on it so we don't raise taxes any higher on the American citizens.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, we have heard about this average tax cut. I just want to show a chart of what they mean when they talk about ''average.''

This is a $20 billion tax cut that's in the Republican package. It's involving personal exemption phaseout and the elimination of ceilings on itemized deductions. This is $20 billion, which is an average $100 for every man, woman, and child. And here's how you distribute the average for this tax cut: if you make over $1 million, you get $17,500. If you make $200,000 to $1 million, you get about $650. If you make $100,000 to $200,000, you get $11 out of this tax cut. And if you make under $100,000, you get on average zero. This is what they call an ''average'' $100-a-person tax cut.

When they talk about the biggest tax cut and all this kind of stuff, let's be clear. What is repealed or what we allow to expire are the kinds of policies that got us into the ditch to begin with. We need to let them expire, get back on the right track, balance the budget, and address our priorities.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, a senior member of the Budget Committee, (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the ranking member for yielding, and I certainly thank him for his leadership and all he does to protect the family budget from the Federal budget.

Mr. Chairman, today the American people are truly presented a tale of two budgets. Look at the Democrat budget: a $683 billion tax increase, the single largest tax increase in American history. And, Mr. Chairman, it's about $3,000 out of every American family paycheck a year. This is written in the law. This isn't something they are planning. This is something written into law. And I hope, Mr. Chairman, that they'll reflect upon how this impacts working families in their district because I can assure you I hear from families in my district.

I heard from the Vance family in Maybank, Texas, in the Fifth Congressional District. They write: ''Dear Jeb, both my wife and I are cancer patients, and I can't for the life of me understand why anyone would think this Nation could survive such a huge tax increase at this time. As it stands right now, I would have to sell my house, lose my small business, and go without health insurance'' to pay the Democrat tax increase. The Republican budget: no tax increases.

Let's look at the spending side. No news here. The largest single budget in American history. More government programs, more government spending, more of the same. The Republican budget actually has spending control, holds discretionary spending to 4.3 percent, and still funds our Nation's priorities.

Let's look at the national debt. What did the Democrats bring us? The single largest 1-year increase in the Federal debt. The Republican budget balances the budget in 2012 without, I repeat, Mr. Chairman, without tax increases.

Let's look at earmarks. The Democrat budget: status quo. They want to continue the earmarks. While they are raising taxes on hardworking American families $3,000 a year, just look at what they did last year.

□ 1615

There was $100,000 for landscaping for the L.A. fashion district; $300,000 to train people to work on Hollywood movie sets; $2 million, $2 million so they could create a monument to one of their Members, all while putting the single largest tax increase on American families. Now let's think about entitlement spending: Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. They're not going to be around for my 6-year-old daughter or my 4-year-old son unless we reform these entitlements.

The Democrat budget? Stone cold silent. What does that mean? Listen to our former Comptroller General: ''The rising cost of government entitlements are a fiscal cancer that threatens catastrophic consequences for our country and could bankrupt America.''

The Republican budget reforms these programs. It is a budget for the next generation. Theirs is a budget for the next election. Two completely different visions, Mr. Chairman. Theirs is a vision of more government, less opportunity, and higher taxes. Ours is about greater economic security and a brighter future for our children. We don't want to be the first generation in America's history to leave the next generation with a lower standard of living. And that's what they do by remaining stone cold silent on the greatest fiscal challenge to our Nation. We can have a brighter future for our children, but we must enact the Republican budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the majority leader of the House, Mr. HOYER, the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I'm always interested to listen to some of the representations made on this floor. I have been here some time, as all of you know.

Ronald Reagan said ''trust but verify.'' For 27 years, all but 8 of those with Republican Presidents, I have heard representations from the floor by Republicans about what their deficits were going to do.

For every one of those 27 years that Republicans were President of the United States, every one without exception, we ran huge deficits. And this year will be no different. The Republicans have had monopoly on policymaking in this town for essentially 7 years. This past year, we had some authority because the American people wanted change. But clearly, the President of the United States would not agree with us, and we had to do what the President would agree to so that, essentially, without restraint, the Republicans have had, for the last 7 years, the authority to do whatever they wanted to do.

The first 8 years I was here, Ronald Reagan was President. He ran $1 trillion in deficits. Then George Bush became President, a little over $1 trillion. This President, a little over $1.6

trillion. President Clinton was President for 8 years, only 8 years that we have had the Presidency, and America ran a net surplus.

So when you hear the protestations of the distinguished ranking member of the Budget Committee and the gentleman who just spoke from Texas, listen to them, but verify. Look at the record of Republican fiscal irresponsibility undiminished in the 27 years I have been here.

Mr. RYAN, for whom I have a great deal of respect, and I have very substantial differences on how you get from here to there, is he correct that we need to look at our entitlement system? He is absolutely correct. As a matter of fact, as he knows, I went to the Senate and testified on behalf of a resolution that does that. There is a resolution here that does that, as well. We have to do that. There is no alternative.

Have they done that over the last 7 years of this Presidency? They did not. Did we do it in 1983 with Ronald Reagan as President, Tip O'Neill as Speaker of the House? We did. And we made Social Security secure for the next 60 years. But when we were running up those deficits that Ronald Reagan said we were not going to run up, the Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid crisis that confronts us was decades away.

Today, the gentleman from Wisconsin is correct. It is years away. However, the solution is not to cut medical services for senior citizens and to cut education for our college students. The solution is not to put the car in reverse. The solution, as Ross Perot said, is to lift up the hood and fix it. And that is what the Spratt budget is doing. The Spratt budget is saying to all the Members of this House and to this Congress, we must act responsibly. Responsibly is not only acting fiscally responsibly, but also investing responsibly in the future of our country.

I would urge my colleagues to reject this tired, tired, tired shibboleth about ''the biggest tax increase in history.'' Frankly, the biggest per capita real tax increase in my tenure was under Bob Dole and Ronald Reagan in 1982. And then, of course, George Bush was defeated, presumably because he tried to help balance the budget. And in fact, George Bush made a significant contribution because it was the George Bush agreement on pay-as-you-go, the 1997 Newt Gingrich-Bill Clinton agreement on pay-as-you-go that got us those 4 years of surplus of which I have spoken.

JOHN SPRATT was involved in the leadership of that effort. Tom Kahn of the committee was involved in that effort. And as a result of that effort, we brought surpluses, 4 years. Surprisingly, one of those years was a real surplus. And when I say ''real surplus,'' notwithstanding the Social Security income that we are counting to get to either balance or surplus which is really not what we should be doing, I agree with that, on either side of the aisle.

But ladies and gentlemen, John Spratt's budget meets the test of verification. It meets the test of reality. It meets the test of saying we need to pay for what we buy and not pass it along to our children and grandchildren. The budget vote is one of the most important that we make. Not because the American people really will look closely at the budget or because they think it has great consequence in their lives. It is very difficult to see the consequence of the budget because the budget then needs to be carried out in appropriations, authorizations, and policy.

But ladies and gentlemen of this House, we know that it speaks to whether or not we have the courage of our appropriations. The gentleman that spoke before me from Texas talked about earmarks. I am always interested to hear Republicans talk about earmarks. They came to Congress and quadrupled, quadrupled, four times, the number of earmarks.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield for a friendly point on that?

Mr. HOYER. I am always pleased to yield to a friendly point. Do I get to make the judgment as to how friendly it is?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. The gentleman is right. Earmarks proliferated under Republican watch. You're right about that. Both parties are guilty. That is why we should have a moratorium and clean the system up.

Mr. HOYER. I am reclaiming my time.

The tears, the crocodile tears that flow from the eyes of the ranking member of the Budget Committee about this awful thing that we called ''congressional investments.'' It is so sad that for 6 years they were unable to discipline themselves. And by the way, last year, they were unable to discipline themselves. And guess what? This year they wanted a moratorium for 6 months.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield on that point? This budget is a 1-year, for-the-rest-of-the-Congress moratorium.

Mr. HOYER. You have gone much longer than your caucus wanted to go. I understand that. But the conference wanted to go for 6 months.

I thought it was such an interesting proposal because it meant ''we will go just long enough until we really do appropriations and when it really means something.'' Too often, ''hypocrisy, thy name is ourselves.'' I say it on both sides of the aisle.

Now, I'm for, as everybody knows, congressional initiatives. But I am for paying for them. When we quadrupled them, we borrowed for them from the Chinese, from the Germans, and from the Saudis. As a matter of fact, this President, as my friend knows, has borrowed more money from foreign governments than all of the other Presidents combined. Trust but verify.

Every year that I have been here, ranking members have risen, one of whom is now the chairman of the OMB, and told me what a bright future it would be if their budgets were adopted. Now, the problem is that sometimes they can't get agreement between Senate Republicans and House Republicans on what that beautiful budget ought to be. We passed a budget last year. We lived within that budget last year. We need to do so this year. And we are trying to pay for things. We had a stimulus we didn't pay for. Some of us were concerned about that, but you can't stimulate and depress at the same time.

So my colleagues in the House, Republicans and Democrats, vote for our children and future generations today. Vote for the John Spratt Democratic budget. Reject this budget that pretends it's going to bring you balance but has never done so once, not once in the 27 years that I have been here. Vote for the Spratt budget. It is good for our country. It is good for our people. It is good for our future.

Let me first thank the chairman of the Budget Committee, JOHN SPRATT of South Carolina, for all of his hard work, patience and intelligence in producing this Democratic budget resolution—which is nothing less than a blueprint of our values and priorities.

Let me also thank my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus and Progressive Caucus for offering their important budget alternatives—alternatives that reflect our shared commitment to the American people and a stronger America.

Now, before I discuss what I believe to be the vastly superior and realistic Democratic budget, let me briefly address the Republican budget substitute that we are now debating.

I both like and respect the gentleman from Wisconsin, the ranking member on the Budget Committee, Mr. RYAN. He is a thoughtful, diligent Member.

And, I believe that were it up to him, he might actually try to implement the provisions in the Republican budget substitute.

But the problem, of course, is that he would be fighting a lonely, losing, untenable battle.

This we know: many, many Republicans would not support the deep, draconian cuts to domestic programs called for in their own budget.

The fact is, this Republican budget only reaches balance in 2012 by slashing funding for mandatory programs by $412 billion.

This Republican budget would cut Medicare and safety-net programs; cut Medicaid, thereby jeopardizing health care for more than 50 million children, parents, seniors and disabled Americans; cut—and possibly eliminate—the recently enacted increase in Pell Grants; and cut funding for military retirement and health care.

Furthermore, the Republican budget implies very deep cuts in discretionary programs, devastating public health, education, safety net and infrastructure programs.

This Republican budget fails to reflect the values and priorities of the American people.

In contrast, the Democratic budget continues to move our Nation in a new direction and to clean up the fiscal train wreck caused by failed Republican economic policies over the last 7 years.

Remember, in just 86 months, Republicans have turned projected budget surpluses into

record deficits—including a projected $386 billion this year and another $340 billion next year—and added more than $3 trillion to the national debt, which today stands at $9 trillion.

Our Democratic budget restores fiscal responsibility, adhering to pay-as-you-go budget rules and bringing the Federal budget back to balance by 2012.

It rejects the drastic funding cuts in the Republican substitute and the President's budget, which includes cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, State and local law enforcement programs, and environmental protection.

It strengthens our economy, providing crucial funding for our innovation agenda, efficient and renewable energy programs, education, and infrastructure.

It provides tax relief for hard-working Americans, including a reconciliation instruction that provides offsets for a new one-year patch of the alternative minimum tax.

And, our Democratic budget makes America safer, providing for a robust defense, boosting homeland security funding, and rejecting the President's cuts to first responder programs.

This is a budget that we can be proud of. And, it stands in stark contrast to the irresponsible fiscal policies of the current administration and former Republican majorities in Congress.

I urge all of my colleagues:

Vote for fiscal responsibility, and a bright future for our children.

Vote for the budget that reflects our values—and meets the needs of the American people.

Vote for this Democratic budget.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield myself 1 minute simply to praise the majority leader before he leaves because he has been a man who has sincerely discussed and talked about the need to reform entitlements most of his career. And we need to talk to each other more often. I want to praise him for his leadership on entitlements.

I also want to say that this budget proposes to borrow more in one year from foreign governments than any has in history. Also, Mr. Chairman, let's take a look at the 2003 taxes.

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend yield on his last point?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. I agree with him, and the reason for that, of course, is while you cut revenues, you didn't cut spending when you were in charge.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Reclaiming my time, my point is the Democrats' budget, the Spratt budget, has the single largest increase in national debt in any given year, which comes from largely foreign governments these days.

My other point was I understand why my friends on the other side of the aisle are so dismissive of these tax cuts in 2003. Only three Democrats who are here today voted for them. All but three of them voted against them. They voted against reducing the marriage tax penalty. They voted against expanding the child tax credit. They voted against lowering tax rates across the board. They voted against lowering dividends and capital gains and repealing the death tax.

I simply would say that, as this chart shows you, even after all of those tax cuts, look what happened. Receipts went up. Four straight years of income tax receipts increased. Do you know why? People went to work. They got jobs. They paid taxes. Economic growth, even at those lower tax rates.

At this time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE).

Mr. HOYER. It is too late to ask you to yield, I take it, on the employment issue.

Mr. PENCE. I thank the ranking member for yielding, and I thank him for his extraordinary leadership on this budget. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of fiscal responsibility, and my conscience therefore demands that I rise in support of the Republican budget.

Now, the American people deserve to know the truth. We have a $9.3 trillion national debt, but that is not the whole story. The American people also deserve to know that we have some $53 trillion in unfunded liability in Social Security and Medicare over the next 75 years. Frankly, if this government were a business back in Indiana, it would have to file bankruptcy.

Republicans are offering an alternative budget to deal with this fiscal crisis at the national level based on spending restraint and entitlement reform. It balances the budget without taxes and without earmarks.

But the answer from the Democrat majority? Get this: The largest budget in American history, $3.1 trillion. The largest 1-year increase in the public debt in American history, some $646 billion. Higher taxes and nothing to reform earmarks or the very entitlement spending that threatens the economic vitality of our children and our grandchildren's future.

□ 1630

In 2006, the American people voted for change in Washington, D.C., but they weren't referring to what would be left in their pockets after the Democrats took control. We must balance the Federal budget with fiscal discipline and reform, not with more spending and more taxes. We must reject the policies of the new liberal Democratic majority in Congress and reject their budget.

I urge my colleagues to vote for fiscal discipline and reform, to end earmarking as usual, and to stand for fundamental entitlement reform in Washington, D.C. Vote for the budget priorities of the Republican minority in Congress. They are, I believe with all my heart, the budget priorities of the overwhelming majority of the American people.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I want to inquire of the time, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. CAPUANO). Both sides currently have 10 minutes each.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

We have heard throughout this debate the charge repeatedly that we are raising taxes by as much as any tax increase since the history of time. The charge won't really bear itself out. But let me just turn to third parties. Don't take it from me, let me turn to third parties who have a tremendous interest in the Federal budget and in the deficit in particular. None is more respected or more truly nonpartisan than the Concord Coalition, and here is what the Concord Coalition says:

''Allowing some of the tax cuts to expire would not be the result of Congress' raising taxes. It would be the result of sunsets that were included when those tax cuts were originally enacted to avoid the level of fiscal scrutiny that PAYGO is designed to ensure.''

Now, I have a chart here which is a replica of our famous eye chart to test your visual acuity. I am not sure whether you can see it, but the bottom line is instructive. We will reach surplus, starting from a CBO baseline, our budget will take us to surplus by the year 2012. That surplus will continue throughout time, 2012, 2013. And if you total that surplus up between 2012 and 2018, the total amount you get is $1.4 trillion.

Out of that $1.4 trillion in surpluses, a lot of money can be derived if we so choose to offset tax cuts. And toward that end, we have pledged ourselves as specifically and explicitly as we possibly can in the budget resolution before you in commitment to the middle-income tax relief. And anyone who has any doubt of this should come and read this paragraph in our budget resolution itself, not in the report, it is in the budget resolution itself, which says the following:

''It is the policy of this resolution to minimize the fiscal burdens on middle-income families and children and grandchildren, to provide immediate relief for tens of millions of middle-income families who would otherwise be subject to the AMT, the alternative minimum tax,'' and, by the way, we provide a 1-year patch. Talk about tax cuts, we have got a tax cut, and it is offset in our bill.

To extend the child tax credit we commit ourselves; to extend the marriage penalty relief, we commit ourselves; to eliminate estate taxes on all but a small fraction of estates, we are committed to that; to extend the research and experimentation tax credit, we are committed to that; to extend the deduction for State and local sales taxes; to extend the deduction for small business expenses; to enact a tax credit for schools.

This resolution assumes that the cost of enacting these policies is offset by reforms within the Internal Revenue Code that promote a fairer distribution of taxes across families and generations and economic efficiency and higher rates of tax compliance. And we

put money in the bill for program integrity, for the IRS to bear down and try to close the tax gap.

When you take what we can reap from doing that, it may not be as great as it would seem since the tax gap is estimated to be $500 billion, when you add to that the $1.4 trillion in surpluses per our projection of our budget, you have a lot to work with, not just for tax relief, but for other things as well. Debt retirement, the retirement of the baby boomers, all of these things will be demanding.

That is why we put this decision off until a later time. It is not pressing now. It doesn't have to be committed to now. The tax cuts don't expire until December 31, 2010. In the interim, nobody's taxes are going up because of what is done here on the House floor today, and nobody's taxes are going down, because it doesn't work that way.

Over time, we think that we have got a partial solution here. If we can simply adhere to the budget that we are proposing in House Concurrent Resolution 312, we believe that we can produce surpluses along this bottom line, a substantial portion of which can be used to offset tax cuts.

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

Mr RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to who has the right to close. There seems to be difficulties about that.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina has the right to close.

Mr RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

You know, our friends on the other side of the aisle may not like and may have problems with our budget, but the one thing they can't say is that we are not doing what we say we are going to do. We have said that we are not going to raise taxes, and it doesn't. We said we will balance the budget in 5 years without raising taxes, and it in fact does that. We have said that entitlements are a big problem and that they will swamp this budget and the next generation with debt if we don't deal with them, and this budget begins to deal with it. They may not like that, but we are doing what we say.

And there is an old saying that says ''do what I say, not what I do.'' That is what somebody who intends to have their actions be different than their words says, ''do what I say, not what I do.''

Let's take a look at this Democratic budget, which I would argue is the ''listen to what I say, don't watch what I do budget.'' We have heard over the last year how PAYGO and all these other things were going to result in and lead towards a balanced budget and that is where they wanted to go. But yet this budget nearly doubles, actually more than doubles, the deficit from the last budget passed under Republican rule.

Our friends on the other side say that they want to eliminate the alternative minimum tax, at least they say for whatever they define as ''middle-class taxpayers.'' But yet in this budget, this budget counts on and continues the revenues from the alternative minimum tax at its current rate or higher for the entire 5 years of the budget.

Our Democratic friends have always talked about how they want a tax cut for the middle class. But yet as has been mentioned, this budget counts on all of the money, all of the tax increases that have been described. It counts on eliminating the marriage penalty credit and the child care credit; it counts on raising the tax rates all the way from the 10 percent rate to 35 percent, raising them all.

They talk about health care, that they want to cover everyone with health care, universal health care and all of that. Is any of that in this budget? No. There are no changes to anything like that in the budget. They were offered the opportunity to put that in the Budget Committee and they didn't do it.

They talk a lot about the death tax, that the death tax is strangling farmers and small businesses. And it is. And what does this budget do? It takes the death tax back up to the rates it was 10 years ago. It increases the death tax over where it is now.

Then there is the big issue of entitlement reform. All of the analyses, liberal, conservative, in the middle, everyone agrees if we don't reform Medicare, Social Security and Medicaid, they will bankrupt this country. What do they do to reform those in the next 5 years in this budget? Nothing. Absolutely nothing.

Yes, my friends, Mr. Chairman, this is the ''listen to what I say, but don't pay attention to what I do'' budget. It is like the Wizard of Oz. Watch the smoke in the front, but don't pay attention to what the man behind the curtain is doing. This budget, if you look at it, is what the man behind the curtain is doing and really wants to do, but it is not what is right or what is good for America or for taxpayers.

Mr SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

May I begin by thanking the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. SPRATT, the chairman of the Budget Committee, for his masterly work in bringing this budget before us. It is fiscally sound. It is a responsible blueprint to build our economy, moving us forward and strengthening our national security. The Democratic budget, which is the budget for our country, puts the future first. It is about future generations, and it moves us to surplus by 2012.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the fiscal soundness of this budget.

While being fiscally sound, the budget is also a plan again to get our country moving. It is a budget for the future by putting family budgets first, helping make affordable everything from energy to groceries to college education, helping families avoid foreclosures, and lowering, lowering, taxes. It provides for us to have middle-income tax cuts. This is about America's families and their economic security.

It invests in the future by investing in renewable energy to make America more energy independent and secure and to create green jobs. It is a blueprint for a green revolution in our country.

It creates a new generation of innovators by investing in math, science, engineering and technology, to keep good-paying jobs here in America. In total, we provide $7.1 billion more than last year for education and job training.

It rebuilds America's crumbling infrastructure, which again is an engine of job creation, and makes health care more affordable for families and veterans. VA health care will receive a $3.6 billion increase to care for the men and women who have defended America.

I read this list of provisions in the bill to show that this budget is really a statement of our values. It shows to the American people that we indeed care about them and the budget that we write is relevant to their lives. These are priorities that leading economic experts have said will put our Nation on solid economic footing.

Our budget is also a plan for a stronger America that begins to restore military readiness and better protect Americans against terrorism. Many of you know that the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee is also the second-highest ranking Democrat on the Armed Services Committee, so he brings to this budget process a full knowledge of our national security needs, a full commitment to our military and their families, and dedication to our veterans which has been unsurpassed.

In this bill in terms of national security, ours is a plan to make Americans safer and stands in stark contrast to the President's priorities in Iraq. That misguided war has badly strained our military, distracted us from the fight against terrorism, and damaged our reputation in the world. In fact, the funds committed to that war, some say $3 trillion, huge amounts of money, not only are an opportunity cost for investments here at home in our own education and reconstruction and military readiness, but the deep debt that we are incurring because of the war in Iraq is damaging to our economy. We cannot continue to borrow to pay for the war in Iraq and not see it have an impact on our economy, and that is in addition to the rising cost of oil prices that are related to the war in Iraq as well.

We begin in our national security to reestablish America's strength by rebuilding our military, investing in equipment and training that our military requires, and making caring for our troops, veterans, and military families a top priority.

Our plan stands in stark contrast to the President's priorities and the Republican budget, which would undermine health care for seniors and working families by cutting Medicare and Medicaid over half a trillion dollars over the next 10 years and charge veterans and military retirees more than $18 billion in new fees over 5 years. Our budget does not do that. The Republican budget puts the burden of additional fees on our veterans.

The Republican budget eliminates essential funding for State and local law enforcement and cuts EPA grants that would help protect our planet and our health.

□ 1645

On inauguration day 2009, President Bush will move out of the White House. But, unfortunately, his fiscal legacy will remain unless we can reverse that.

The Bush administration turned a projected $5.6 trillion surplus, I heard our distinguished majority leader talking about this earlier, into a $3.2 trillion deficit. That is historic, that is a historic fiscal turnaround of epic proportions, nearly a $10 trillion swing in fiscal soundness. The President leaves a record of breathtaking fiscal recklessness.

Budgets are more than just accounting documents. Budgets, our Federal budget, I believe, should be a statement of our national values. What we believe in our Nation should be reflected in the allocation of our resources, in our budget.

With this budget, the New Direction Congress and under the leadership of Chairman SPRATT is saying that we value families and their economic future, we will fight to insure their hard work is rewarded, and that the American Dream is renewed.

With this statement of our values, we are saying that we do value our valiant men and women in uniform. We will insist that they receive the tools and training they need to perform their mission, and that when they return home, they will come to high quality health care.

And we were saying in this statement that we value our children. We will invest in their education, their health care, and their future, and do this without leaving them a legacy of debt.

My colleagues, we must make clear that the American values are the values of this House. We should have a statement of the values of the American people in the budget that we put forth, and we do today, to invest in our children's health and education and strengthening families, to provide for the national security of our country by rebuilding our military and respecting our responsibility to our veterans, by investing in the future and innovation and new energy technologies and the education that goes with it. We must make clear that this is a budget plan for a stronger America, for stronger families, for a stronger economy, and a stronger military.

I urge my colleagues to support with great pride the budget put forth by Mr. SPRATT in the Budget Committee this evening.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I will just take 30 seconds for myself.

I would simply say our budget does not have the veterans fee increases. That is in the President's budget. That is not in our budget.

Also, our budget does not cut Medicare and Medicaid by a half a trillion dollars. Under our budget, Medicare and Medicaid increases every year, one year after the other. We simply think it should not increase as fast as it is because we want to make it more solvent.

Third point, they say this is a new vision budget that they are proposing. All they are really doing is bringing us a CBO baseline and slapping another $280 billion on top of it. That's what their budget is. The problem is that the CBO baseline requires the largest tax increase in history. That's what we don't support.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the new Member from Georgia, Dr. BROUN.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the Speaker is absolutely right, but this is about their values, not America's values. We hear it's about the children. The Democrat Party's budget, the one that they have proposed, is going to bankrupt our children. They are not going to live at a standard of life as we live today because of their budget, if this is put into place.

The Republican budget is about the children, because it will save their future. Our budget is about the children's well-being. The Democratic Party's budget is about their values, bigger government, greater control of people's lives. They want to do that. They want to take money away from hardworking American citizens and build a bigger government, and they want to tax them to death, tax them into bankruptcy.

But our budget doesn't do that. It actually helps to balance the budget. It helps to have a future for our children. That's the difference. Our budget is about the children. It's about families. It's about businesses. It's about having a strong financial future for small business. That's what our budget does. Their budget guarantees a bigger future for government bureaucrats.

I encourage anyone in this House who is interested in, truly, our children and furthering the best interests of America and the middle class to vote for the Republican budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, may I just ask the chairman of the Budget Committee, are you the last person? You are going to close next, no more speakers on your side; is that right?

Mr. SPRATT. I reserve the right to close. I have no further speakers.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. All right. I will address the House from the well for the remainder of my time.

Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time I have left?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, I would like to say thank you to a few people. I would like to take this moment to recognize the hard work of the minority staff of the Budget Committee.

I want to thank Austin Smythe, our new staff director; Chauncey Goss, Pat Knudson, Charlene Crawford, Tim Flynn, John Gray, Jim Herz, Charlotte Ivancic, Angela Kuck, Paul Restuccia, Jon Romito, Stephen Sepp and Clete Willems; and our interns, Sigurd Neubauer, Dustin Antonello, and Ryan Michaels.

I am very fortunate to have very bright, very talented, and very dedicated coworkers on the Budget Committee. I also want to thank the chairman for being a gentleman and for his staff for being professional as well.

I have a problem with the budget the chairman has brought to the floor. We have a different vision. It's good that we have these choices. We owe the American people a choice. We owe them two different visions to choose from in this country.

That's what's good about elections. Lately, the differences have been muddled. I'm glad we are making them more clear. What do we want to do with our budget?

We believe that we should do a few things. We should balance the budget, number one, and we shouldn't raise taxes. We think that it's really tough for people to afford just the cost of living today. You are filling up your gas pump at the highest prices you have ever paid before. You are paying health care costs the highest you have probably ever paid before. Food prices are up $70 a month for the average family these days.

The last thing the American taxpayer needs is a big tax increase, an average of $3,000 per family per year. That's what the Democrat budget has.

Now, the Democrats like to say they have this policy document in their budget. On page 48, it's the policy that we don't want these taxes to go up. Then they say, later on, but we are balancing the budget.

The first 27 pages are ones that matter in this budget, the numbers. They can't have it both ways. They can't look the American people in the eye and say we are balancing the budget and we are not raising taxes, because

the only way they balance the budget, you can bring out all these left-of-center experts that tell you otherwise, but according to the numbers, according to the Congressional Budget Office, the only way they balance the budget is by enacting the largest tax increase in American history.

So the question is, at this time of economic uncertainty, at this time of job loss, at this time where we possibly could go into a recession, at this time of high prices of living, can we afford the Democrats' tax hike? I would like to know. I would like to get e-mails and calls from people to know, can we afford this?

What is our vision? Our vision is to balance the budget without raising taxes. The key thing is we have got to save money. We are not even proposing to cut spending. We are saying instead of spending $15.832 trillion over the next 5 years, let's spend $15.32 trillion over the next 5 years. Instead of growing spending at 5.2 percent, let's grow it at 3.8 percent.

In that, we are saying let's put a down payment for reform on our children and grandchildren so we can make Medicare and Social Security more solvent, so we can say to the seniors of this country we want Social Security and Medicare to last for you and for our kids.

But we also say, this Congress is broken. Most people get that. We don't call earmarks congressional initiatives or investments; it's pork. If we just do away with the pork for 1 year, we can put a down payment on making sure we don't have our taxes increased. For 1 year, we can make sure we don't raise taxes on everybody who has children by $500 per child. We can make sure we are not going to tax people simply because they are married if Congress just says ''no'' for pork for a year.

So what's the question? Do we want pork or paychecks? More money in workers' paychecks or more pork up here in Washington?

I agree that earmarks are necessary and are a function of this branch of government. It's out of control. It's broken. It needs to be fixed.

Let's stop them for a year, fix this problem so that it has the integrity and the faith that the American people deserve. While we are doing that, let's balance the budget without raising taxes. That is what our budget does.

Yet you hear this same old thing in Washington every year. What they always say is, if you are doing anything other than spending as much as they want, you are cutting spending. If you are not throwing all this money at new programs, you are cutting spending, you are hurting the veterans, you are hurting children, you are hurting people, you are doing this, you are doing that. We are simply saying we need to control our spending in this town.

You see, Washington doesn't have a tax revenue problem. Plenty of money is coming in. Washington has a spending problem. We have got to get our handle on that spending.

By controlling that spending, by growing it at a slower pace, by putting a down payment on reform, by making Medicare more solvent, we can do those things while we balance the budget without raising taxes.

That's the choice. We can have their plan with the largest tax increase in history, more and more and more spending, more earmarks, more pork, less money in our paychecks, or we can have our plan: control spending, balance the budget, keep more money in your paychecks.

Because you know what? Paychecks aren't going as far as they used to. They don't cover as much groceries, as many gas tanks. They don't cover as much of health care bills as they used to. We believe it's the people's money; they believe it's Washington's money. That's the basic difference at the end of the day.

We believe people ought to keep more of their own money because it is their money. They believe it's Washington money, and they want more of it.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, for purpose of closing, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, like Mr. RYAN, I want to express my heartfelt gratitude to the staff on both sides: Tom Kahn, Sarah Abernathy, Ellen Balis, Arthur Burris, Linda Bywaters, Barbara Chow, Marsha Douglass, Stephen Elmore, Chuck Fant, Jason Freihage, Jose Guillen, Jennifer Hanson-Kilbride, Dick Magee, Sheila McDowell, Diana Meredith, Gail Millar, Morna Miller, Namrata Mujumdar, Kimberly Overbeek, Kitty Richards, Diane Rogers, Scott Russell, Marcus Stephens, Naomi Stern, Lisa Venus, Greg Waring, Andrea Weathers, and interns Les Braswell and Tina Shah.

We have had a fast track on which to bring this resolution out of committee onto the floor to passage. Without their assistance, long nights, weekends, you name it, we certainly could not have done it. We certainly could not have done it without the presentation we put on the last 2 days. To them, I am deeply indebted for all of their help, both sides of the aisle, my staff in particular, which I think is one of the best committee staffs of any committee on the Hill in either House.

If I had a chart of my choice, I would have a counterpart to Mr. RYAN's chart, which said, can we afford the Democrats' tax? It would say, can our children afford the Republicans' debt tax? Because the legacy of this administration, 8 years, is nearly $5 trillion in additional debt, a phenomenal increase in debt that will have to be borne by our children.

When I say that our first objective in taking on this budget was to move it to balance, that's not some economic goal. That's not some green eyeshade objective. That's because I think we are morally wrong in leaving this mountain of debt to our children and our grandchildren.

□ 1700

If I had a chart, it would say just that, because I would assign the blame, the primary blame, to our Republican colleagues for the last 7 years.

We have brought to this floor a budget resolution, the base bill on which we will vote. After we vote on the Ryan amendment, we will vote on the base bill. I would ask for a vote against the Ryan amendment and for the base bill, H. Con. Res. 312, which is the Democratic-reported budget resolution.

We set as our first objective balancing the budget within a reasonably foreseeable period of time. The day we chose was 2012, and we hit that day. In fact, by our calculations, using CBO numbers, we will have a surplus that year under certain assumptions of $178 billion. That surplus will grow as time moves on; and by the year 2018, we will have accumulated $1.4 billion in surpluses. Now, I know they will be dissipated and used for other purposes, but I am suggesting here and have been suggesting that is one of the ways that we will pay for the tax cuts, particularly the middle-income tax cuts to which we have explicitly committed ourselves. That is one way we will make certain that they are cared for and extended.

Secondly, even though we are committed to balancing the budget, we are also morally committed to doing other things that shouldn't be held up or put aside while we try to bring our books in order, one of which is the education of our children. The President's budget basically flat funds education for the next 5 years.

I am proud to say that our budget provides $7.3 billion, $7.1 billion more than the President requested in his budget for the education of our children.

And watch out for education when they begin to, if you adopt the Ryan resolution, when they begin to distribute these undistributed, unallocated cuts, because education is right there in the bore sights.

Secondly, veterans health care. Of all of the promises government makes, the promises we make to our veterans ought to be upheld. And right now we have an increasing caseload. Therefore, we are proposing $3.6 billion over and above current services in order to pay for the additional case loads.

CHIP, children's health insurance. I am proud to claim a little paternity there. I was involved in 1997 when we created the program in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. Now we are saying that we can balance our budget and still balance our priorities by seeing that our children, all of our children who don't have health insurance, can get health insurance. We provide for that. We provide for that in this budget resolution.

Finally, we provide for innovation, competitiveness, energy, research, things that will keep our economy on a competitive edge. For all of these reasons, we think we have brought to the

floor a good budget resolution which is worthy of the support of not just the Democrats on this side, but Republicans as well. It moves us toward balance, and it has balanced priorities. It is good for America and good for our economy.

I, therefore, request a vote in favor of the Spratt resolution, H. Con. Res. 312, which is the base bill and against the Ryan resolution which, if it were adopted, and I don't think it will be, but were it to be adopted, it would displace our bill. Vote for the base bill, H. Con. Res. 312, and vote to do these things that are so important to our economy, our country, our families, and our children. This is a good bill and I commend it to you for your support today.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 157, noes 263, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 140]

AYES—157

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Ehlers
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reynolds
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Upton
Walberg
Wamp
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Young (FL)

NOES—263

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fossella
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Heller
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—15

Bordallo
Boustany
Fortuño
Hooley
Hunter
LaHood
Oberstar
Rangel
Renzi
Rush
Tancredo
Waters
Weller
Woolsey
Young (AK)

□ 1730

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Messrs. GUTIERREZ, SAXTON, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Messrs. HOYER, COHEN, FRELINGHUYSEN, FATTAH, TURNER and Mrs. SCHMIDT changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. FLAKE, EHLERS, FRANKS of Arizona, SHULER and MCINTYRE changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota: Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 312 and congratulate Chairman SPRATT for putting forward a budget that reflects the values of American families.

Again this year, President Bush proposed a reckless, fiscally irresponsible budget that would have neglected key investments and made significant cuts to critical services while driving up an already unsustainable deficit. Democrats reject Republican policies that have led to record debt and a weakened economy and today offer a budget that invests in families, makes America safer, strengthens our economy and improves our global competitiveness.

This budget proposal recognizes that smart investments in our country today will result in significant savings in the long run. H. Con. Res. 312 invests in renewable energy and "green collar jobs". Record gas prices are straining family, business and government budgets. This investment in the Midwest will reduce our dependence on oil, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and create new jobs in our communities.

While the President proposed to cut education, the Democrats budget provides for a significant investment in our children by including $7.1 billion above the President's request. This funding will provide needed increases for No Child Left Behind, Head Start and Special Education. The underfunding of these programs under Republican leadership has led to reduced opportunities for our students and increased taxes for homeowners. The Democratic budget makes an important step in living up to the federal government's promises on education funding. It also provides funding for the America COMPETES Act, allowing for the education of the teachers, scientists, engineers and mathematicians we need to remain competitive in the global economy.

The Democratic budget invests in health care. It provides health care for all children and makes significant investments in health research and public health. Importantly, this budget rejects the draconian cuts to Medicare and Medicaid proposed by the President. Democrats recognize that access to health care includes access to quality health care providers.

In contrast to claims made by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, this budget does not raise taxes on the middle class families. It fact, it includes a 1-year fix for the Alternative Minimum Tax and extends middle class tax cuts including the child tax

credit, the marriage penalty relief, and the deduction for state and local sales taxes. It also calls for immediate action on the foreclosure crisis and provides for an affordable housing trust fund to help families find safe, stable housing and to begin to create wealth.

Democrats support investing in our communities. This budget recognizes the declining status of our nation's infrastructure and makes it a priority to invest in the necessary rebuild and expansion. In Minnesota, because of the tragic bridge collapse last August, we are all too aware of the need for upgrade and repair to our infrastructure. In addition, families are spending too much time and too much money commuting. This budget will allow for investment in transportation—both to increase options and to improve safety.

I also commend the Congressional Black Caucus and the Progressive Caucus for putting forward alternative budget proposals. I strongly support the emphasis on diplomacy and investments in global health proposed in these amendments.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic budget reflects America's priorities and will put this country back on track by reducing our debt and investing in our future. I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 312.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Chairman, this budget is a commitment to restoring fiscal responsibility while providing for programs that boost economic growth, create new jobs, and provide tax relief to millions of middle-class families.

When the President presented the last budget proposal of his administration last month, he cemented his legacy of fiscal irresponsibility. Since January 2001, a $5.6 trillion 10-year surplus has been converted into record deficits and mounting debt.

The budget, which will outline Congressional spending for the next fiscal year, rejects the President's original proposal of cutting Medicare/Medicaid, key education programs, and the COPS law enforcement agency grant programs.

In contrast to the Administration's budget proposal, this budget passed by the House reaches a balance by FY 2012. It ensures that, under the adopted pay-as-you-go principles, any new spending is offset and does not add to the deficit.

With over 20 million middle-class American families facing the burden of paying the Alternative Minimum Tax, AMT, we have included fiscally responsible legislation that will provide a one-year 'patch' and provide AMT relief to those families.

This is a budget that defends our Nation and provides for our Nation's veterans and wounded heroes. It increases veterans funding for FY 2009 by $3.6 billion above current levels and $38 billion over the next 5 years. Our budget also allows the Department of Veterans Affairs to treat 5.8 million patients in 2009 and rejects the $2.3 billion in health care fee increases imposed by the President's budget proposal.

The budget also prioritizes resources to restore military readiness that has been worn down by repeated deployments and more than 6 years of war. As chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee, I am fully aware of the need to restore the strength of our military and protect our country from future attacks.

Despite the President's insistence on not expanding children's health insurance program, CHIP, this budget includes a reserve fund to provide up to $50 billion for CHIP. The President's budget proposal also cuts Medicaid by $94 billion over 10 years and a whopping $479 billion from Medicare over the same period. That is unacceptable and Congress rejects those cuts.

I urge all my colleagues to support this fiscally responsible budget that properly funds our nation's priorities.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I support this budget resolution, which will lay the foundation for the decisions about spending and taxes that we must make this year.

Our first responsibility as Members of Congress is to provide for our national defense and homeland security, in order to safeguard the lives and liberties of the American people.

For that reason, and as a Member of the Armed Services Committee, I am glad to be able to say that this budget meets that responsibility by providing $537.8 billion for national defense, which is in line not only with the amounts requested but also the recommendation of our committee.

I also support the budget because it puts the needed priority on moving to restore the capabilities so seriously eroded by repeated deployments and more than 6 years of war. And, even more important, it includes instructions to properly care for the men and women in uniform by rejecting TRICARE fee increases, providing funding to continue addressing problems such as those at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, and calling for enhanced pay and benefits to improve the quality of life of our troops and their families. It also calls for allocating $4.9 billion more than in the current fiscal year for veterans' health care.

But that is not the end of our responsibility. We also need to act responsibly to change the policies that over the last seven years have brought us deeper budget deficits and massive increases in the national debt even as we make needed investments in our society here at home.

This budget meets that responsibility as well. It lays out a path that can bring the budget back to balance. It includes an essential aspect of fiscal responsibility by following the "pay-as-you-go" approach now embodied in our House rules, requiring that any entitlement spending increases or revenue reductions be offset, so that the bottom line of the budget is not worsened.

At the same time it allows for funding priority investments in education, children's health care, veterans' health care, and innovation but also accommodating tax relief for middle-income Americans. It rejects President Bush's proposed cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, and assistance to local law-enforcement agencies while accommodating $50 billion over 5 years for the State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP). It also allows for substantially greater appropriations that the president has requested for education, and energy efficiency and renewable energy programs.

And it includes a deficit-neutral reserve fund to accommodate middle-income tax cuts, such as extension of the child tax credit, marriage penalty relief, extension of the 10 percent individual income tax bracket, elimination of most estate taxes, extension of the research and experimentation tax credit, extension of the deduction for state and local sales taxes, and a tax credit for school construction bonds. In addition, through a reconciliation instruction to the Ways and Means Committee, it allows for action to protect more than 20 million middle-income taxpayers from exposure to the alernative minimum tax, which was never intended to apply to them.

As a member of the Committee on Science and Technology, I applaud the fact that the budget will allow an additional $1.98 billion over the amounts appropriated for this fiscal year for science, space, and technology.

That amount will fully accommodate the commitments made in the America COMPETES Act—a measure I was proud to cosponsor and champion in the conference committee—for the National Science Foundation and the Department of Energy Office of Science.

Further, the budget includes increased budget authority for energy technology research programs such as those at the Advanced Research Projects Agency for Energy, ARPA–E and the National Institute of Standards and Technology, which include help for small manufacturers and technology companies through the Manufacturing Extension Partnership and Technology Innovation Program.

These programs have great potential to increase our economic growth and to foster innovation. As the global marketplace becomes more competitive, it is essential that we compete on the basis of improved skills and greater productivity, rather than follow the destructive path of trying to compete solely on cost with the half of the world's workers who earn less than $2 a day.

That is the purpose of the America COMPETES Act, and why it is so important that we provide adequate funding for it. And it also the point of the resolution's provision saying the House should provide sufficient funding so that our Nation may continue to be the world leader in education, innovation, and economic growth and so we can stay on a path toward doubling funding for the National Science Foundation, basic research in the physical sciences, and collaborative research partnerships, and toward achieving energy independence through the development of clean and sustainable alternative energy technologies.

In addition, as a member of the Natural Resources, and as a westerner, I also support the budget because it will allow for an increase of more than $6 billion in the amounts available for protection of our water and air and the sound management of our public lands and other natural resources.

Mr. Chairman, it is said that to govern is to choose—and today's debate demonstrates the truth of that adage because the House must choose among four competing proposals for how the budget should be shaped in the years ahead.

Before deciding to support the resolution approved by the Budget Committee, I carefully reviewed the three competing alternatives, and in each I found some things that I think have considerable merit. For example, I liked the additional investments in education, job training, and employment included in the alternative advanced by the Congressional Black Caucus, as well as the provisions regarding unemployment insurance, food stamps, and housing assistance highlighted in the Progressive Caucus alternative. And the Republican alternative includes procedures for a legislative line-item veto similar to legislation (H.R.

595) I have introduced under the name of the Stimulating Leadership in Limiting Expenditures (or ''SLICE'') Act and would place a moratorium on spending earmarks pending review of the earmarking process by a bipartisan panel—two ideas that I think could result in worthwhile reforms.

But, on balance, I have concluded that the version now before us, developed in the Budget Committee under the able leadership of its distinguished Chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr SPRATT, is the best choice. It is a sound proposal that will enable our government to meet its responsibilities, at home and abroad, in a way that is fiscally sound and respectful of the need to provide tax relief for middle-income Americans and promoting a sound economy.

I will vote for it and I urge its approval by the House.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of North Carolina's children and our working families, I rise in support of this budget resolution and I congratulate you, Chairman JOHN SPRATT for your visionary leadership in crafting this important document.

With this budget resolution, the Democratic majority will succeed where our Republican predecessors failed. To budget is to govern, and this resolution will produce a balanced budget with balanced priorities.

As the only former State schools chief serving in Congress, I am particularly pleased about this measure's provisions for education and innovation. Specifically, rather than continue the Republicans' record of passing a crushing debt burden on to future generations, the Spratt resolution contains tough budget discipline for a new direction for the Federal budget. The Spratt resolution rejects the President's proposed education cuts and instead provides greater investment in our Nation's schools, including the school construction bonds Chairman RANGEL and I have been working on for nearly a decade and increased Impact Aid for federally impacted local public schools. It provides $50 billion for children's health insurance. And it protects millions of middle income families from the onslaught of the alternative minimum tax.

As a Member of the Committee on Homeland Security, I am pleased that after 7 years of this Administration failing to address fully some of our most pressing security needs, the Chairman's mark provides the necessary resources to meet critical threats to the Nation. Specifically, the Chairman's mark places high priority on rejecting the President's cuts to first responder support. This includes the State Homeland Security Grant Program through which States may direct grants to local law enforcement, firefighters, emergency medical services, and other preparedness officials to address a wide array of public safety needs. The Administration proposed cutting this proven security initiative by $705 million, and the Spratt budget rejects that misguided cut. The Chairman's mark also rejects these other mistaken budget cuts: $463 million from firefighter assistance grants that give local firefighters the tools they need to do their dangerous jobs protecting the public; $173 million from Byrne Justice Assistance Grants flexible funding for local criminal justice efforts; $599 million from the Community Congress Oriented Policing Services COPS funds that help local communities hire, train and retain police officers and to improve law enforcement technology. I strongly believe the homeland security starts with hometown security, and I strongly support the Chairman's mark as it provides essential services for local first responders. Unbelievably, for the sixth year in a row, the President's budget proposes to eliminate the State Criminal Alien Assistance fund of $417 million which helps States cope with the costs of incarcerating undocumented aliens who commit crimes. I am pleased the Chairman's mark rejects this misguided budget cut.

I was disappointed to see the President's proposed budget contains the failed Social Security privatization plan, and the leading Republican Presidential candidate just this week embraced this risky plan. When the President first proposed privatizing Social Security, I toured the country to oppose this risky gamble with Social Security. The American people have spoken loud and clear that they want their Social Security benefits to be an ironclad guarantee instead of a risky gamble like the Republicans continue to propose. The Bush/McCain plan is a bad idea. I am pleased the Chairman's mark rejects this risky Social Security privatization scheme.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I have become increasingly concerned about the legacy of debt this Administration is passing on to future generations. The $5.6 trillion projected surplus that the Administration inherited when it took office has been transformed into a $3.2 trillion deficit. More than 80 cents of every dollar of new debt since 2001 is owed to foreign investors, including foreign governments. The high level of indebtedness to foreign investors heightens the American economy's exposure to potential instability or even from financial threat from unfriendly foreign governments, and places additional burdens on our children and grandchildren. It is a massively irresponsibly tax on posterity.

There are many reasons to support this resolution, but in my brief allotment of time, I want to say that I support this resolution on behalf of my grandchildren and all the children of this country and their families who deserve a budget that puts their needs first. That's the definition of a budget that's truly balanced.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 312, the Budget Resolution for fiscal year 2009. This proposal fulfills an important commitment that we have made to the American people by investing in fiscally responsible tax relief to millions of households and in programs that strengthen the economy, make America safer, and help families struggling to make ends meet in an economic downturn.

On February 6, I expressed my strong concerns over the misguided budget request that the President transmitted to Congress. I am very pleased to see that the budget before us today restores many of the important programs that the President proposed to cut, while achieving balance by 2012. It is more vital than ever that we remain responsive to the needs of the American people, while maintaining strong fiscal stewardship to ensure our financial obligations are not passed along to our children and grandchildren.

Any budgetary blueprint that we expect to bolster the economy must also include an investment in education and job training programs that will promote new employment and ensure our workforce can adapt to the jobs of the future. Unfortunately, those programs were not priorities for this Administration. Under the President's proposal, Rhode Island would see $1.5 million less for after-school programs and a cut of almost $6 million for career and technical education. In contrast, the Democratic budget resolution would provide $7.1 billion more than the President for vital education, job training, and social services programs nationwide in 2009.

I am pleased that this resolution addresses the President's failure to make higher education affordable for students with economic challenges, especially in Rhode Island, where college tuition has risen 45 percent in 4 years. This measure also includes crucial funding for the Democratic innovation agenda and the America COMPETES Act, which will enhance our edge in math and science education and research. To maintain our economic advantage in the coming years, our Nation must invest more in science, technology, engineering and mathematics, STEM, education.

Also critical to America's economic prosperity is a budget that promotes fiscally responsible tax relief to millions of families struggling to make ends meet. In particular, this measure includes a 1-year patch to keep millions of hard-working, middle-class Americans outside the ever-widening net of the alternative minimum tax, AMT, and it is fully offset. In addition, the Democratic budget will extend the R&D tax credit, which will spur economic growth, create new jobs, and help struggling small businesses regain their competitive edge.

Community development and social services programs will play an important role for businesses and families as we attempt to reclaim our economic prosperity, and I am proud to support a budget that funds these initiatives. This budget restores community and regional development programs, like the Community Development Block Grant, CDBG, program, which provides vital funding for economic and community development in both urban and rural areas nationwide. The House Democratic budget resolution also reverses cuts to the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, LIHEAP, and the Weatherization Assistance Program, which helps people actually reduce their energy consumption. These programs are vital to places like Rhode Island where families are struggling with astronomical heating costs.

This budget resolution also includes $1.2 billion more than the President's budget for energy programs. As families face unprecedented costs to heat their homes and put gas in their cars, it is imperative that we fund efficient and renewable energy programs. H. Con. Res. 312 does this by encouraging the production of renewable energy alternatives, increasing energy efficiency, investing in new energy and vehicle technologies, and training workers for ''green collar'' jobs. This resolution also encourages mass transit by increasing funding for Amtrak. I am proud that Rhode Island has already started many of these initiatives, but Democrats recognize that we need to support them on a broad, nationwide basis.

Equally important during this challenging economic time is the continued need for strong health care funding. The Democratic budget measure rejects the President's proposed 10-year cut of over $500 billion to both Medicare and Medicaid, two vital safety net programs serving our Nation's elderly, low-income, and disabled citizens. It also provides

an increase over the President's proposed discretionary health care budget to fund programs that emphasize support for disease-prevention, food safety, and access to quality health care for underserved populations. I am also very pleased to see that this budget will accommodate up to a $50 billion increase to expand children's health insurance to cover millions of uninsured children.

Health care also remains the highest priority for our Nation's veterans and the brave men and women currently serving in our Armed Forces. This resolution appropriately addresses veterans' needs by rejecting the President's proposed new fees and increasing veterans funding by $3.6 billion relative to the amount needed to keep pace with inflation. This will provide increased resources for the VA to treat 5.8 million patients in 2009, including 333,275 Iraq and Afghanistan war veterans. We cannot lose sight of the fact that the VA will play a larger role in the coming years as more servicemembers return from ongoing conflicts.

As the Chairman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Emerging Threats, Cybersecurity, Science and Technology, I am proud to support a budget that properly invests in our homeland security. Unlike the President's budget, this resolution provides robust funding for programs important to State and local law enforcement in Rhode Island, including the State Homeland Security Grant Program, which awarded $34.8 million to Rhode Island from 2004 to 2007, and the Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program, LETPP, from which Rhode Island received $11.5 million from 2004 to 2006. By passing the Democratic budget, we can give local law enforcement officials in Rhode Island the tools they need to continue to keep our citizens safe.

The Democratic budget resolution also makes America safer by investing in our Nation's transportation systems, including highways and waterways, providing sufficient funding as well as a reserve fund to facilitate new infrastructure initiatives. This budget also meets the President's funding level for the Department of Defense, but shifts resources to high priorities such as nuclear nonproliferation programs, which was a recommendation of the 9/11 Commission. Finally, this resolution responds to the current hardships faced by our servicemembers by funding quality of life improvements for the troops as well as their families.

In this time of uncertainty, the American people are relying on us as decisionmakers to put forth a plan that will restore our economic prosperity, strengthen our national security, provide relief where it is needed, and promote fiscal discipline. Today, I am pleased to rise in support of a Democratic proposal that will accomplish each one of these goals. This budget resolution represents a new roadmap toward achieving the true priorities of Americans, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting yes on this measure.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, let me take this means to congratulate Budget Committee Chairman JOHN SPRATT, also a senior and well-respected member of the House Armed Services Committee, for crafting a strong, balanced budget for fiscal year 2009. I am pleased to support this bill that would provide for a strong national defense, would put our country on a path to budget surpluses in 2012, would promote tax relief for middle-class American families, and would invest in programs that have been priorities for those living in rural Missouri.

On defense, the House Budget Resolution would prioritize resources to restore military readiness that has been worn down by repeated deployments and more than 6 years of war. The resolution would reject TRICARE fee increases, provide funding to continue addressing problems such as those identified at Walter Reed Army Medical Center, and would call for enhanced pay and benefits to improve the quality of life of our troops and their families.

On rural affairs, the House Budget Resolution would bolster commodity support, agricultural research, and animal and plant inspection programs. It would assume sufficient resources for the Farm Bill, which provides Missouri farmers with a secure economic safety. It would also set aside critical funds for rural development, for food and nutrition programs, and for conservation.

Also important to Fourth District residents are commitments in the House Budget Resolution to infrastructure improvements, to local police and firefighters, to the health care needs of Missouri's senior citizens and low-income children, to education, and to our cherished veterans.

The resolution would provide immediate and long-term relief from the alternative minimum tax and provide for additional middle-class tax relief and enhanced economic equity through tax policies. And, importantly, it would adhere to the "pay-as-you-go" rule adopted by House Democrats early in 2007. That rule requires new entitlement spending or revenue reductions to be offset so the budget remains in balance.

On behalf of the rural Missourians I am privileged to represent, I am pleased to support Chairman SPRATT's work product.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER) having assumed the chair, Mr. CAPUANO, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 312) revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2010 through 2013, pursuant to House Resolution 1036, he reported the concurrent resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the concurrent resolution.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the concurrent resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules on House Resolution 991.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 212, nays 207, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

YEAS—212

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—207

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake

Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Sanchez, Loretta
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Boustany
Hooley
Hunter
LaHood
Oberstar
Rangel
Renzi
Rush
Tancredo
Weller
Woolsey
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1750

Mr. SHULER changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

RECOGNIZING THE EXCEPTIONAL SACRIFICE OF THE 69TH INFANTRY REGIMENT, KNOWN AS THE FIGHTING 69TH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 991, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 991.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 0, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 142]

YEAS—406

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—24

Berman
Boustany
Cramer
Gohmert
Gutierrez
Hooley
Hunter
King (IA)
LaHood
Lewis (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
Meeks (NY)
Oberstar
Rangel
Renzi
Rush
Tancredo
Tierney
Waters
Weller
Woolsey
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are less than 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1759

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I was detained in the elevator while attempting to reach the House floor to cast my vote on roll-call 142 earlier this evening. Had I been able to reach the floor before the vote was closed, I would have voted ''yea.''

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 5464

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as an original cosponsor of H.R. 5464, the A Child is Missing Alert and Recovery Center Act.

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

There was no objection.

PENSION PROTECTION TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2008

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to engross the bill, H.R. 3361, in the form of the bill that I have placed at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3361

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES TO ACTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This Act may be cited as the ''Pension Protection Technical Corrections Act of 2008''.

(b) REFERENCES TO ACTS.—For purposes of this Act—

(1) AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.—The term ''1986 Code'' means the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(2) AMENDMENT OF ERISA.—The term ''ERISA'' means the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974.

(3) 2006 ACT.—The term ''2006 Act'' means the Pension Protection Act of 2006.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE I.

(a) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTIONS 101 AND 111.—

(1) AMENDMENTS TO ERISA.—

(A) Clause (i) of section 302(c)(1)(A) of ERISA is amended by striking ''the plan is'' and inserting ''the plan are''.

(B) Section 302(c)(7) of ERISA is amended by inserting ''which reduces the accrued benefit of any participant'' after ''subsection (d)(2)'' in subparagraph (A).

(C) Section 302(d)(1) of ERISA is amended by striking '', the valuation date,''.

(2) AMENDMENTS TO 1986 CODE.—

(A) Clause (i) of section 412(c)(1)(A) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking ''the plan is'' and inserting ''the plan are''.

(B) Section 412(c)(7) of the 1986 Code is amended by inserting ''which reduces the accrued benefit of any participant'' after ''subsection (d)(2)'' in subparagraph (A).

(C) Section 412(d)(1) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking '', the valuation date,''.

(b) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTIONS 102 AND 112.—

(1) AMENDMENTS TO ERISA.—

(A) Section 303(b) of ERISA is amended to read as follows:

''(b) TARGET NORMAL COST.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (i)(2) with respect to plans in at-risk status, the term 'target normal cost' means, for any plan year, the excess of—

''(A) the sum of—

''(i) the present value of all benefits which are expected to accrue or to be earned under the plan during the plan year, plus

''(ii) the amount of plan-related expenses expected to be paid from plan assets during the plan year, over

''(B) the amount of mandatory employee contributions expected to be made during the plan year.

''(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR INCREASE IN COMPENSATION.—For purposes of this subsection, if any benefit attributable to services performed in a preceding plan year is increased by reason of any increase in compensation during the current plan year, the increase in such benefit shall be treated as having accrued during the current plan year.''.

(B) Section 303(c)(5)(B)(iii) of ERISA is amended by inserting ''beginning'' before ''after 2008''.

(C) Section 303(c)(5)(B)(iv)(II) of ERISA is amended by inserting ''for such year'' after ''beginning in 2007)''.

(D) Section 303(f)(4)(A) of ERISA is amended by striking ''paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''paragraph (3)''.

(E) Section 303(h)(2)(F) of ERISA is amended—

(i) by striking ''section 205(g)(3)(B)(iii)(I)) for such month'' and inserting ''section 205(g)(3)(B)(iii)(I) for such month)'', and

(ii) by striking ''subparagraph (B)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (C)''.

(F) Section 303(i) of ERISA is amended—

(i) in paragraph (2)—

(I) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

''(A) the excess of—

''(i) the sum of—

''(I) the present value of all benefits which are expected to accrue or to be earned under the plan during the plan year, determined using the additional actuarial assumptions described in paragraph (1)(B), plus

''(II) the amount of plan-related expenses expected to be paid from plan assets during the plan year, over

''(ii) the amount of mandatory employee contributions expected to be made during the plan year, plus'', and

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''the target normal cost (determined without regard to this paragraph) of the plan for the plan year'' and inserting ''the amount determined under subsection (b)(1)(A)(i) with respect to the plan for the plan year'', and

(ii) by striking ''subparagraph (A)(ii)'' in the last sentence of paragraph (4)(B) and inserting ''subparagraph (A)''.

(G) Section 303(j)(3) of ERISA—

(i) is amended by adding at the end of subparagraph (A) the following new sentence: ''In the case of plan years beginning in 2008, the funding shortfall for the preceding plan year may be determined using such methods of estimation as the Secretary of the Treasury may provide.'',

(ii) by adding at the end of subparagraph (E) the following new clause:

''(iii) PLAN WITH ALTERNATE VALUATION DATE.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe regulations for the application of this paragraph in the case of a plan which has a valuation date other than the first day of the plan year.'', and

(iii) by striking ''AND SHORT YEARS'' in the heading of subparagraph (E) and inserting '', SHORT YEARS, AND YEARS WITH ALTERNATE VALUATION DATE''.

(H) Section 303(k)(6)(B) of ERISA is amended by striking '', except'' and all that follows and inserting a period.

(2) AMENDMENTS TO 1986 CODE.—

(A) Section 430(b) of the 1986 Code is amended to read as follows:

''(b) TARGET NORMAL COST.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (i)(2) with respect to plans in at-risk status, the term 'target normal cost' means, for any plan year, the excess of—

''(A) the sum of—

''(i) the present value of all benefits which are expected to accrue or to be earned under the plan during the plan year, plus

''(ii) the amount of plan-related expenses expected to be paid from plan assets during the plan year, over

''(B) the amount of mandatory employee contributions expected to be made during the plan year.

''(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR INCREASE IN COMPENSATION.—For purposes of this subsection, if any benefit attributable to services performed in a preceding plan year is increased by reason of any increase in compensation during the current plan year, the increase in such benefit shall be treated as having accrued during the current plan year.''.

(B) Section 430(c)(5)(B)(iii) of the 1986 Code is amended by inserting ''beginning'' before ''after 2008''.

(C) Section 430(c)(5)(B)(iv)(II) of the 1986 Code is amended by inserting ''for such year'' after ''beginning in 2007)''.

(D) Section 430(f) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''as of the first day of the plan year'' the second place it appears in the first sentence of paragraph (3)(A),

(ii) by striking ''paragraph (2)'' in paragraph (4)(A) and inserting ''paragraph (3)'',

(iii) by striking ''paragraph (1), (2), or (4) of section 206(g)'' in paragraph (6)(B)(iii) and inserting ''subsection (b), (c), or (e) of section 436'',

(iv) by striking ''the sum of'' in paragraph (6)(C), and

(v) by striking ''of the Treasury'' in paragraph (8).

(E) Section 430(h)(2) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) by inserting ''and target normal cost'' after ''funding target'' in subparagraph (B),

(ii) by striking ''liabilities'' and inserting ''benefits'' in subparagraph (B),

(iii) by striking ''section 417(e)(3)(D)(i)) for such month'' in subparagraph (F) and inserting ''section 417(e)(3)(D)(i) for such month)'', and

(iv) by striking ''subparagraph (B)'' in subparagraph (F) and inserting ''subparagraph (C)''.

(F) Section 430(i) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) in paragraph (2)—

(I) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

''(A) the excess of—

''(i) the sum of—

''(I) the present value of all benefits which are expected to accrue or to be earned under the plan during the plan year, determined using the additional actuarial assumptions described in paragraph (1)(B), plus

''(II) the amount of plan-related expenses expected to be paid from plan assets during the plan year, over

''(ii) the amount of mandatory employee contributions expected to be made during the plan year, plus'', and

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''the target normal cost (determined without regard to this paragraph) of the plan for the plan year'' and inserting ''the amount determined under subsection (b)(1)(A)(i) with respect to the plan for the plan year'', and

(ii) by striking ''subparagraph (A)(ii)'' in the last sentence of paragraph (4)(B) and inserting ''subparagraph (A)''.

(G) Section 430(j)(3) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) by adding at the end of subparagraph (A) the following new sentence: ''In the case of plan years beginning in 2008, the funding shortfall for the preceding plan year may be determined using such methods of estimation as the Secretary may provide.'',

(ii) by striking ''section 302(c)'' in subparagraph (D)(ii)(II) and inserting ''section 412(c)'',

(iii) by adding at the end of subparagraph (E) the following new clause:

''(iii) PLAN WITH ALTERNATE VALUATION DATE.—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations for the application of this paragraph in the case of a plan which has a valuation date other than the first day of the plan year.'', and

(iv) by striking ''AND SHORT YEARS'' in the heading of subparagraph (E) and inserting '', SHORT YEARS, AND YEARS WITH ALTERNATE VALUATION DATE''.

(H) Section 430(k) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) by inserting ''(as provided under paragraph (2))'' after ''applies'' in paragraph (1), and

(ii) by striking '', except'' and all that follows in paragraph (6)(B) and inserting a period.

(c) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTIONS 103 AND 113.—

(1) AMENDMENTS TO ERISA.—

(A) Section 101(j) of ERISA is amended—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking ''section 206(g)(4)(B)'' and inserting ''section 206(g)(4)(A)''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following: ''The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary, shall have the authority to prescribe rules applicable to the notices required under this subsection.''.

(B) Section 206(g)(1)(B)(ii) of ERISA is amended by striking ''a funding'' and inserting ''an adjusted funding''.

(C) The heading for section 206(g)(1)(C) of ERISA is amended by inserting ''BENEFIT'' after ''EVENT''.

(D) Section 206(g)(3)(E) of ERISA is amended by adding at the end the following new flush sentence:

''Such term shall not include the payment of a benefit which under section 203(e) may be immediately distributed without the consent of the participant.''.

(E) Section 206(g)(5)(A)(iv) of ERISA is amended by inserting ''adjusted'' before ''funding''.

(F) Section 206(g)(9)(C) of ERISA is amended—

(i) by striking ''without regard to this subparagraph and'' in clause (i), and

(ii) in clause (iii)—

(I) by striking ''without regard to this subparagraph'' and inserting ''without regard to the reduction in the value of assets under section 303(f)(4)'', and

(II) by inserting ''beginning'' before ''after'' each place it appears.

(G) Section 206(g) of ERISA is amended by redesignating paragraph (10) as paragraph (11) and by inserting after paragraph (9) the following new paragraph:

''(10) SECRETARIAL AUTHORITY FOR PLANS WITH ALTERNATE VALUATION DATE.—In the case of a plan which has designated a valuation date other than the first day of the plan year, the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe rules for the application of this subsection which are necessary to reflect the alternate valuation date.''.

(H) Section 502(c)(4) of ERISA is amended by striking ''by any person'' and all that follows through the period and inserting ''by any person of subsection (j), (k), or (l) of section 101 or section 514(e)(3).''.

(2) AMENDMENTS TO 1986 CODE.—

(A) Section 436(b)(2) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''section 303'' and inserting ''section 430'' in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), and

(ii) by striking ''a funding'' and inserting ''an adjusted funding'' in subparagraph (B).

(B) Section 436(b)(3) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) by inserting ''BENEFIT'' after ''EVENT'' in the heading, and

(ii) by striking ''any event'' in subparagraph (B) and inserting ''an event''.

(C) Section 436(d)(5) of the 1986 Code is amended by adding at the end the following new flush sentence:

''Such term shall not include the payment of a benefit which under section 411(a)(11) may be immediately distributed without the consent of the participant.''.

(D) Section 436(f) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) by inserting ''adjusted'' before ''funding'' in paragraph (1)(D), and

(ii) by striking ''prefunding balance under section 430(f) or funding standard carryover balance'' in paragraph (2) and inserting ''prefunding balance or funding standard carryover balance under section 430(f)''.

(E) Section 436(j)(3) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking ''without regard to this paragraph and'',

(II) by striking ''section 430(f)(4)(A)'' and inserting ''section 430(f)(4)'', and

(III) by striking ''paragraph (1)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (1) and (2)'', and

(ii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) by striking ''without regard to this paragraph'' and inserting ''without regard to the reduction in the value of assets under section 430(f)(4)'', and

(II) by inserting ''beginning'' before ''after'' each place it appears.

(F) Section 436 of the 1986 Code is amended by redesignating subsection (k) as subsection (m) and by inserting after subsection (j) the following new subsections:

''(k) SECRETARIAL AUTHORITY FOR PLANS WITH ALTERNATE VALUATION DATE.—In the case of a plan which has designated a valuation date other than the first day of the plan year, the Secretary may prescribe rules for the application of this section which are necessary to reflect the alternate valuation date.

''(l) SINGLE-EMPLOYER PLAN.—For purposes of this section, the term 'single-employer plan' means a plan which is not a multiemployer plan.''.

(3) AMENDMENTS TO 2006 ACT.—Sections 103(c)(2)(A)(ii) and 113(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the 2006 Act are each amended—

(A) by striking ''subsection'' and inserting ''section'', and

(B) by striking ''subparagraph'' and inserting ''paragraph''.

(d) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTIONS 107 AND 114.—

(1) AMENDMENTS TO ERISA.—

(A) Section 103(d) of ERISA is amended—

(i) in paragraph (3), by striking ''the normal costs, the accrued liabilities'' and inserting ''the normal costs or target normal costs, the accrued liabilities or funding target'', and

(ii) by striking paragraph (7) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(7) A certification of the contribution necessary to reduce the minimum required contribution determined under section 303, or the accumulated funding deficiency determined under section 304, to zero.''.

(B) Section 4071 of ERISA is amended by striking ''as section 303(k)(4) or 307(e)'' and inserting ''or section 303(k)(4),''.

(2) AMENDMENTS TO 1986 CODE.—

(A) Section 401(a)(29) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking ''ON PLANS IN AT-RISK STATUS'' in the heading.

(B) Section 401(a)(32)(C) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''section 430(j)'' and inserting ''section 430(j)(3)'', and

(ii) by striking ''paragraph (5)(A)'' and inserting ''section 430(j)(4)(A)''.

(C) Section 401(a)(33) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''section 412(c)(2)'' in subparagraph (B)(iii) and inserting ''section 412(d)(2)'', and

(ii) by striking ''section 412(b)(2) (without regard to subparagraph (B) thereof)'' in subparagraph (D) and inserting ''section 412(b)(1), without regard to section 412(b)(2)''.

(D) Section 411 of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''section 412(c)(2)'' in subsection (a)(3)(C) and inserting ''section 412(d)(2)'', and

(ii) by striking ''section 412(e)(2)'' in subsection (d)(6)(A) and inserting ''section 412(d)(2)''.

(E) Section 414(l)(2)(B)(i)(I) of the 1986 Code is amended to read as follows:

''(I) the sum of the funding target and target normal cost determined under section 430, over''.

(F) Section 4971 of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''required minimum'' in subsection (b)(1) and inserting ''minimum required'',

(ii) by inserting ''or unpaid minimum required contribution, whichever is applicable'' after ''accumulated funding deficiency'' each place it appears in subsections (c)(3) and (d)(1), and

(iii) by striking ''section 412(a)(1)(A)'' in subsection (e)(1) and inserting ''section 412(a)(2)''.

(3) AMENDMENT TO 2006 ACT.—Section 114 of the 2006 Act is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to plan years beginning after 2007.

''(2) EXCISE TAX.—The amendments made by subsection (e) shall apply to taxable years beginning after 2007, but only with respect to plan years described in paragraph (1) which end with or within any such taxable year.''.

(e) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 116.—Section 409A(b)(3)(A)(ii) of the 1986 Code is amended by inserting ''to an applicable covered employee'' after ''under the plan''.

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE II.

(a) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTIONS 201 AND 211.—Section 201(b)(2)(A) of the 2006 Act is amended by striking ''has not used'' and inserting ''has not adopted, or ceased using,''.

(b) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTIONS 202 AND 212.—

(1) AMENDMENTS TO ERISA.—

(A) Section 302(b)(3) of ERISA is amended by striking ''the plan adopts'' and inserting ''the plan sponsor adopts''.

(B) Section 305(b)(3)(C) of ERISA is amended by striking ''section 101(b)(4)'' and inserting ''section 101(b)(1)''.

(C) Section 305(b)(3)(D) of ERISA is amended by striking ''The Secretary'' in clause (iii) and inserting ''The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary''.

(D) Section 305(c)(7) of ERISA is amended—

(i) by striking ''to agree on'' and all that follows in subparagraph (A)(ii) and inserting ''to adopt a contribution schedule with terms consistent with the funding improvement plan and a schedule from the plan sponsor,'', and

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

''(B) DATE OF IMPLEMENTATION.—The date specified in this subparagraph is the date which is 180 days after the date on which the collective bargaining agreement described in subparagraph (A) expires.'', and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(C) FAILURE TO MAKE SCHEDULED CONTRIBUTIONS.—Any failure to make a contribution under a schedule of contribution rates provided under this paragraph shall be treated as a delinquent contribution under section 515 and shall be enforceable as such.''.

(E) Section 305(e) of ERISA is amended—

(i) in paragraph (3)(C)—

(I) by striking all that follows ''to adopt a'' in clause (i)(II) and inserting ''to adopt a contribution schedule with terms consistent with the rehabilitation plan and a schedule from the plan sponsor under paragraph (1)(B)(i),'',

(II) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following new clause:

''(ii) DATE OF IMPLEMENTATION.—The date specified in this clause is the date which is 180 days after the date on which the collective bargaining agreement described in clause (i) expires.'', and

(III) by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(iii) FAILURE TO MAKE SCHEDULED CONTRIBUTIONS.—Any failure to make a contribution under a schedule of contribution rates provided under this subsection shall be treated as a delinquent contribution under section 515 and shall be enforceable as such.'',

(ii) in paragraph (4)—

(I) by striking ''the date of'' in subparagraph (A)(ii), and

(II) by striking ''and taking'' in subparagraph (B) and inserting ''but taking'',

(iii) in paragraph (6)—

(I) by striking ''paragraph (1)(B)(i)'' and inserting ''the last sentence of paragraph (1)'', and

(II) by striking ''established'' and inserting ''establish'',

(iv) in paragraph (8)(C)(iii)—

(I) by striking ''the Secretary'' in subclause (I) and inserting ''the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary'', and

(II) by striking ''Secretary'' in the last sentence and inserting ''Secretary of the Treasury'', and

(v) by striking ''an employer's withdrawal liability'' in paragraph (9)(B) and inserting ''the allocation of unfunded vested benefits to an employer''.

(F) Section 305(f)(2)(A)(i) of ERISA is amended by adding at the end the following: ''to a participant or beneficiary whose annuity starting date (as defined in section 205(h)(2)) occurs after the date such notice is sent,''.

(G) Section 305(g) of ERISA is amended by inserting ''under subsection (c)'' after ''funding improvement plan'' the first place it appears.

(H) Section 502(c)(2) of ERISA is amended by striking ''101(b)(4)'' and inserting ''101(b)(1)''.

(I) Section 502(c)(8)(A) of ERISA is amended by inserting ''plan'' after ''multiemployer''.

(2) AMENDMENTS TO 1986 CODE.—

(A) Section 432(b)(3)(C) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking ''section 101(b)(4)'' and inserting ''section 101(b)(1)''.

(B) Section 432(b)(3)(D)(iii) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking ''The Secretary of Labor'' and inserting ''The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor''.

(C) Section 432(c) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) in paragraph (3), by striking ''section 304(d)'' in subparagraph (A)(ii) and inserting ''section 431(d)'', and

(ii) in paragraph (7)—

(I) by striking ''to agree on'' and all that follows in subparagraph (A)(ii) and inserting ''to adopt a contribution schedule with terms consistent with the funding improvement plan and a schedule from the plan sponsor,'', and

(II) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following new subparagraph:

''(B) DATE OF IMPLEMENTATION.—The date specified in this subparagraph is the date which is 180 days after the date on which the collective bargaining agreement described in subparagraph (A) expires.''.

(D) Section 432(e) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) in paragraph (3)(C)—

(I) by striking all that follows ''to adopt a'' in clause (i)(II) and inserting ''to adopt a contribution schedule with terms consistent with the rehabilitation plan and a schedule from the plan sponsor under paragraph (1)(B)(i),'', and

(II) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following new clause:

''(ii) DATE OF IMPLEMENTATION.—The date specified in this clause is the date which is 180 days after the date on which the collective bargaining agreement described in clause (i) expires.'',

(ii) in paragraph (4)—

(I) by striking ''the date of'' in subparagraph (A)(ii), and

(II) by striking ''and taking'' in subparagraph (B) and inserting ''but taking'',

(iii) in paragraph (6)—

(I) by striking ''paragraph (1)(B)(i)'' and inserting ''the last sentence of paragraph (1)'', and

(II) by striking ''established'' and inserting ''establish'',

(iv) in paragraph (8)—

(I) by striking ''section 204(g)'' in subparagraph (A)(i) and inserting ''section 411(d)(6)'',

(II) by inserting ''of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974'' after ''4212(a)'' in subparagraph (C)(i)(II),

(III) by striking ''the Secretary of Labor'' in subparagraph (C)(iii)(I) and inserting ''the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor'', and

(IV) by striking ''the Secretary of Labor'' in the last sentence of subparagraph (C)(iii) and inserting ''the Secretary'', and

(v) by striking ''an employer's withdrawal liability'' in paragraph (9)(B) and inserting ''the allocation of unfunded vested benefits to an employer''.

(E) Section 432(f)(2)(A)(i) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''section 411(b)(1)(A)'' and inserting ''section 411(a)(9)''; and

(ii) by inserting at the end the following: ''to a participant or beneficiary whose annuity starting date (as defined in section 417(f)(2)) occurs after the date such notice is sent,''.

(F) Section 432(g) of the 1986 Code is amended by inserting ''under subsection (c)'' after ''funding improvement plan'' the first place it appears.

(G) Section 432(i) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''section 412(a)'' in paragraph (3) and inserting ''section 431(a)'', and

(ii) by striking paragraph (9) and inserting the following new paragraph:

''(9) PLAN SPONSOR.—For purposes of this section, section 431, and section 4971(g)—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'plan sponsor' means, with respect to any multiemployer plan, the association, committee, joint board of trustees, or other similar group of representatives of the parties who establish or maintain the plan.

''(B) SPECIAL RULE FOR SECTION 404(c) PLANS.—In the case of a plan described in section 404(c) (or a continuation of such plan), such term means the bargaining parties described in paragraph (1).''.

(H) Section 412(b)(3) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking ''the plan adopts'' and inserting ''the plan sponsor adopts''.

(I) Section 4971(g)(4) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking ''first day of'' and inserting ''day following the close of'', and

(ii) by striking clause (ii) of subparagraph (C) and inserting the following new clause:

''(ii) PLAN SPONSOR.—For purposes of clause (i), the term 'plan sponsor' has the meaning given such term by section 432(i)(9).''.

(3) AMENDMENTS TO 2006 ACT.—

(A) Section 212(b)(2) of the 2006 Act is amended by striking ''Section 4971(c)(2) of such Code'' and inserting ''Section 4971(e)(2) of such Code''.

(B) Section 212(e)(1) of the 2006 Act is amended by inserting '', except that the amendments made by subsection (b) shall apply to taxable years beginning after 2007, but only with respect to plan years beginning after 2007 which end with or within any such taxable year'' before the period at the end.

(C) Section 212(e)(2) of the 2006 Act is amended by striking ''section 305(b)(3) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974'' and inserting ''section 432(b)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986''.

SEC. 4. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE III.

(a) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 301.—Clause (ii) of section 101(c)(2)(A) of the Pension Funding Equity Act of 2004, as amended by section 301(c) of the 2006 Act, is amended by striking ''2008'' and inserting ''2009''.

(b) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 302.—

(1) AMENDMENT TO ERISA.—Section 205(g)(3)(B)(iii)(II) of ERISA is amended by striking ''section 205(g)(3)(B)(iii)(II)'' and inserting ''section 205(g)(3)(A)(ii)(II)''.

(2) AMENDMENTS TO 1986 CODE.—

(A) Section 417(e)(3)(D)(i) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking ''clause (ii)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (C)''.

(B)(i) Section 415(b)(2)(E)(v) of the 1986 Code is amended to read as follows:

''(v) For purposes of adjusting any benefit or limitation under subparagraph (B), (C), or (D), the mortality table used shall be the applicable mortality table (within the meaning of section 417(e)(3)(B)).''.

(ii)(I) Except as provided in subclause (II), the amendment made by clause (i) shall apply to years beginning after December 31, 2008.

(II) A plan sponsor may elect to have the amendment made by clause (i) apply to any year beginning after December 31, 2007, and before January 1, 2009, or to any portion of any such year.

SEC. 5. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE IV.

(a) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 401.—Section 4006(a)(3)(A)(i) of ERISA is amended by striking ''1990'' and inserting ''2005''.

(b) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 402.—Section 402(c)(1)(A) of the 2006 Act is amended by striking ''commercial airline'' and inserting ''commercial''.

(c) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 408.—Section 4044(e) of ERISA, as added by section 408(b)(2) of the 2006 Act, is redesignated as subsection (f).

(d) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 409.—Section 4041(b)(5)(A) of ERISA is amended by striking ''subparagraph (B)'' and inserting ''subparagraphs (B) and (D)''.

(e) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 410.—Section 4050(d)(4)(A) of ERISA is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of clause (i), and

(2) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following new clauses:

''(ii) which is not a plan described in paragraph (2), (3), (4), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), or (11) of section 4021(b), and

''(iii) which, was a plan described in section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 which includes a trust exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code, and''.

SEC. 6. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE V.

(a) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 501.—Section 101(f)(2)(B)(ii) of ERISA is amended—

(1) by striking ''for which the latest annual report filed under section 104(a) was filed'' in subclause (I)(aa) and inserting ''to which the notice relates'', and

(2) by striking subclause (II) and inserting the following new subclause:

''(II) in the case of a multiemployer plan, a statement, for the plan year to which the notice relates and the preceding 2 plan years, of

the value of the plan assets (determined both in the same manner as under section 304 and under the rules of subclause (I)(bb)) and the value of the plan liabilities (determined in the same manner as under section 304 except that the method specified in section 305(i)(8) shall be used),''.

(b) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 502.—

(1) Section 101(k)(2) of ERISA is amended by filing at the end the following new flush sentence:

''Subparagraph (C)(i) shall not apply to individually identifiable information with respect to any plan investment manager or adviser, or with respect to any other person (other than an employee of the plan) preparing a financial report required to be included under paragraph (1)(B).''.

(2) Section 4221 of ERISA is amended by striking subsection (e) and by redesignating subsections (f) and (g) as subsections (e) and (f), respectively.

(c) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 503.—

(1) AMENDMENTS TO ERISA.—

(A) Section 104(b)(3) of ERISA is amended by—

(i) striking ''section 103(f)'' and inserting ''section 101(f)'', and

(ii) striking ''the administrators'' and inserting ''the administrator''.

(B) Section 104(d)(1)(E)(ii) of ERISA is amended by inserting ''funding'' after ''plan's''.

(2) AMENDMENTS TO 2006 ACT.—Section 503(e) of the 2006 Act is amended by striking ''section 101(f)'' and inserting ''section 104(d)''.

(d) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 505.—Section 4010(d)(2)(B) of ERISA is amended by striking ''section 302(d)(2)'' and inserting ''section 303(d)(2)''.

(e) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 506.—

(1) Section 4041(c)(2)(D)(i) of ERISA is amended by striking ''subsection (a)(2)'' the second place it appears and inserting ''subparagraph (A) or the regulations under subsection (a)(2)''.

(2) Section 4042(c)(3)(C)(i) of ERISA is amended—

(A) by striking ''and plan sponsor'' and inserting '', the plan sponsor, or the corporation'', and

(B) by striking ''subparagraph (A)(i)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (A)''.

(f) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 508.—Section 209(a) of ERISA is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''regulations prescribed by the Secretary'' and inserting ''such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe'', and

(B) by striking the last sentence and inserting ''The report required under this paragraph shall be in the same form, and contain the same information, as periodic benefit statements under section 105(a).'', and

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) If more than one employer adopts a plan, each such employer shall furnish to the plan administrator the information necessary for the administrator to maintain the records, and make the reports, required by paragraph (1). Such administrator shall maintain the records, and make the reports, required by paragraph (1).''

(g) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 509.—Section 101(i)(8)(B) of ERISA is amended to read as follows:

''(B) ONE-PARTICIPANT RETIREMENT PLAN.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'one-participant retirement plan' means a retirement plan that on the first day of the plan year—

''(i) covered only one individual (or the individual and the individual's spouse) and the individual (or the individual and the individual's spouse) owned 100 percent of the plan sponsor (whether or not incorporated), or

''(ii) covered only one or more partners (or partners and their spouses) in the plan sponsor.''.

SEC. 7. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE VI.

(a) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 601.—

(1) AMENDMENTS TO ERISA.—

(A) Section 408(g)(3)(D)(ii) of ERISA is amended by striking ''subsection (b)(14)(B)(ii)'' and inserting ''subsection (b)(14)(A)(ii)''.

(B) Section 408(g)(6)(A)(i) of ERISA is amended by striking ''financial adviser'' and inserting ''fiduciary adviser''.

(C) Section 408(g)(11)(A) of ERISA is amended—

(i) by striking ''the participant'' each place it appears and inserting ''a participant'', and

(ii) by striking ''section 408(b)(4)'' in clause (ii) and inserting ''subsection (b)(4)''.

(2) AMENDMENTS TO 1986 CODE.—

(A) Section 4975(d)(17) of the 1986 Code, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), is amended by striking ''and that permits'' and inserting ''that permits''.

(B) Section 4975(f)(8) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''subsection (b)(14)'' and inserting ''subsection (d)(17)'',

(ii) in subparagraph (C)(iv)(II), by striking ''subsection (b)(14)(B)(ii)'' and inserting ''(d)(17)(A)(ii)'',

(iii) in subparagraph (F)(i)(I), by striking ''financial adviser'' and inserting ''fiduciary adviser,'',

(iv) in subparagraph (I), by striking ''section 406'' and inserting ''subsection (c)'', and

(v) in subparagraph (J)(i)—

(I) by striking ''the participant'' each place it appears and inserting ''a participant'',

(II) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by inserting ''referred to in subsection (e)(3)(B)'' after ''investment advice'', and

(III) in subclause (II), by striking ''section 408(b)(4)'' and inserting ''subsection (d)(4)''.

(3) AMENDMENT TO 2006 ACT.—Section 601(b)(4) of the 2006 Act is amended by striking ''section 4975(c)(3)(B)'' and inserting ''section 4975(e)(3)(B)''.

(b) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 611.—

(1) AMENDMENT TO ERISA.—Section 408(b)(18)(C) of ERISA is amended by striking ''or less''.

(2) AMENDMENTS TO 1986 CODE.—Section 4975(d) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) of paragraph (18)—

(i) by striking ''party in interest'' and inserting ''disqualified person'', and

(ii) by striking ''subsection (e)(3)(B)'' and inserting ''subsection (e)(3)'',

(B) in paragraphs (19), (20), and (21), by striking ''party in interest'' each place it appears and inserting ''disqualified person'', and

(C) by striking ''or less'' in paragraph (21)(C).

(c) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 612.—Section 4975(f)(11)(B)(i) of the 1986 Code is amended by—

(1) inserting ''of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974'' after ''section 407(d)(1)'', and

(2) inserting ''of such Act'' after ''section 407(d)(2)''.

(d) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 624.—Section 404(c)(5) of ERISA is amended by striking ''participant'' each place it appears and inserting ''participant or beneficiary''.

SEC. 8. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE VII.

(1) AMENDMENTS TO ERISA.—

(A) Section 203(f)(1)(B) of ERISA is amended to read as follows:

''(B) the requirements of section 204(c) or 205(g), or the requirements of subsection (e), with respect to accrued benefits derived from employer contributions,''.

(B) Section 204(b)(5) of ERISA is amended—

(i) by striking ''clause'' in subparagraph (A)(iii) and inserting ''subparagraph'', and

(ii) by inserting ''otherwise'' before ''allowable'' in subparagraph (C).

(C) Subclause (II) of section 204(b)(5)(B)(i) of ERISA is amended to read as follows:

''(II) PRESERVATION OF CAPITAL.—An applicable defined benefit plan shall be treated as failing to meet the requirements of paragraph (1)(H) unless the plan provides that an interest credit (or equivalent amount) of less than zero shall in no event result in the account balance or similar amount being less than the aggregate amount of contributions credited to the account.''.

(2) AMENDMENTS TO 1986 CODE.—

(A) Section 411(b)(5) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''clause'' in subparagraph (A)(iii) and inserting ''subparagraph'', and

(ii) by inserting ''otherwise'' before ''allowable'' in subparagraph (C).

(B) Section 411(a)(13)(A) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(i) by striking ''paragraph (2)'' in clause (i) and inserting ''subparagraph (B)'',

(ii) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following new clause:

''(ii) the requirements of subsection (a)(11) or (c), or the requirements of section 417(e), with respect to accrued benefits derived from employer contributions,'', and

(iii) by striking ''paragraph (3)'' in the matter following clause (ii) and inserting ''subparagraph (C)''.

(C) Subclause (II) of section 411(b)(5)(B)(i) of the 1986 Code is amended to read as follows:

''(II) PRESERVATION OF CAPITAL.—An applicable defined benefit plan shall be treated as failing to meet the requirements of paragraph (1)(H) unless the plan provides that an interest credit (or equivalent amount) of less than zero shall in no event result in the account balance or similar amount being less than the aggregate amount of contributions credited to the account.''.

(3) AMENDMENTS TO 2006 ACT.—

(A) Section 701(d)(2) of the 2006 Act is amended by striking ''204(g)'' and inserting ''205(g)''.

(B) Section 701(e) of the 2006 Act is amended—

(i) by inserting ''on or'' after ''period'' in paragraph (3),

(ii) in paragraph (4)—

(I) by inserting ''the earlier of'' after ''before'' in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), and

(II) by striking ''earlier'' and inserting ''later'' in subparagraph (A),

(iii) by inserting ''on or'' before ''after'' each place it appears in paragraph (5), and

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

''(6) SPECIAL RULE FOR VESTING REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements of section 203(f)(2) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and section 411(a)(13)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by this Act)—

''(A) shall not apply to a participant who does not have an hour of service after the effective date of such requirements (as otherwise determined under this subsection); and

''(B) in the case of a plan other than a plan described in paragraph (3) or (4), shall apply to plan years ending on or after June 29, 2005.''.

SEC. 9. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE VIII.

(a) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 801.—

(1) Section 404(o) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''430(g)(2)'' in paragraph (2)(A)(ii) and inserting ''430(g)(3)'', and

(B) by striking ''412(f)(4)'' in paragraph (4)(B) and inserting ''412(d)(3)''.

(2) Section 404(a)(7)(A) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(A) by striking the next to last sentence, and

(B) by striking ''the plan's funding shortfall determined under section 430'' in the last sentence and inserting ''the excess (if any) of the plan's funding target (as defined in section 430(d)(1)) over the value of the plan's assets (as determined under section 430(g)(3))''.

(b) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 802.—Section 404(a)(1)(D)(i) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking ''431(c)(6)(C)'' and inserting ''431(c)(6)(D)''.

(c) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 803.—Clause (iii) of section 404(a)(7)(C) of the 1986 Code is amended to read as follows:

''(iii) LIMITATION.—In the case of employer contributions to 1 or more defined contribution plans—

''(I) if such contributions do not exceed 6 percent of the compensation otherwise paid or accrued during the taxable year to the beneficiaries under such plans, this paragraph shall not apply to such contributions or to employer contributions to the defined benefit plans to which this paragraph would otherwise apply by reason of contributions to the defined contribution plans, and

''(II) if such contributions exceed 6 percent of such compensation, this paragraph shall be applied by only taking into account such contributions to the extent of such excess.

For purposes of this clause, amounts carried over from preceding taxable years under subparagraph (B) shall be treated as employer contributions to 1 or more defined contributions plans to the extent attributable to employer contributions to such plans in such preceding taxable years.''.

(d) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 824.—

(1) Section 408A(c)(3)(B) of the 1986 Code, as in effect after the amendments made by section 824(b)(1) of the 2006 Act, is amended—

(A) by striking the second ''an'' before ''eligible'',

(B) by striking ''other than a Roth IRA'', and

(C) by adding at the end the following new flush sentence:

''This subparagraph shall not apply to a qualified rollover contribution from a Roth IRA or to a qualified rollover contribution from a designated Roth account which is a rollover contribution described in section 402A(c)(3)(A).''

(2) Section 408A(d)(3)(B), as in effect after the amendments made by section 824(b)(2)(B) of the 2006 Act, is amended by striking ''(other than a Roth IRA)'' and by inserting at the end the following new sentence: ''This paragraph shall not apply to a distribution which is a qualified rollover contribution from a Roth IRA or a qualified rollover contribution from a designated Roth account which is a rollover contribution described in section 402A(c)(3)(A)''.

(e) AMENDMENT TO SECTION 827.—The first sentence of section 72(t)(2)(G)(iv) of the 1986 Code is amended by inserting ''on or'' before ''before''.

(f) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 829.—

(1) Section 402(c)(11) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(A) by inserting ''described in paragraph (8)(B)(iii)'' after ''eligible retirement plan'' in subparagraph (A), and

(B) by striking ''trust'' before ''designated beneficiary'' in subparagraph (B).

(2)(A) Section 402(f)(2)(A) of the 1986 Code is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''Such term shall include any distribution to a designated beneficiary which would be treated as an eligible rollover distribution by reason of subsection (c)(11), or section 403(a)(4)(B), 403(b)(8)(B), or 457(e)(16)(B), if the requirements of subsection (c)(11) were satisfied.''

(B) Clause (i) of section 402(c)(11)(A) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking ''for purposes of this subsection''.

(C) The amendments made by this paragraph shall apply with respect to plan years beginning after December 31, 2008.

(g) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 832.—Section 415(f) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking paragraph (2) and by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(h) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 833.—

(1) Section 408A(c)(3)(C) of the 1986 Code, as added by section 833(c) of the 2006 Act, is redesignated as subparagraph (E).

(2) In the case of taxable years beginning after December 31, 2009, section 408A(c)(3)(E) of the 1986 Code (as redesignated by paragraph (1))—

(A) is redesignated as subparagraph (D), and

(B) is amended by striking ''subparagraph (C)(ii)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (B)(ii)''.

(i) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 841.—

(1) Section 420(c)(1)(A) of the 1986 Code is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: ''In the case of a qualified future transfer or collectively bargained transfer to which subsection (f) applies, any assets so transferred may also be used to pay liabilities described in subsection (f)(2)(C).''

(2) Section 420(f)(2) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking ''such'' before ''the applicable'' in subparagraph (D)(i)(I).

(3) Section 4980(c)(2)(B) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking ''or'' at the end of clause (i), by striking the period at the end of clause (ii) and inserting '', or'', and by adding at the end the following new clause:

''(iii) any transfer described in section 420(f)(2)(B)(ii)(II).''.

(j) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 845.—

(1) Subsection (l) of section 402 of the 1986 Code is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting ''maintained by the employer described in paragraph (4)(B)'' after ''an eligible retirement plan'', and

(ii) by striking ''of the employee, his spouse, or dependents (as defined in section 152)'' ,

(B) in paragraph (4)(D), by—

(i) inserting ''(as defined in section 152)'' after ''dependents'', and

(ii) striking ''health insurance plan'' and inserting ''health plan'', and

(C) in paragraph (5)(A), by striking ''health insurance plan'' and inserting ''health plan''.

(2) Subparagraph (B) of section 402(l)(3) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking ''all amounts distributed from all eligible retirement plans were treated as 1 contract for purposes of determining the inclusion of such distribution under section 72'' and inserting ''all amounts to the credit of the eligible public safety officer in all eligible retirement plans maintained by the employer described in paragraph (4)(B) were distributed during such taxable year and all such plans were treated as 1 contract for purposes of determining under section 72 the aggregate amount which would have been so includible''.

(k) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 854.—

(1) Section 3121(b)(5)(E) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking ''or special trial judge''.

(2) Section 210(a)(5)(E) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking ''or special trial judge''.

(l) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 856.—Section 856 of the 2006 Act, and the amendments made by such section, are hereby repealed, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be applied and administered as if such sections and amendments had not been enacted.

(m) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 864.—Section 864(a) of the 2006 Act is amended by striking ''Reconciliation''.

SEC. 10. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE IX.

(a) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 901.—Section 401(a)(35)(E)(iv) of the 1986 Code is amended to read as follows:

''(iv) ONE-PARTICIPANT RETIREMENT PLAN.—For purposes of clause (iii), the term 'one-participant retirement plan' means a retirement plan that on the first day of the plan year—

''(I) covered only one individual (or the individual and the individual's spouse) and the individual (or the individual and the individual's spouse) owned 100 percent of the plan sponsor (whether or not incorporated), or

''(II) covered only one or more partners (or partners and their spouses) in the plan sponsor.''.

(b) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 902.—

(1) Section 401(k)(13)(D)(i)(I) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking ''such compensation as exceeds 1 percent but does not'' and inserting ''such contributions as exceed 1 percent but do not''.

(2) Sections 401(k)(8)(E) and 411(a)(3)(G) of the 1986 Code are each amended—

(A) by striking ''an erroneous automatic contribution'' and inserting ''a permissible withdrawal'', and

(B) by striking ''ERRONEOUS AUTOMATIC CONTRIBUTION'' in the heading and inserting ''PERMISSIBLE WITHDRAWAL''.

(3) Section 402(g)(2)(A)(ii) of the 1986 Code is amended by inserting ''through the end of such taxable year'' after ''such amount''.

(4) Section 414(w)(3) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''and'' after the comma at the end,

(B) by striking subparagraph (C), and

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (C).

(5) Section 414(w)(5) of the 1986 Code is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting a comma, and by adding at the end the following:

''(D) a simplified employee pension the terms of which provide for a salary reduction arrangement described in section 408(k)(6), and

''(E) a simple retirement account (as defined in section 408(p)).''.

(6) Section 414(w)(6) of the 1986 Code is amended by inserting ''or for purposes of applying the limitation under section 402(g)(1)'' before the period at the end.

(c) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 903.—

(1) AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.—Section 414(x)(1) of the 1986 Code is amended by adding at the end of paragraph (1) the following new sentence: ''In the case of a termination of the defined benefit plan and the applicable defined contribution plan forming part of an eligible combined plan, the plan administrator shall terminate each such plan separately.''

(2) AMENDMENTS OF ERISA.—Section 210(e) of ERISA is amended—

(A) by adding at the end of paragraph (1) the following new sentence: ''In the case of a termination of the defined benefit plan and the applicable defined contribution plan forming part of an eligible combined plan, the plan administrator shall terminate each such plan separately.'', and

(B) by striking paragraph (3) and by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), and (6) as paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), respectively.

(d) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 906.—

(1) Section 906(b)(1)(B)(ii) of the 2006 Act is amended by striking ''paragraph (1)'' and inserting ''paragraph (10)''.

(2) Section 4021(b) of ERISA is amended by inserting ''or'' at the end of paragraph (12), by striking ''; or'' at the end of paragraph (13) and inserting a period, and by striking paragraph (14).

SEC. 11. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE X.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT.—

(1) Section 14(b) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 (45 U.S.C. 231m(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3)(i) Payments made pursuant to paragraph (2) of this subsection shall not require that the employee be entitled to an annuity under section 2(a)(1) of this Act: Provided, however, That where an employee is not entitled to such an annuity, payments made pursuant to paragraph (2) may not begin before the month in which the following three conditions are satisfied:

''(A) The employee has completed ten years of service in the railroad industry or, five years of service all of which accrues after December 31, 1995.

''(B) The spouse or former spouse attains age 62.

''(C) The employee attains age 62 (or if deceased, would have attained age 62).

''(ii) Payments made pursuant to paragraph (2) of this subsection shall terminate upon the death of the spouse or former spouse, unless the court document provides for termination at an earlier date. Notwithstanding the language in a court order, that portion of payments made pursuant to paragraph (2) which represents payments computed pursuant to section 3(f)(2) of this Act shall not be paid after the death of the employee.

''(iii) If the employee is not entitled to an annuity under section 2(a)(1) of this Act, payments made pursuant to paragraph (2) of this subsection shall be computed as though the employee were entitled to an annuity.''.

(2) Subsection (d) of section 5 of the Railroad Retirement Act (45 U.S.C. 231d) is repealed.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATES.—

(1) SUBSECTION (a)(1).—The amendment made by subsection (a)(1) shall apply with respect to payments due for months after August 2007. If, prior to the effective date of such amendment, payment pursuant to paragraph (2) of section 14(b) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 (45 U.S.C. 231m(b)) was terminated because of the employee's death, payment to the former spouse may be reinstated for months after August 2007.

(2) SUBSECTION (a)(2).—The amendment made by subsection (a)(2) shall take effect upon the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 12. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE XI.

(a) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 1104.—Section 1104(d)(1) of the 2006 Act is amended by striking ''Act'' the first place it appears and inserting ''section''.

(b) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 1105.—Section 3304(a) of the 1986 Code is amended—

(1) in paragraph (15)—

(A) by redesignating clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A) as subclauses (I) and (II),

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii),

(C) by striking the semicolon at the end of clause (ii) (as so redesignated) and inserting '', and'',

(D) by striking ''(15)'' and inserting ''(15)(A) subject to subparagraph (B),'', and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) the amount of compensation shall not be reduced on account of any payments of governmental or other pensions, retirement or retired pay, annuity, or other similar payments which are not includible in the gross income of the individual for the taxable year in which it was paid because it was part of a rollover distribution;'', and

(2) by striking the last sentence.

(c) AMENDMENTS RELATED TO SECTION 1106.—Section 3(37)(G) of ERISA is amended by—

(1) striking ''paragraph'' each place it appears in clauses (ii), (iii), and (v)(I) and inserting ''subparagraph'',

(2) striking ''subclause (i)(II)'' in clause (iii) and inserting ''clause (i)(II)'',

(3) striking ''subparagraph'' in clause (v)(II) and inserting ''clause'', and

(4) by striking ''section 101(b)(4)'' in clause (v)(III) and inserting ''section 101(b)(1)''.

SEC. 13. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the amendments made by this Act shall take effect as if included in the provisions of the 2006 Act to which the amendments relate.

Mr. STARK (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman's initial request is agreed to.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO RESOLVE INTO SECRET SESSION

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, at the request of, and after discussion with, the distinguished Republican whip, I ask unanimous consent that at a time designated by the Speaker on the legislative day of March 13, 2008, the House resolve itself into secret session as though pursuant to clause 8 of rule XVII; secondly, debate in such secret session proceed without intervening motion for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the majority leader and the minority whip; and, thirdly, at the conclusion of that debate, the secret session shall be dissolved.

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

Mr. BLUNT. Reserving the right to object, Madam Speaker, I believe I heard the leader say clause 8.

Did you mean clause 9?

Mr. HOYER. Clause 9. Excuse me.

Mr. BLUNT. Clause 9. And this secret session would be convened at some time by the Speaker today when the room has been secured and would dissolve at the end of an hour of discussion? Is that what I understand?

Mr. HOYER. That's what the consent agreement is, pursuant to our discussions.

Mr. BLUNT. I withdraw my reservation, Madam Speaker.

Mr. KUCINICH. Reserving the right to object, Madam Speaker, would the gentleman from Maryland yield to a question?

Mr. HOYER. Certainly.

Mr. KUCINICH. Can you divulge to this House what is going to be discussed, not the content of it, but the topic that's going to be discussed?

Mr. HOYER. My presumption is, and I think that's accurate because of my discussions with the Republican whip, the discussion will be with reference to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

Mr. KUCINICH. And the debate that will take place regarding the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, what would conceivably be the nature of that debate?

Mr. HOYER. I can't tell you that because I don't know.

Mr. KUCINICH. Is it going to be debate over legislation?

Mr. HOYER. I presume, I tell the gentleman from Ohio, that it certainly will relate to the legislation that we will then be considering probably at this point in time tomorrow.

Mr. KUCINICH. The gentleman, in his long experience in the House, could he communicate to those who have, in my case, been in this House 12 years or less, anytime in your experience where the House has debated legislation in secret?

Mr. HOYER. My presumption is that we will not debate the legislation in secret. Not only is that my presumption, I think we will clearly have public debate tomorrow on the bill. The minority whip came to me indicating that there were things he thought the Members ought to have knowledge of that he was of the opinion could not be divulged in public debate. There is a provision under our rules to accomplish that objective. After discussion with him and limitation on the time so that we could, in fact, get to a vote on what we believe is very important legislation, we have agreed to this arrangement. Again, it's limited, but we did not want to be nor are we in the position of saying to the minority whip if he has such information that we want to preclude that from being offered, because we want no indication that any information is being withheld. That is appropriate, obviously. There are going to be restrictions, obviously, even in the context of the session.

Mr. KUCINICH. My friend has said two things. One is that there's an assumption that it's going to be about FISA, and another one is that there is going to be a debate of sorts.

When I asked the question if you are aware of whether or not anything like this has happened before, we are talking about specific legislation that is before this House, would the gentleman know what the precedent for this is? Is this unprecedented that the House of Representatives would be meeting in secret preliminary to legislation that it intends to pass? I haven't experienced this in my time; and for information purposes, I would ask the gentleman, who has been here, I think 26, 28 years, if in his experience he can remember that.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman. In responding to him, I believe, and I'm not, frankly, absolutely positive, and I am hoping that somebody perhaps on the Intelligence Committee staff or others in the House knows, but I believe that during the early 1980s, 1983, on Contragate there was such a session.

Mr. KUCINICH. When?

Mr. HOYER. In 1983.

Mr. KUCINICH. On what?

Mr. HOYER. Contragate.

Mr. KUCINICH. Iran-Contra?

Mr. HOYER. Yes.

Mr. KUCINICH. Was that before the hearings or after the hearings?

Mr. HOYER. I don't know the answer to that question.

Mr. KUCINICH. Well, I mean there's relevance here.

Mr. HOYER. If you will yield to Mr. BLUNT, he may be able to offer some information.

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield to my friend, Mr. BLUNT.

Mr. BLUNT. My friend, I didn't quite hear your last question.

Mr. KUCINICH. I said was it Iran-Contra?

Mr. BLUNT. It was not on Iran-Contra. It was 1983 and it was on Contra. In fact, our colleague from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) called for that secret session in 1983. There was also a secret session in 1979 and in 1980. So there have been three of these. They were in recent years, but it has obviously been a long time since 1983.

Mr. KUCINICH. And they were preliminary to the passing of legislation?

Mr. BLUNT. I don't know the answer to that.

Mr. KUCINICH. I just want to point out something here, Madam Speaker, as this House proceeds on this track. There are some of us here who feel that this country has drifted towards a version of a national security state. When the House begins to meet in secret on matters that relate to security prior to legislative acts, it raises questions about the Constitution of the United States. I know I am familiar with my friends' awareness that the Constitution gives the Congress the ability to make its own rules. I also understand from the first amendment that Congress wouldn't restrict any establishment of free speech. This is the citadel of free speech. This is the only place in America that someone can stand and say anything they want at any time and be free from any kind of a legal attack.

Once we close that up, we're changing the nature of it at a time when this country's at war, when there have been questions raised about secret meetings and what was told with respect to torture, about secret meetings and what was told with respect to rendition, about secret meetings and what was told with respect to private corporations doing wiretapping.

I just want the Members of this House to incorporate that in their reflections when we proceed to approve an agreement for a secret meeting.

I'd also like to state this, to just share my experience, and that is without referring to any content of any secret meeting I have been in, and I have been in a few at the beginning of my term in the House, I have found from my own experience, from my own experience, that secret meetings end up being occasions for the communication of information of, at least at best, dubious value. And I am not in any way impugning the motives of my good friends who are asking for a secret meeting in this case. But I am sharing with you my experience prior to this moment that secret meetings have been the occasion to communicate information that hasn't been particularly forthright or true.

Now, I could point to individuals, at least one individual who is sitting in this Chamber right now, who, when we had a secret meeting right after 9/11, walked right down that aisle and uttered a famous barnyard expletive after we were being briefed in a secret meeting by a member of the administration. Some of you who were there at the time remember. So I'm just communicating a concern here about the path we're going down, and I can only do that.

I will not attend that meeting. I will withdraw my reservation of objection. But I want to have my friends here know that we ought to be proceeding with the utmost caution in going in this direction. I am not going to be attending such a session. I believe that it violates the spirit of this House, but I will withdraw my reservation of objection since my good friend feels that this is the path that he has to go.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there further objection?

Mr. PASTOR. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the leader yield for two questions?

Mr. HOYER. Yes.

Mr. PASTOR. As I understand the situation, we are going to secure the Chamber, and in securing the Chamber, I think it means that from the Cloakroom, the people who work the Cloakroom who usually tell us when the Chamber will be cleared, how are they going to communicate that we can come back in for the secret session?

Mr. HOYER. The answer to the question is you will all be receiving from the leader and the whip's office on your e-mails notification of the time and you will get sufficient notice. It is contingent upon how long it takes those that have the responsibility to do so. But you will be getting your e-mails in a time frame that will allow you to get back notice.

Mr. PASTOR. The second question I have is do you expect to have further votes tonight, for those of us who will not attend this secret session and we won't know when it's finished?

Mr. HOYER. If this is approved, my expectation is there probably will be no further votes tonight.

Mr. PASTOR. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there further objection?

Mr. DOGGETT. Reserving the right to object, Madam Speaker, certainly if the minority leader or any other Member of this House has classified information about a sensitive, important subject like foreign intelligence and there is no other way to present it, this is an appropriate way to do it. I want to be sure that I understand the parameters under which that's being done.

It is occurring pursuant to a unanimous consent agreement that sets forth the conditions of this meeting?

Mr. HOYER. Yes.

Mr. DOGGETT. And the minority leader has mentioned there were secret sessions in this House in 1979, in 1980, and 1983; and apparently there has not been one since 1983, to the best of your knowledge?

Mr. HOYER. I think that's accurate.

Mr. BLUNT. If the gentleman would yield, that's to the best of my knowledge. I'm the minority whip. I am sure the leader would verify that as well, and we have Members who were here during that time. But there has not been a secret session since 1983. There have clearly been times when the room has been secured, but not for secret session.

Mr. DOGGETT. So in the history of the United States Congress since its founding, there have been secret sessions no more than five times?

Mr. BLUNT. That's not correct.

Mr. DOGGETT. Do you have an estimate of it?

Mr. BLUNT. I think in the early days they were in secret session all the time or much of the time. Since 1825, I think, there have been three secret sessions. Prior to that I think there were many secret sessions.

Mr. DOGGETT. So since 1825, three times in the history of this country, and at no time since 1983 we have done what you are proposing in this unanimous consent agreement to do.

□ 1815

Now, in this session, so that I understand the parameters and assure that we are not really doing the public's business in secret that ought to be done out here in public, will the session and the debate be limited to the presentation of classified material or the discussion of the significance of that classified material?

Mr. HOYER. That is my expectation.

Mr. BLUNT. If we move this without unanimous consent under the rules, it provides for 1 hour of debate, and you can debate and discuss the information that is presented and the conclusions that may have been drawn from that information.

Mr. DOGGETT. Let me just get clarification of that.

Mr. BLUNT. I don't have the time.

Mr. DOGGETT. I would not want to limit the ability of anyone to debate any aspect of this. If their points are clear and justified, I would want them to do that in front of the American people and not in a secret session, unless it in some way compromised the confidentiality and the classified nature of the material.

And that is why I am trying to be sure that if I come tonight, as I intend to do, to this session, and I hear an hour or 15 or 20 minutes of debate that has nothing to do with these classified materials, I want to know if I am going to have the right to raise a point of order that this is conducting the

public's business in secret and that we have been brought here under false pretenses. I assume that won't happen, but I want to be clear before going into this session what my rights are pursuant to the unanimous consent agreement. Because if the unanimous consent agreement does not protect that, then it would be appropriate, I suppose, at this time, to ask that the agreement be amended to provide something along those lines.

Mr. HOYER. I think the answer is that, within the framework of the unanimous consent, I've requested there is not such a limitation. I think the gentleman is correct on that. However, as I said, my expectation and my discussions with the whip ares that the purpose of the session is to offer information that might not otherwise be appropriate to disclose in public session.

My expectation is there is going to be a fulsome debate, as there has been, tomorrow on the legislation itself. So my expectation, given the shortness of the time that we are talking about, 30 minutes per side, we will have the Intelligence Committee here and the Judiciary Committee here to comment, obviously it is going to be a little difficult, because if there is information brought up that there may be comment on that information, and very frankly, the parameters of the debate tomorrow may, although not disclosing that information, may obviously be perceived by many of us as relating to whatever is discussed. It is very difficult to know specifically because I do not know the specific information that that request was made for.

Mr. DOGGETT. I understand. If there is discussion and debate of matters that do not concern classified materials, then under the terms of the unanimous consent agreement and the rules of the House, is any Member of this House who is present for that discussion free to openly discuss in public, during later debate, what was said during that session?

Mr. HOYER. I think that's a very good question. Let me tell you that we have asked. Mr. BLUNT and I have discussed that. And we have asked the appropriate officials, bipartisan officials, of this House, under the rules, to give us the answer to that question and to have on paper the specific advice to every Member of the House so that we cannot have Members go out of here, put themselves at risk of violation of the rules, have clear advice and counsel as to what that is.

Now, it is my belief, this is not an opinion given to me, but it is my belief that every Member of this House that receives information from sources unrelated to this hour are certainly free, as they are right now, to discuss that information. And the fact that it is discussed in the session would not adversely affect that right. I would be shocked and not in agreement with this unanimous consent if the case were otherwise.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOGGETT. I believe I control the time under the reservation, but I yield to you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas controls the time.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I was here for the last three secret sessions we had. They are unusual, but it is within the rules that did deal with subject matter dealing with legislation that we were to talk about. We should be careful, however, while some classified information might be discussed, the information that those of us on the Judiciary Committee and Intelligence Committee received of the program we were read into, we are not able to discuss what we were briefed on specifically. We are, as I understand under the rules, able to draw conclusions and attempt to present that based on what we saw, but the fact that we have a secret session does not allow us to speak to that.

Secondly, that which is discussed in the secret session cannot be revealed even if it is of an unclassified nature. It does not prohibit you in the later debate on the floor from discussing the same subject saying the same thing; it is that you cannot refer to it having been in the secret session.

And I hope that helps the gentleman.

Mr. DOGGETT. You are saying you were here in 1979, 1980 and 1983 for those three sessions?

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Believe it or not, I was, as young as I am now.

Mr. HOYER. We are not surprised by that.

Mr. DOGGETT. I would just suggest that we could be better off having this done in the unanimous consent agreement itself, since that is what's setting out the terms of this discussion. It is a very, very serious matter when we do the public's business in secret. That is why it has only been done three times since 1825. And it is a very bad precedent for this House to get into the business of conducting any of its business in secret, except, and Mr. BLUNT appears to provide the exception, except under a circumstance where there's classified material on something as important as the security of our families. And so long as we have set out all the parameters of the meeting in the agreement, then I have no problem with it. But I don't want it to wander off in debate, which now my friend tells me I can't talk about afterwards, because I came to this secret session about something that maybe didn't need to be secret.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. The contemplation of this unanimous consent is that there will be no business done in the sense of ''doing business'' as taking legislative action. Nobody contemplates that.

Mr. DOGGETT. I understand the distinction, but I think of my history with the Texas Open Meetings Act, and just the discussing of these matters is part of public business.

Mr. HOYER. If I could continue, there are some in this body who have, because of their membership on particular committees, been able to see information in secret which other Members of this body have not seen. As the distinguished gentleman from California observed, there are still limitations notwithstanding this secret session.

We have a room that allows people to receive information in secret. They are not necessarily transacting business; although, the Intelligence Committee obviously on both Houses does, in fact, conduct its business in secret in that they vote in secret on some legislation.

All this contemplates is the offering and receiving of information that the minority has represented they believe they want to give to the Members that they ought not to give in open session. The matter that we are considering obviously is a very important, critical matter. There are substantial, as you know, differences. You and I agree on most of those. We perhaps disagree with others. It was the Speaker's and my view after discussing with Mr. CONYERS and Mr. REYES that to deny that would give Members the impression that somehow we did not believe they ought to have that information.

Now, I don't know what the information is, as I have said. But having said that, we certainly do not contemplate any business being done. Now, the fact that a Member may say something that is not secret, I would presume things are going to be said in there that are not secret. The gentleman from Ohio raised some excellent points. I share the concern of the gentleman from Texas and the concerns.

But I also understand this is a serious matter. We believe in public we will debate tomorrow a serious proposal as to how to serve our intelligence interests and our constitutional responsibilities. So I am hopeful that we will not object to this, although I think the concerns raised are absolutely legitimate, very serious, worthwhile concerns, and as the gentleman from Texas observes, which is why this is done so very infrequently. I have only been a participant in the 1983 session.

I thank the gentleman for yielding. But that is my take on what is going to transpire.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLUNT. I will say to my friend, I appreciate your concern about this. I would also say the rules provide for this kind of session. Many Members of the House, more Members in the majority than the minority were here when we had a secret session before when we talked about implementing legislation of the Panama Canal Zone or Cuba and other Communist block countries' involvement in Nicaragua.

I actually think that the debate that we are entering into this week is at a high level of security for the country. I believe I will bring information to the secret session that some Members are aware of but most are not. I also think that by the definition of the mutual agreement that we would divide the time, that I am only bringing part of the discussion. I certainly can't suggest what will happen in the questions, comments, and concerns that will come from the other side. So at least 30 minutes of the hour, I also have no idea what will be said in that, but I thought that was a fair way to divide the hour that I could at least ask for to control on my own under the rules with none of the restrictions the gentleman has suggested, and a majority of the Members of the House can either decide to do that or not.

And I appreciate the Speaker and the leader trying to work in this important issue to create an environment where we can talk about topics that we could not otherwise talk about. I am also sure, as my friend from California suggested, that some of the things that will be talked about very likely can and will be talked about later in the week, because they will be related to a secret topic but not secret in nature. You just can't discuss them as having been discussed as part of this secret session. You just discuss them as you would if we hadn't had the secret session that the rules clearly allow for.

And again, the most times these rules were exercised in the history of the Congress was not in the 1820s or 1830s. It was in the 1970s and the 1980s. And many Members of the majority were here during that time and participated in those sessions.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. DOGGETT. You ease some of my concerns. But when you talk about the seventies and the eighties and the like, it is three times since 1825.

Let me just be sure that I'm clear, because maybe we are in agreement on this. The only purpose of your requesting this secret session is to present to the House, or have others present, matters that you feel you cannot present in public concerning matters that are classified. It may be necessary to discuss other interrelated matters, and you can anticipate what questions you may be asked, but the only reason for convening the House tonight in secret is because there are classified matters that you feel would jeopardize the security of our country if we discussed them in public.

Mr. BLUNT. I think I am in agreement with the parameters the gentleman has suggested. I also understand that when you raise those topics, you have perhaps a fuller exchange of ideas, but certainly you can't control what the exchange of ideas will be in the hour that we would mutually agree to give ourselves for this topic. And I believe the topic is every bit as important as implementing legislation for the Panama Canal Zone or other things that this has been used for in the past. And I frankly think the topic is of supreme importance to the security of the country.

And that is why I was prepared to make the request, but also prepared not to make the request with, my discussions with the majority leader and the Speaker about a way that we could mutually agree how to divide the time, how to establish rules that go beyond the rule that I would have been entitled to ask for, but perhaps not as far as being able to prove that we wouldn't talk about anything in that hour that wasn't of a secret nature. And I would thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman. Let me simply say I was here for those secret sessions. And I think the great utility of having another one, given the mumbo jumbo that I heard at the last three, is simply to demonstrate the almost total uselessness of secret sessions.

□ 1830

Mr. DOGGETT. Madam Speaker, I will at this point withdraw my reservation, but would want noted by the reservation my concern as a former member of the Judiciary about the precedent-setting nature of this. This is the fourth time since 1825, and I just ask that we stick to the purpose for which the gentleman has said we are gathering, and we give the most careful consideration before embarking on any such secret sessions in the future.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. DOGGETT. I withdraw my reservation.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, I appreciate the comments of my friend from Texas on our concern about our not conducting our business in secret. We share those concerns. Although this isn't unprecedented, it is an extraordinary act for this Congress to take.

I think it is important that many of us, at least on this side of the aisle, believe the necessity for this is because the Protect America Act has not been brought to the floor and the House hasn't been allowed to vote on it. Consequently, we believe that it is important to have a discussion that hopefully will allow our friends, many of our friends on the other side of the aisle, to see the imperative of moving forward with the Protect America Act and allowing H.R. 3773 with the Senate amendments to be voted on on this floor of the House.

So I will be supporting moving into the secret session, because I believe that it is a step that will allow our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to appreciate and understand the imperative of having a vote on the floor of the House to the Senate amendments and concur in those Senate amendments to H.R. 3773.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

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

Mr. SERRANO. Madam Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. SERRANO. The least important thing I can think of, the least important, is that the American public doesn't think too well of Congress right now, and going into a secret session is not going to help that. But that is the least important thing.

It almost sounds like we need a secret session prior to the secret session to tell the membership what we are allowed to do and say after the secret session. Some of us who oppose many of the things that have happened since September 11 have already drawn conclusions as to what we think is happening or not happening. I am not privy to all the intelligence and I don't think anyone is, and there are some folks in our government and some agencies historically that I don't trust. So I will never really know what the truth is. But I have a sense of what the truth may be and what the danger is of what we are doing in this country at this point.

So my concern is, at what point does what I feel and know become part of what is discussed at this session, and therefore if I keep discussing it in public I have now violated the secret session that I wasn't supposed to violate? I heard before that some things will be discussed at the secret session that are not classified. So if I discuss them later, am I in violation of House rules?

In other words, what I am suggesting, Mr. Leader, is that to tell the membership that we are having a secret session and have someone like me who has been here 18 years say what is that, without preparation for this extreme type of behavior, is to put the membership at risk. At risk.

We don't want to walk into this blindly, and I am walking into it blindly if I decide to attend. I don't know what I am allowed to say and do, and I say a lot of things about our behavior.

So I would hope if we are going to do this, we actually, and this is not a very popular notion, take some extra time in private to tell us. I know what happens when a general comes to me and tells me something that is going on in Iraq. I know I can't say that, because it was a classified meeting. I know that. But this is going to be debate. How is that debate going to be different from some things we say tomorrow in open debate? And if I forget, and I am not trying to be funny here, and mention some of that debate in this debate, what violation am I in?

My last point: With all due respect, if the gentleman has secret information

that speaks to the safety of my beloved country, our country, why didn't the gentleman take that information to the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, where it belongs? Why bring it to the whole House and put us all in that situation, when indeed we have an Intelligence Committee, we have a ranking member, we have a full committee?

I as a Member would be totally comfortable with the gentleman bringing that information. I assure you that if I ever learn anything that I believe can hurt our country, I will bring it to the Intelligence Committee right away. I will not call for a secret session that puts us at risk, that makes the American people think that we don't want to discuss in public some things, and that may in fact strike fear into Members to vote for a bill that we probably should not vote for.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any Member further object?

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Madam Speaker, one of the reasons that we find ourselves in this position is the discussion between both Houses of Congress and Members on either side regarding immunity. It is fascinating that we find ourselves in the position of debating giving immunity to people that we don't know what violations they have committed that we are giving them immunity for. Very strange.

But I would ask the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader a very serious question: Who has the classified information? As I listened to both of you, I did not get clarity as to whether either of you know what is supposed to be that information. And if that person has classified information, at what level is it? Is it at top secret, or is it at secret? Can either of the distinguished gentlemen provide that information to this Member?

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. I think it would be my obligation, even though I haven't actually moved to do so based on our discussions, to bring information and communicate information that is confidential and that I believe ought to be kept secret at this time. I will also remind my colleagues that many of them in September of 2006 voted to go into secret session, and we didn't go into secret session that day. I am pleased that we appear to be moving in that direction. But there is a time that the rules call for when you are in a situation where the national security of the country is important, and there is much of the information that reaches a secret level that could be discussed in a secret session that conclusions have been drawn from and can be drawn from, that my belief is we would benefit from that discussion.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Reclaiming my time and continuing my reservation, with all due respect, I don't think the distinguished minority leader answered the question that I asked, and that is, Who has the classified information?

Mr. BLUNT. If the gentleman will yield further, I think I said it would be my obligation to bring that information. Because of my clearance level, I have seen the secret information, and information at other levels as well, and would anticipate bringing information to the secret session at the secret level.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. It is at the secret level.

Mr. BLUNT. At the secret level.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. That being said, I will not object. But as other Members have, I will place on the RECORD I came here with the thought in mind that there was a substantial reason for us to go forward with a secret session, but I have learned from a considerable amount of experience in this arena that there are times when it is best not to be where ostensibly secret information is supposed to be provided, so at least I will not attend the session.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there further objection?

Ms. KAPTUR. I reserve the right to object, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Ohio is recognized.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I likely will object, in my 26th year in the House I guess first I look at the clock. It is Thursday night, almost 7 p.m. here in Washington. We have been in session all week long. We knew that FISA would be coming up. Now at this moment a secret session is requested.

As a member of one of the key committees in the House, the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, whatever is so secret has never been discussed in our subcommittee. We have been having repeated meetings every day for the last several weeks.

I don't know if this has come up before our Intelligence Committee. I notice that most of the people who are asking are not ranking members on some of our key committees dealing with the oversight of intelligence in our country, and that makes me wonder why on Thursday night, when people have had to change their plane reservations, this is coming up now.

I ask myself, is there any imminent danger to our country that would require such a secret session now, and why is the gentleman asking and not the minority leader asking, if it is so imminent and it is so much a threat?

Mr. BLUNT. Madam Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. The timing of the floor, I would tell my friend from Ohio, is not up to me, and it has been well known for this entire day that I would make this request at sometime during the day. We worked with the majority to try to get the budget out of the way. It is my impression we were going to be here on Friday anyway. Maybe others had better knowledge of plane reservations than I did, but I think we are here on Friday.

I think the Friday work we would do is critically important, and my view is that this discussion adds to the knowledge that the Members will have as we have the debate on the bill tomorrow. Of course, I would much prefer we were voting on the Senate bill tomorrow, a bill that could go to the President; but I don't control that either, not being in the majority.

Ms. KAPTUR. Continuing my reservation, most of the information that I have ever sought relating to intelligence, one can ask special permission. You can go up to the room in the Capitol and you can read anything. You can read for days. I really don't understand what the minority is doing here tonight.

I am not comfortable with this at all. We had caucus meetings this week. This never came up. I understand under the rules you can ask for it and it can come up almost immediately, but I just am extraordinarily uncomfortable with being asked to hold this session tonight.

I won't attend, and I think there is special responsibility on the gentleman for providing documentation in the regular channels in the Intelligence Committee and in the other committees that have oversight over intelligence for the information that you claim you are going to be presenting to this Chamber.

I would just urge our leadership to not approve this.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation for the moment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there further objection?

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, I reserve the right to object to this process.

I am feeling manipulated. My question is, if there is confidential information, why was it not taken to the Intelligence Committee first before there is a secret session?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman reserve the right to object to the request?

Mr. HOYER. If the gentlewoman will yield, I believe the gentlewoman is reserving her right to object and wanted to speak on the issue.

Ms. WATSON. I reserve my right to object. That is what I said before I came to the mike. I guess I wasn't heard.

Mr. HOYER. The gentlewoman has the floor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized.

Ms. WATSON. Madam Speaker, I want to know why the Intelligence Committee did not receive the confidential information that I am hearing is going to be discussed here. If the information discussed here is not confidential, why do we need a secret session and to what end are we having this? We are supposed to vote on FISA tomorrow. I understand there is a compromise that pretty much has been agreed upon. I have been whipping it.

So I want to know to what end we are having this secret session. I would like to yield to you, Mr. BLUNT.

□ 1845

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I would say that every knowledge I have would indicate that our Intelligence Committees have seen the information, and that does not preclude moving to secret session to share information with other Members. I appreciate what some other Members have said about the difficulty of remembering what's secret and what's not, because those of us who have the obligation or the clearance level to look at this information have to do that.

I think the information we will bring to the floor will not be confusing to the Members but enlightening to the Members, and that's why I propose that we will move for a secret session later in the day if this UC is not agreed to.

Ms. WATSON. Reclaiming my time, I would like to know the purpose of the secret session, if you have confidential information, why it was not taken to Intelligence before it was brought here to the Chambers in secret?

I have got to go back to my district and explain to my constituents why we had a secret session before we voted on the FISA bill.

Mr. BLUNT. I actually think it would be harder to explain to our constituents why we didn't have a secret session.

This is a bill that goes well beyond the information that most Members would normally have. I think the secret session will be helpful to the Members, or I wouldn't have said early today that I would ask for it. The information that I have, I believe, will be information that, in my opinion, has been available to the Members with the security clearance that allows them to normally see this information.

The Intelligence Committee would already know the kinds of things that I would intend to discuss this evening.

Ms. WATSON. Reclaiming my time, I asked the Chair, and the Chair is unaware of what this information might be. I am continuing to object until I am satisfied that this meeting is necessary in secrecy and why it didn't go to the Intelligence Committee first.

I don't feel comfortable being manipulated with scare tactics.

Why is it this didn't come forward prior to voting on FISA?

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend yield?

Ms. WATSON. I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my good friend for yielding. What I think the whip is saying, the Whip came to me earlier today, said he wanted to discuss information which the Intelligence Committee has, which the broad reach of the Members do not have, but he did not want to, he did not feel he could discuss that in open session.

The rules provide for the whip to make a motion to do that. That will then be a relatively lengthy process. The whip and I discussed this on his representation that he had information that he felt, in good conscience, he could not divulge, not because it's not in the bosom of the Intelligence Committees or, frankly, maybe the Judiciary Committee, which has been cleared, but because he felt it was information that was not releasable.

What we have done is reached an agreement that makes it very clear that there are very short parameters for this discussion and debate.

I want to say that I, generally, have not been here as long as Mr. OBEY, but my experience on these kinds of sessions, whether they are briefings, has been the same as his. I have rarely learned something that I couldn't read in U.S. News & World Report or Time the day before or the day after.

But having said that, we have tried to reach an agreement with the minority that would facilitate the receiving of information which many Members, not the Intelligence members or the Judiciary members, but many Members have not had available to them and could not be discussed in open session.

I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Ms. WATSON. I just want to end this with this: I went over to the Chair of Intelligence. I said, Do you know about this? He said, No. He can speak for himself. But why at this time are we given information that is supposed to be so strategic we have to do it before we take the vote on FISA? I smell something, and I do not like to be manipulated.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Are there further objections?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Madam Speaker, listening to this discussion and the minority whip, as we have gathered a number of overlays of a discussion, people who are frustrated by the idea of a secret session.

Mr. Majority Leader, I am always interested in Members having the full understanding of the challenges that they face. It is important to know that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and chairman of the Intelligence Committee made every opportunity for Members to engage in materials or to utilize materials that they might find helpful in this discussion on the FISA bill. Certainly members of the two committees, of which I am a member of the Judiciary Committee, had intense opportunity and, of course, meetings in the appropriate place to be able to garner information.

To the minority whip, I think what I have heard from Members is a degree of confusion and opposition at the same time. We do understand that majority leader has been most gracious in cooperating with Members who are unready, but our difficulty is that it seems as if it is a tool to delay our full discussion on FISA.

I would ask the first question of whether that is the case. Then the other part of it is: There are a number of Members who have already indicated that they will not be present. I am disappointed in that, not in the Members, but in their concern of being held accountable when they debate the question on the floor tomorrow as to why they have said a statement or not said a statement, whether it's relevant or whether it is in this discussion today.

The first question: Is this a tool to delay us from the ultimate business that the people of America want us to engage in is to pass a FISA bill from this floor?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentlelady for yielding. I would say it is not intended for that but, in fact, to further amplify our ability to have that discussion tomorrow as we thoughtfully reflect on information. You couldn't talk about the information but you could talk about your reflections on things that you now know other Members are discussing. I think it helps that.

In terms of FISA, the rule allows for 20 minutes to the entire Intelligence Committee to discuss this issue and 40 minutes for Judiciary.

I just think this provides for a fuller moment for the Members to think about, talk about, and discuss some specific information at the secret level that otherwise would not have a chance to be discussed before we move forward with this vote tomorrow.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Majority Leader, on a very detailed explanation of why we should do this; however, there are gaping holes in the explanation of why we should do this, the timing of it. I think you are being enormously cooperative. I think it's important for the minority that ask for a privilege to be given a privilege.

Mr. Leader, I am concerned, if I might yield to you again, the two-edged sword that Members want to be vigorous in their discussion and want to be open minded, if they participate in this closed session, closed to the American people, the lights out, in essence, questions about the constitutionality, not because it might not have that basis, but others may question it because it is so unique, three times since 1825.

What is the standard, what is the criteria for Members' discussion in a closed session and then the Member going to the floor tomorrow and wanting to be within the realm of the rules of debate tomorrow, want to make the right decision, and now may be caught in a two-edged sword?

It should not be that a Member has to not come tonight to be fully briefed, as Mr. BLUNT seems to think we need to be, and then be in the crosshairs tomorrow when we need to have a full debate in front of the American people.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

For my part, I believe I will be fully engaged on this piece of legislation, on its merits, what it does to facilitate the interception of communications which may prove dangerous to our country and at the same time protect our Constitution.

I don't think I am going to be constrained in any way.

Now, what I will be constrained on saying is that, obviously, I have had the opportunity and taken the opportunity to go to the committee to review information in the bosom of the committee and to make conclusions on that. I will not discuss that specific information, but there is, most of the information that I have, having done that, is from the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Wall Street Journal, other news magazines, from articles that I have read. I frankly think that no Member is going to have to be confused about debating the merits or the demerits of the issue that will be before us tomorrow based upon this secret session.

Now, the gentleman, as I say, has made a request that he has information that he wants to discuss which he believes ought not to be discussed in public. I think everybody, not in public in the sense of depriving the American people from the information, but information that we need to hold close so that it is not used by those who would cause us harm, without speculating as to what that information may be. I frankly think that every Member will be able to make that judgment.

But, more than that, we have discussed this, and we hope to have, and I forget who it was who was mentioned, very appropriately, we hope being prepared now is directive from a nonpartisan source of security people. This is, after all, a rule of the House that is being pursued. It could be pursued by motion, but it's being pursued by unanimous consent. Doing so, we believe, sets the parameters more appropriately.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Reclaiming my time, this point was made earlier, but I don't think that it has been clearly enunciated for Members. What you are suggesting is that Members can participate in this discussion. Unfortunately, closed to the American people sounds ominous, and it is unfortunate that we have reached this point, because I do believe that Members have the individual opportunity to visit the Intelligence information, as was made possible by both the Intelligence Committee and the Judiciary Committee.

But I think it's important to note that a Member could be on the floor this evening and review materials and be in debate, be on the floor tomorrow and say, in my studied opinion on the discussions of last evening, I believe so and so, meaning that I think this FISA bill is solid on its four corners, it is protected, it is constitutional, it protects those individuals covered by it, it gives the American people the sense of national security but also the protection of their civil liberties.

They will at least be able to refer in that general term, is that my understanding? They are not completely silenced from even referring to the fact that they were in a secret session last evening or they were looking at materials in a secret condition.

Mr. HOYER. Would the gentlelady yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HOYER. I don't want to go further than I am absolutely confident on the response to this. However, let me say that I believe that all the information that Members need to debate this bill tomorrow is currently in their possession and will be elicited in public debate.

The minority whip does not believe that. He believes there is additional information.

I think Members, I would not want to leave the impression with any of our Members that somebody had information that they believed was very important to the security of our country that they were precluded from giving to Members. That is why we pursued this objective.

As I say, the rules provide for that. But in terms of the debate, my suggestion is, I think, particularly the gentlewoman who serves so ably on the Judiciary Committee has all the information, and she has some information she knows she can't speak of because she has received briefings as a member of the Judiciary Committee.

□ 1900

But I believe there will be no constraints.

However, the constraint I think is you would not say, out of a secret session, and none of us should say out of a secret session, that X, Y and Z was said in a secret session, or that I got this information from a secret session. And if you did not have that information but for being in that session, my advice would be not to tell that information. But my view has been this has been a very wide, public debate; and I don't have any problems debating this vigorously tomorrow, as I intend to do because I think the bill is a good bill and protects both our intelligence ability and our Constitution. So I will not feel constrained at all. But I will not say I will not tell information that I received in this secret session because I don't think I am going to need to at all.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the minority whip.

Mr. BLUNT. I would just say obviously some Members were here and others were not when we had these sessions, five times since 1825, or three times since 1979, depending on how you want to use those numbers. My understanding is that you constantly in your efforts with the information you have as a member of the Judiciary Committee know where that line is. And you can't refer to the secret session, although you can clearly refer to any information that happened to be discussed there that was generally available before that session. You just don't say that it came out of the secret session. And the gentlelady does that with frequency based on her level of current clearance, and you know that line better than most Members of the House do and how to do that.

This would be the same kind of source of information that you would use in your other access, and it is a secret session under the rules on the basis that the rules then provide that what is there is not later to be discussed.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Reclaiming my time, I want it to be clear that a Member can rise on the floor and say, having been in a secret session last evening, not recounting what was in the secret session, but I find that my position remains the same in my support of the bill or my opposition to the bill. One could say that.

Members are going to be coming to the floor and some Member may want to say tomorrow that they were here. They would not be reciting what they heard. They would simply say what they heard did not move them or it moved them. Can someone not say tomorrow they were in the session without recounting what you heard?

Mr. HOYER. I think the fact of attending the session is not secret. The answer is ''yes.''

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Having not been in a session, Members don't know the parameters. Minimally they can say they were here, and what they heard, which they don't recount; they can proceed in their debate on how they review the bill. But they don't recount what was heard.

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I think every Member will in fact say based upon the information they have, as I will say and as you will say, some of that information is held close. Some is not. And we will make our decisions based upon the information we have. So I think the gentlelady is absolutely correct.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. This reflects on what our distinguished majority leader said, Congresswoman JACKSON-LEE. In the House under rule XVII, clause 9, it is true that any Member could ask for a secret session, claim they have information. That is a privilege. Furthermore, under rule X, clause 11, and then a subparagraph, the Select Committee

on Intelligence may move to hold a secret session to determine whether classified information held by the committee should be made public.

Now, we haven't seen our distinguished colleague ask for such a secret session, although our other distinguished colleague is requesting it. Now obviously since this has only been done five times in 182 years, five times in 182 years of this institution, it would seem to me that a very high bar has been reached here.

Now my question would be, hypothetically, since any Member has the ability to call for a secret session, if a secret session is requested and the bar that one would assume that we would need to clear to achieve a secret session has in fact not been met, that in fact a secret session was called for reasons for something that was not really all that secret, or not evidence that was probative and weighty, but instead that one person may have felt. And I am not impugning my friend here because he may have some information.

But generally speaking, under the rule, we can all ask for it. But, Mr. HOYER, I think since you are our senior Member here who is our majority leader, or maybe the Parliamentarian knows, if a secret session is called for and the bar isn't reached, what then? What happens then with that secret session?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Reclaiming my time, I would be happy to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. KUCINICH. And what happens to the Member, if I may.

Mr. HOYER. There are a lot of hypotheticals, a, I believe the gentleman is correct, there is a high bar. I will tell you that as everybody in this House knows, Mr. BLUNT and I are friends. I have great respect for Mr. BLUNT. Mr. BLUNT came to me, without denigrating any other Member, he is a leader of his party and I accord him the respect of making the judgment that in fact he is going to meet that high bar.

I have not interrogated him any more than I would want him to interrogate me on that issue. I take him at his word as a Member. Now, the consequence of not meeting that high bar is only that Members will say that a request was made that was not justified. I think that is the consequence. There is certainly no consequence in the rules. And, first of all, we would, I suppose, as a body have to judge, a, what the bar was and whether you met it.

In any event, I think the gentleman understands the answer to my question. I respect him as the leader of his party. He has made this request, and we are trying to honor it, I might say, in a way that most fashions it so that it will be as focused and as helpful as can be.

Mr. KUCINICH. Would the gentlelady yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. It is my understanding relative to these proceedings in a secret session that the proceedings of a secret session are not published unless the relevant Chamber votes during the meeting or at a later time to release them. Then portions can be released in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Is that right, Congressman JACKSON-Lee and Mr. HOYER?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Reclaiming my time, I yield to Mr. HOYER.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman is reading from the rule and he is a very bright, good friend; and I am sure he read the rule accurately. So my presumption is that he is accurate.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. So that is the remedy, that the House could vote at some point to release.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman is absolutely correct on that observation.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Reclaiming my time, I indicate to the majority leader and to the minority whip just the discussion here this evening highlights, one, the collegiality of the relationship and the effort, Mr. Leader, you are making, and you are to be commended.

But it also highlights the constitutional weakness, if you will, of the understanding of the Members and the whole question of what we are doing before the American public in a secret session.

I would like to simply say to the American public it is not that we are denying you the opportunity to be fully informed. It is my understanding that Members are asking to debate information that may be classified or secret. Whether this is the right approach, I take great question to this, and would rather it not be.

I think all Members have had access to materials. They can study the FISA bill. The good news is that the American people will have a FISA bill tomorrow passed by this House.

I have a continuing reservation. However, at this time I will withdraw my reservation acknowledging that this is both a unique challenge that we are being offered and that it is possible that there is a better way. But I hope the debate tomorrow, in front of the eyes of the American people, will be vigorous and honest and straightforward and that a bill will be passed.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Reserving the right to object, Madam Speaker, I just wanted to very briefly come down because I think we need to remember, first of all, that we are standing on some very hallowed ground here. We are standing on the grounds of the citadel of this Nation where some heavy prices were paid for the foundation of our government, the hallmark of which is openness and freedom. So when we take a step to close our proceedings to the American people, we are treading on treacherous ground.

And so I believe, I think that it is very important, Mr. Minority Whip, that I ask you this question because I think you certainly need to answer this for those of us here and the American people, and that question is: Is this a political ploy? In the land of Greek mythology was a land called Troy, and in that land they brought a Trojan horse. And so when you look at the facts that have been exposed in this discourse this evening, you say you have information that is of high intelligence matter, that you are asking us to undermine the very hallmark and foundation of our free, open Republic to present, that has not even been presented to the proper channels of our Intelligence Committee on the eve of a vote that has been moving around these Chambers for well over a month.

Here, just before we are about to go for a 2-week recess, we come with this mysterious information. So the question has to be answered: Is this a Trojan horse? Is this a political ploy? To call a meeting in secret to give secret information, those of us that would come have to abide by the secrecy, then when the vote takes place, if it doesn't go the way that you want it, you can say to the press, well, hey, we called a secret meeting. We gave them valuable information, and see what they did.

It puts this whole situation in a very confounding box, and I ask you to answer that question. Is this not a political ploy? Is this not a Trojan horse? And if so, could it not be a misuse of the sanctity of the House of Representatives?

Mr. BLUNT. I would say to my friend that it is not a political ploy. I would also say that beginning in 1978 when we passed actually the first Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, we set a new structure in place where the House of Representatives took more responsibility for intelligence information in the country.

And we can talk about how many times we have done this since 1825 or whatever, but three times, and certainly three times after the House decided in 1978 to take more responsibility for the intelligence issues in the country, we had a discussion that I thought was possible to have here today.

The bar certainly, I understand why my friends would want to raise the bar, but I have information that has been available to the Intelligence Committee that I thought the Members that have not seen that information would benefit from talking about.

I haven't suggested it is at the top secret level. I haven't suggested it is at the program level. I have said it is at the secret level. That kind of information is important to discuss, I think, and should not be discussed in a general session, but also does not rise to

the kinds of things that even in a secret session of the whole House I don't think should be discussed.

You know, the suggestion that somehow here the bar is that if the Member doesn't bring information that the entire country should know, the very future of the country, the essence of the country, rests on, that is not the determination of either a secret level of intelligence or a secret session.

Nor in saying to my good friend, the majority leader, I would be glad to discuss this for an hour, this topic generally, based on information that I think would be important for all of the Members to talk about. Many of the Members have not seen this. It is information I think would be helpful.

□ 1915

I certainly can't control the discussion of the hour, the 30 minutes that I've said I'd be more than happy for the majority to have. I hope we'd both try to be positive here in creating a discussion of items on an issue that, after all, does relate to some of the most sensitive techniques and procedures in our country.

I'm not going to talk about the highly classified parts of the program. I'm not going to talk about the top secret parts of the program that the chairman and the ranking member and others, including the majority leader and I am aware of. But I did have some information that I thought would help the debate that rose to the secret level that all of the Members otherwise would not hear.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. But if you were, if that information rose to that level, Mr. Minority Leader, to that level of secrecy, then why would it not certainly have raised to the level that you could have shared it with the chairman of the Intelligence Committee?

Mr. BLUNT. I've said three times now this was information that's been available to the Intelligence Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. What I'm saying, but the point is that you, yourself, had the information, but you, yourself, did not share it with the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BLUNT. That is not what I said or what the record would reflect.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. I will yield to the majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. The reason I stand is because again I want to explain. The information, I don't know the information, but the information that Mr. BLUNT has clearly is within the bosom of the Intelligence Committee, and I don't know, but I presume the Judiciary Committee has had access to it under the President's order. What has not been done is that information has not been shared with the Members. It's not a question of the sharing with the Intelligence Committee. I understand the gentleman's concern. What Mr. BLUNT is simply saying is he wants to share with the Members. He cannot share it in open session. I don't know what the information is, but, again, as I expressed to my friend, and I would hope that we would understand that at some point in time, we need to accord to one another the credibility. Particularly I would hope that he would accord to me, as the leader, credibility, and as I accord to him credibility on his assertion that this is something he wants to share with the Members, some of whom would not have had access. They may have had access to it, but they haven't heard it. That is all I think he's saying. And in that context, we have come to this agreement which we think, as I say, focuses and serves the concerns that you have legitimately raised and focuses our efforts.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. I will yield to you.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. As a member of the Judiciary Committee who's read into the program, when Mr. BLUNT talked to me about the possibility of this effort, it was in the context of how do we make that careful distinction, and those of us who've been read into the program, to try and inform the membership without violating the confidentiality under which we work. And the suggestion was that a secret session might allow for a freer discussion, while those of us who've been read into the program still protect the classified nature of the program.

Now, I don't know if it's going to work. All I'm saying is it's no information that's, from my standpoint, that is unknown to other members of the Judiciary or the Intelligence Committee who've been read into the program, but it's our effort to try and find some vehicles by which we can inform the membership while still preserving the confidential status of that information. It's nothing that we have within our bosom that no one else has. It is information that we're trying to find a vehicle to allow the other membership to be informed. And I hope that helps the gentleman.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. My final concern is, and I will let this rest, is that after tomorrow when we read the accounts of this, or when we go home and the American people ask us that question, the issue is going to be, Was it worth it? Was it, did it reach that level to really undermine the openness in government?

Our Nation is littered with examples of secrecy when it should have been openness. And as we've seen from those who've been here long before I have, who've gone through these previous times, in the five times and the most recent two or three times that some of those that spoke have been here, it proved to not reach that bar. And I'd just say, these are hallowed grounds. This is a precious country, the centerpiece of which is openness, and if we keep tipping away at this, we undermine the very fabric of our country. And I just submit to you, Mr. Leader, this is really what's at stake tonight.

Mr. BLUNT. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. BLUNT. I would just say to my friend that the information that I had hoped we would discuss today and still hope we will be able to discuss today is not, is information that most of the Members do not have and have not had access to. And I think our respect for each other as we approach this important decision would indicate that a further discussion, and my view was a discussion that could not be had because of the nature of some of the implications of what we do in an open session, would benefit the debate and the final decision at whatever point that decision will be made.

We do know tomorrow when we leave, the Senate's leaving and there will be no decision made that becomes law this week. But my thought was that all of the Members would benefit from a discussion based on information at a level that could not be disclosed in full debate and a discussion that I hoped would actually see the Members respond with appreciation for each other and our ability to talk about one or two items that were secret and what those items might mean, rather than say, Did that rise to the level of our time?

I don't know what all Members had planned to do tonight, but I suspect that you could argue, if you wanted to, that that discussion will lead, will be well worth the time. I also suspect if you don't want to, you could argue that it doesn't. But my intention was not to create animus among the Members, but to try to create an opportunity where all of our Members, as they have this ongoing discussion about foreign intelligence, have just a little broader window. I think it's important we all understand.

I'm not proposing we open the entire window. I'm not proposing that we go to levels that we probably even among 431 of us who respect each other would want to go to. I thought it would be helpful. We've already debated whether to have this discussion far longer than I had anticipated the discussion taking. But I respect the Member's concern about something that we've only done three times in 30 years, haven't done very many times in the history of the Congress, and we may decide that the expectation of this discussion becomes so high that no Member would ever even consider saying, you know, I saw something here that I think we, it is truly secret so I can't talk about it in the full session. I think we should discuss it in a bigger session.

But if Members begin to think that that has to be that somebody has the plans, and we didn't know it, to nuclear weapons before it's worth having that discussion, we'll never have that discussion. That's not what I'm proposing at all, nor was I anticipating

setting any kind of condition that my friends would have a problem with. I truly believe, after months of looking at this issue, that if the Members understood, even at the entry level, some of the problems it creates not to have a program in place that deals with these problems, the Members would reach a different conclusion. It may turn out that I am wrong on that, and I may take the advice of others who were here 30 years ago when we had three of these and decide this is never worth advancing again to my colleagues; but could we have a discussion in private about things that we can only discuss in private.

The option here is to discuss it in private or not to discuss it at all. And if my friends want to set a level of that discussion so high that if a Member walks out of here and says, well, the world wouldn't have survived without that session, we're never going to have a session where any more of us know the secret level items available to the Congress than know those items right now.

I was trying to be expansive in my sense of this discussion, rather than restrictive. By the end of the day, I'm beginning to think that may have been a mistake, but I'm still optimistic that we can have a discussion that the Members will think, you know, I don't know what I intended to do with the hour tonight, but that was actually as valuable as whatever it was I expected to do. And I would hope that would be the decision the Members would make, was this a more valuable hour for me as I looked to the future of these programs than the hour I might have spent doing whatever you would have been doing if you hadn't been here as Members of Congress talking about things that, if they're going to be talked about, can only be talked about in this way.

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Well, just finally, in conclusion, I just want to say that I know that I speak for every single Member of the House of Representatives, both Democrat and Republican, when I say that foremost in all of our minds, foremost is the security of the United States of America, and foremost in our minds is that we do that in the context of the foundations of this country, which are freedom and openness.

We walk a very delicate balance this evening. Let us hope we walk it right.

I withdraw my reservation.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1930

PERMISSION TO ADJOURN UPON DISSOLUTION OF SECRET SESSION

Mr. REYES. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the secret session of the House is dissolved pursuant to the previous order of the House, the House stand adjourned.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to read to the Members the contents of clause 9 of rule XVII:

SECRET SESSION

Whenever confidential communications are received from the President of the United States, or whenever the Speaker or any Member shall inform the House that he has communications which he believes ought to be kept secret for the present, the House shall be cleared of all persons except the Members and officers thereof, and so continue during the reading of such communications, the debates and the proceedings thereon, unless otherwise ordered by the House.

The galleries of the House Chamber will be cleared of all persons and the House Chamber will be cleared of all persons except Members of the House and those officers and employees specified by the Speaker whose attendance on the floor is essential to the functioning of the secret session of the House. All proceedings in the House during such consideration shall be kept secret until otherwise ordered by the House.

In addition to the provisions of clause 13 of rule XXIII, which is applicable to all Members, officers and employees, every employee and officer present in the Chamber during the secret session will sign an oath of secrecy, which is in the Speaker's Ceremonial Office, room H–210.

The Chair will declare a recess long enough for this order to be carried out.

The Chair will ask all Members to leave the Chamber temporarily until the security check is completed.

Three bells will be rung approximately 15 minutes before the House reconvenes for the secret session.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2211

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER) at 10 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.

SECRET SESSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the previous order of the House, the Chair declares the House in secret session.

(House proceedings held in secret session.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The secret session is dissolved.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2733. An act to temporarily extend the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965.

S. 2745. An act to extend agricultural programs beyond March 15, 2008, to suspend permanent price support authorities beyond that date, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the previous order of the House, the House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 14, 2008, at 10 a.m.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

> "I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 110th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

ANDRÉ CARSON, Indiana, Seventh.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5710. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Fruits and Vegetables [Docket No. APHIS-2007-0116] (RIN: 0579-AC64) received March 6, 2008, pursuant to 5

U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5711. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Mgmt. Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Labeling: Health Claims; Soluble Fiber From Certain Foods and Risk of Coronary Heart Disease [[Docket No. FDA-2009-P-0090](formerly Docket No. 2006P-0393)] received March 11, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

5712. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, LRAD, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Securities Offering Disclosure Rules [Docket ID OCC-2008-0003] (RIN: 1557-AD04) received March 7, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5713. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Standardized and Enhanced Disclosure Requirements for Television Broadcast License Public Interest Obligations Extension of the Filing Requirement For Children's Television Programming Report (FCC Form 398) [MM Docket No. 00-168 MM Docket No. 00-44] received March 10, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5714. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of DTV Consumer Education Initiative [MB Docket No. 07-148] received March 10, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5715. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — In the Matter of Advanced Television Systems and their Impact Upon the Existing Television Broadcast Service [MB Docket No. 87-268] received March 10, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5716. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator For Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Shrimp Fisheries of the Gulf of Mexico; Revisions to Bycatch Reduction Devices and Testing Protocols [Docket No. 0612243163-7151-01] (RIN: 0648-AU59) received March 11, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5717. A letter from the Director Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Closure [Docket No. 001005281-0369-02] (RIN: 0648-XF24) received March 11, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5718. A letter from the Director Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Criteria and Procedures for Proposed Assessment of Civil Penalties (RIN: 1219-AB57) received March 11, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5719. A letter from the SSA Regulations Officer, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Amendment to the Attorney Advisor Program [Docket No. SSA 2007-0036] (RIN: 0960-AG49) received March 11, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ELLSWORTH (for himself, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. POMEROY):

H.R. 5602. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Social Security Act to treat certain domestically controlled foreign persons performing services under contract with the United States Government as American employers for purposes of certain employment taxes and benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia (for himself and Mr. TAYLOR):

H.R. 5603. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to enhance the national defense through empowerment of the National Guard, enhancement of the functions of the National Guard Bureau, and improvement of Federal-State military coordination in domestic emergency response, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. PLATTS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California):

H.R. 5604. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reduce cost-sharing under part D of such title for certain non-institutionalized full-benefit dual eligible individuals; 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. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. STARK, Mr. BERRY, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. LEE, Mr. WU, and Mr. KUCINICH):

H.R. 5605. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to provide for transparency in the relationship between physicians and manufacturers of drugs, devices, or medical supplies for which payment is made under Medicare, Medicaid, or SCHIP, and for other purposes; 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. SCHIFF (for himself and Mr. ROGERS of Michigan):

H.R. 5606. A bill to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a permanent background check system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. PETRI, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. DELAHUNT):

H.R. 5607. A bill to provide safe, fair, and responsible procedures and standards for resolving claims of state secret privilege; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAHALL (for himself and Mr. KILDEE):

H.R. 5608. A bill to establish regular and meaningful consultation and collaboration with tribal officials in the development of Federal policies that have tribal implications, to strengthen the United States government-to-government relationships with Indian tribes, and to reduce the imposition of unfunded mandates upon Indian tribes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BUYER, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PASTOR, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. MICHAUD, and Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas):

H.R. 5609. A bill to provide for transitional health care for members of the Armed Forces separated from active duty who agree to serve in the Selected Reserve of the Ready Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico):

H.R. 5610. A bill to designate as wilderness additional National Forest System lands, Bureau of Land Management Lands, and National Parks Service lands in the States of West Virginia, Arizona, New Mexico, Oregon, and California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. CLAY, Mr. ROSS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee):

H.R. 5611. A bill to reform the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. TAYLOR (for himself, Mr. MELANCON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. PICKERING):

H.R. 5612. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to waive the deadline on the construction of GO Zone property which is eligible for bonus depreciation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself and Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 5613. A bill to extend certain moratoria and impose additional moratoria on certain Medicaid regulations through April 1, 2009; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CASTLE (for himself and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H.R. 5614. A bill to authorize the production of Saint-Gaudens Double Eagle ultra-high relief bullion coins in palladium to provide affordable opportunities for investments in precious metals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, and Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida):

H.R. 5615. A bill to provide parity under group health plans and group health insurance coverage in the provision of benefits for prosthetic devices and components and benefits for other medical and surgical services; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. BACHMANN (for herself, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. GOODE, Mr. FEENEY, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. SHADEGG):

H.R. 5616. A bill to provide for the repeal of the phase out of incandescent light bulbs unless the Comptroller General makes certain specific findings; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 5617. A bill to amend the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 to require the disclosure of political intelligence activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BORDALLO (for herself, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mr. FARR):

H.R. 5618. A bill to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOUCHER (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 5619. A bill to enhance the ability to combat methamphetamine; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa (for himself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 5620. A bill to establish a program to assure the safety of fresh produce intended for human consumption, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida:

H.R. 5621. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to extend concurrent receipt authority to members and former members of the uniformed services who are entitled to voluntary separation incentive payments and are also entitled to veterans' disability compensation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida:

H.R. 5622. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to establish standards of access to care for veterans seeking health care from certain Department of Veterans Affairs medical facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida (for herself and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 5623. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish licensure requirements for employees and contractor personnel of the Department of Veterans Affairs performing orthotics services, pedorthics services, or prosthetics services in any State in which there is a State licensure requirement for persons performing those services in private practice; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. CLARKE (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. HARMAN, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 5624. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to secure domestic sources of radiological materials that could be used to make a radiological dispersion device against access by terrorists, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CLEAVER:

H.R. 5625. A bill to amend the Economic Stimulus Act of 2008 to provide for a temporary increase in the maximum loan guaranty amount for housing loans guaranteed by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DELAHUNT (for himself and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 5626. A bill to reassert the constitutional role of Congress in making long-term security commitments, to defer significant long-term security commitments to Iraq to the next Administration and Congress, and to maintain international legal authority and immunity for United States Armed Forces in Iraq by promoting the extension of the United Nations mandate; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida (for himself, Mr. SIRES, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 5627. A bill to award the congressional gold medal to Dr. Oscar Elias Biscet, in recognition of his courageous and unwavering commitment to democracy and human rights in Cuba; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Ms. LEE, and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin):

H.R. 5628. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to give individuals who are permitted to cast a provisional ballot in elections for Federal office the option to reregister to vote in such elections at the polling place, to establish a uniform standard for the treatment of provisional ballots cast at incorrect polling places, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. HILL, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WYNN, Mr. PITTS, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. BUYER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. FERGUSON):

H.R. 5629. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a pathway for the licensure of biosimilar biological products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. GIFFORDS:

H.R. 5630. A bill to modify certain requirements with respect to H-1B nonimmigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODE (for himself, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. FORBES, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia):

H.R. 5631. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1155 Seminole Trail in Charlottesville, Virginia, as the ''Corporal Bradley T. Arms Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GORDON (for himself, Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky, and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 5632. A bill to prohibit the importation of certain low-level radioactive waste into the United States; 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. GUTIERREZ (for himself, Mr. WATT, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 5633. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to prohibit certain discriminatory uses of consumer reports and consumer information in connection with certain personal lines of insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas):

H.R. 5634. A bill to exempt from numerical limitations any alien who has received a Ph.D. from an institution of higher education within the 3-year period preceding such alien's petition for special immigrant status; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. BRADY of Texas):

H.R. 5635. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on digital-to-analog converter boxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 5636. A bill to establish a comprehensive process to inform American consumers about food and product recalls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia:

H.R. 5637. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to eligible entities to prevent or alleviate community violence by providing education, mentoring, and counseling services to children, adolescents, teachers, families, and community leaders on the principles and practice of nonviolence; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California:

H.R. 5638. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to create an exception from infringement for certain component parts used to repair another article of manufacture; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado (for himself and Mr. WAMP):

H.R. 5639. A bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to publish physical activity guidelines for the general public, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota):

H.J. Res. 78. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services within the Department of Health and Human Services relating to optional State plan case management

services under the Medicaid Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. INSLEE (for himself, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HINCHEY, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.J. Res. 79. A joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission with respect to broadcast media ownership; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself and Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California):

H. Res. 1045. A resolution recognizing the paramount need to address the threat of international terrorism and protect the global security of the United States by reducing the number and accessibility of nuclear weapons and preventing their proliferation, and directing a portion of the resulting savings towards child survival, hunger, and universal education, and calling on the President to take action to achieve these goals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. FARR, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GERLACH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KUCINICH, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California):

H. Res. 1046. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 2008 as ''National Link Awareness Month'' and recognizing the link between animal cruelty and other forms of societal violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. GERLACH:

H. Res. 1047. A resolution expressing the strong support of the House of Representatives for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization to enter into a Membership Action Plan with Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California (for herself, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H. Res. 1048. A resolution condemning the detention of Dr. Nguyen Quoc Quan, a citizen of the United States, by the Government of Vietnam, and expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should remove permanent normal trade relations status with Vietnam unless Dr. Nguyen is released; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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. MACK (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. BONO MACK, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida):

H. Res. 1049. A resolution calling for the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela to be designated a state sponsor of terrorism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OLVER (for himself, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HODES, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. FARR, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia):

H. Res. 1050. A resolution recognizing Pittsfield, Massachusetts, as being home to the earliest known reference to the word ''baseball'' in the United States as well as being the birthplace of college baseball; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 82: Mr. KUHL of New York and Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 211: Mr. MATHESON.
H.R. 333: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.
H.R. 406: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. HELLER, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 552: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. GIFFORDS, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
H.R. 594: Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 619: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 690: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 706: Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 760: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 847: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 882: Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico.
H.R. 1017; Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 1043: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.
H.R. 1072: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 1103: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 1108: Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 1178: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1193: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1237: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1264: Mr. GERLACH and Mr. KAGEN.
H.R. 1295: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 1363: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 1418: Mr. GOODE, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1431: Mr. ALEXANDER.
H.R. 1439: Mr. FORTUÑO.
H.R. 1594: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1665: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 1767: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 1781: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 1820: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 1843: Ms. RICHARDSON and Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 1992: Mr. CLAY and Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 2054: Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 2091: Mr. KAGEN and Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 2123: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2138: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 2205: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 2342: Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 2469: Mr. BILBRAY.
H.R. 2495: Mr. ALTMIRE.
H.R. 2790: Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 2792: Mr. WU and Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 2820: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
H.R. 2892: Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 2894: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 2896: Mr. BERRY.
H.R. 2897: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 2922: Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 2965: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 3036: Mr. DELAHUNT.
H.R. 3089: Mr. KUHL of New York.
H.R. 3098: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 3175: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 3212: Mr. CONYERS and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 3223: Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 3232: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.
H.R. 3287: Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 3314: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H.R. 3406: Ms. SUTTON.
H.R. 3533: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 3543: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 3544: Mr. BERRY.
H.R. 3547: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 3609: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 3622: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3652: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 3654: Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 3660: Ms. RICHARDSON.
H.R. 3726: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. CARSON.
H.R. 3797: Mr. DOGGETT.
H.R. 3799: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 3822: Mr. RAMSTAD.
H.R. 3825: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 3834: Ms. FALLIN, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 3846: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
H.R. 3865: Mr. OLVER.
H.R. 3934: Mrs. DRAKE and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 3968: Mr. AKIN, Mr. MCNULTY, and Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 4044: Mrs. GILLIBRAND.
H.R. 4054: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 4055: Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 4061: Mr. HULSHOF and Mr. PLATTS.
H.R. 4088: Mr. BUYER.
H.R. 4105: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 4116: Mr. MCINTYRE.
H.R. 4139: Mr. SALAZAR.
H.R. 4230: Ms. SOLIS and Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 4248: Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 4313: Mr. BACA, Mr. KAGEN, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. COOPER, and Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 4318: Mr. TERRY.
H.R. 4460: Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida.
H.R. 4884: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 4897: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 4900: Mr. PORTER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. AKIN, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. KAGEN, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. NUNES, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. SALI, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. STEARNS, Ms. FOXX, Mr. BOREN, and Mr. ROYCE.
H.R. 4926: Mr. GORDON and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 4930: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 4934: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 4959: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 4987: Mr. FEENEY.
H.R. 5032: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. FOXX, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. WAMP, and Mrs. DRAKE.
H.R. 5038: Mr. SIRES and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 5109: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 5130: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 5136: Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 5173: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. KAGEN.

H.R. 5180: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. WYNN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BARROW, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, and Ms. SOLIS.

H.R. 5223: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 5235: Mr. WELDON of Florida and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 5244: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 5268: Mr. STARK and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 5315: Mr. MOORE of Kansas and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 5437: Mr. BOREN and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 5440: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 5443: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 5445: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.

H.R. 5448: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. KAGEN.

H.R. 5461: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 5465: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 5467: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. POE.

H.R. 5470: Mr. BERRY and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 5475: Mr. GRAVES.

H.R. 5481: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. FOSSELLA.

H.R. 5489: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. PUTNAM, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 5490: Ms. FOXX, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. GOODE, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. SHADEGG.

H.R. 5505: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 5510: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 5514: Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 5529: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. MCNERNEY, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 5532: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 5534: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 5542: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 5543: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida and Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 5558: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 5559: Mr. PAUL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 5561: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.J. Res. 53: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.J. Res. 68: Mr. FILNER.

H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. CARNEY.

H. Con. Res. 75: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H. Con. Res. 223: Mr. MARSHALL.

H. Con. Res. 244: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.

H. Con. Res. 305: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H. Con. Res. 315: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. GRAVES.

H. Res. 356: Mr. RADANOVICH.

H. Res. 424: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. ALTMIRE, Ms. SUTTON, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. CASTOR, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HILL, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. EMANUEL, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. MARKEY.

H. Res. 538: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H. Res. 887: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H. Res. 888: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. BACHUS.

H. Res. 896: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Res. 985: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Res. 987: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. HINCHEY.

H. Res. 988: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. HULSHOF.

H. Res. 990: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H. Res. 992: Ms. SUTTON.

H. Res. 997: Mr. ALTMIRE and Mr. COSTA.

H. Res. 1006: Mr. MARSHALL.

H. Res. 1011: Mr. RUSH, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. STARK, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. WATERS, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H. Res. 1016: Mr. JORDAN, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mrs. CUBIN, and Mr. MCCARTHY of California.

H. Res. 1026: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. REYES.

H. Res. 1044: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3547: Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 5464: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 154 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 13, 2008 No. 43

Senate

The Senate met at 10:15 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable MARK L. PRYOR, a Senator from the State of Arkansas.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, gracious Father of us all, You have guided the leadership of this Nation through troubled waters in the past. Lead our lawmakers now into these difficult days. Give our governmental leaders wisdom and energy, that they may successfully meet today's challenges. Assure them of Your presence, love, and grace in their labors. Temper their awareness of privilege in this place with humility and respect toward each other. May their work be productive of justice, equity, and peace. Today, Lord, we also pray Your blessings upon our Nation's military and our men and women in harm's way.

We pray in the Name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable MARK L. PRYOR 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, March 13, 2008.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable MARK L. PRYOR, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PRYOR thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MOMENT OF SILENCE TO HONOR U.S. TROOPS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will observe a moment of silence in honor of our troops.

(Moment of Silence.)

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SENATOR HOWARD METZENBAUM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I had the good fortune to serve in the Senate with one of the real characters of this Senate, Howard Metzenbaum. A smile has to cross my lips when we talk about Howard Metzenbaum because he was someone who really was a Senator. He had read the bills. He wanted to make sure people were treated fairly. If they weren't, he knew how to slow things up. But in the end, he was willing to come around. I have such respect and gratitude for the service to our country of Howard Metzenbaum.

He served 18 years as a Senator from Ohio, from 1976 to 1995. He was really a self-starter, for lack of a better description. He held his first job at age 10 delivering groceries, worked his way through Ohio State University with all kinds of jobs—sold flowers, played trombone in the band at the university, sold magazines, razor blades, rented bicycles. But he graduated Ohio State with all those odd jobs, Ohio State law school.

His first big business break came when he and a partner created a 24-hour staff parking lot at Cleveland's Hopkins Airport. No one had ever heard of a 24-hour parking lot. He did.

Howard Metzenbaum came to the Senate as a very wealthy man. He was a self-made man. He was a man who had made a name for himself. He was a labor lawyer, a union lobbyist. When he came to the Senate, he never forgot the people those unions represented, the working men and women of Ohio. After he left the Senate, he became the head of the Consumer Federation of America, a perfect place for him.

His partner in all this was his wife Shirley, whom we all came to adore. They have four daughters.

I want the RECORD to be spread with my appreciation and admiration for this good man from Ohio.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

PASSING OF SENATOR HOWARD METZENBAUM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, let me also note the passing of our former colleague, Senator Metzenbaum. I think the majority leader captured him well. He was a man who operated in the Senate similarly to two of our colleagues today—I think of Senator COBURN and Senator FEINGOLD—in the sense that he actually was interested in every piece of legislation that went across the Senate floor. He took the time to look at it, to decide whether he thought it was a good idea or not. He was a man of extraordinary passion.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

He was, by his own description, an orthodox liberal and made no apologies about it. As the majority leader has pointed out, he had extraordinary success, rising from absolutely nothing financially and in terms of connections, not only made a substantial amount of money in the private sector but then had a long and distinguished public career as well.

We all remember Senator Metzenbaum with fondness and with respect. I, too, extend my sympathy to the Metzenbaum family.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as we all know, this is the time for the vote-arama or whatever we want to call it. It is usually an exciting day, but it is a difficult day. I have conferred with the two Republican leaders, and what we are going to do—and I ask unanimous consent that this be the case—the first vote we are going to have will occur sometime around 11 o'clock. The first vote will be 15 minutes plus 5, like we do. After that, they will be 10 minutes straight, no wiggle time at all. Senator CONRAD and Senator GREGG have been through this many times. We tried 5 minutes; it doesn't work. But 10 minutes we are going to do. This is going to apply to my side of the aisle and the other side of the aisle, the 10 minutes. We are going to cut things off, if people miss votes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Will the leader yield? That would include, of course, the 1-minute explanation of the amendment on each side.

Mr. REID. Of course. I appreciate that very much. As my friend indicated, prior to each vote there will be 1 minute on each side, pro and con. I also have asked the Parliamentarian to enforce this. I say to the Chair, and I hope you will notify your successor, we are going to gavel people after 1 minute. These 1-minute speeches drag on for 3 or 4 minutes. That takes away from what we are supposed to do. The 1 minute is something we have kind of traditionally started doing. There is nothing in the rules to say you have any time.

I ask unanimous consent that the first vote be 15 minutes plus 5, subsequent votes will be 10 minutes, with no wiggle room after that, and that there be 1 minute on each side on each amendment and that the Chair will enforce the 1 minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my final request would be that the Senator from Ohio, Mr. BROWN, be given 5 minutes to speak as in morning business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent for 3 minutes for Senator KENNEDY.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Ohio.

SENATOR HOWARD METZENBAUM

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, Senator KENNEDY and Senator Metzenbaum were so often fighting for same causes and the same issues and showed the same courage. They both were and are heroes to many. I thank the majority leader for the time.

A great son of Ohio, Senator Howard Metzenbaum, passed away last night in Florida. He was personally inspirational to so many. He changed the lives of Ohioans, as he changed the lives of so many Americans through his lifetime commitment to public service. I am honored to hold his seat in the Senate and to follow in his footsteps.

According to Senate tradition, many Members of the Senate carve their names in the drawers of the desks that line the rows. Whoever has Senator Metzenbaum's desk can, with all of us, share in the legacy of his greatness.

As different as they were, Senator Metzenbaum and Senator John Glenn, who served together for almost two decades, made an unparalleled team for Ohio.

Senator REID mentioned that Howard was a child of poverty. He was a child of prejudice growing up as a Jew on the east side of Cleveland and suffered both from his family's poverty and anti-Semitism in all too many cases. He worked his way in jobs, starting as a 10-year-old, through Ohio State.

Senator REID told us that in the Senate, Senator Metzenbaum was a master of the rules, a constant presence in an often empty Chamber, who would, when leaving the Chamber, post an aide to scout for an unexpected amendment or hastily scheduled floor action on various bills. Once, when a 2-week filibuster was cut off and Metzenbaum was still determined to block action on lifting natural gas price controls, he and a partner sent the Senate into round-the-clock sessions by demanding rollcall votes on 500 amendments. He did not care if he angered his colleagues. He did not care if he was liked every day by his colleagues. What he cared about was to fight for economic and social justice for the 10 million citizens whom he represented in Ohio and for the 250 million or so Americans when he served in the Senate.

The Washington Post, in 1982, said that Senator Metzenbaum singlehandedly saved at least $10 billion by blocking special interest tax breaks and pork-barrel programs.

I remember watching Senator Metzenbaum when I served in the House, at the beginning of my House career and at the end of his Senate career. I watched him as a younger elected official in State politics. Even as he was getting older and he began to show his age, when he stood in front of an audience, the energy just burst from him. Fiery passion for economic justice and social justice poured forth from Howard Metzenbaum. He would start at the podium—he is the first politician I saw do this—and as he would work his way up into his speech and begin to inspire people, he would come away from the podium and walk out into the audience, and he had a strong, powerful voice even when he was no longer speaking into the microphone. People would always respond with the same kind of passion and be inspired by him. That is my clearest, favorite memory of him. His legislative record, of course, was so important too. One of the most important things he did was the plant closing legislation, giving 60 days' notice to workers who too often have seen their jobs disappear with nothing to show for it—pensions, health care, all that.

Howard Metzenbaum always fought for people who had less. He always fought for people who had less privilege than he had. He always fought for opportunity for people of all races and both genders and all social classes. That is what he will be remembered for.

I particularly admire his family. Howard was a great family man—a man who cared very much about Shirley, his wife, and his four daughters: Shelley, Amy, Susan, and Barbara. He will be greatly missed.

After his service in the Senate, as Senator REID said, he became the head of the Consumer Federation of America. He never gave up his passion for fighting for ordinary people and for being a warrior for social and economic justice.

Mr. President, I yield to Senator KENNEDY, who was a comrade in arms in so many ways with Senator Metzenbaum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, one thing I did not mention—the Republican leader is on the floor—we are going to finish this bill tonight. Or if it goes past midnight, we are going to finish it on Friday. We are going to finish this bill. We have a lot of amendments. It is not as if we have not done this before. I hope people will be understanding of the rest of the Senators as to how many amendments are offered.

We understand the rules. You can offer all you want. We are going to finish this legislation tonight. It is important we do that. We have a very important work period coming, with many

things scheduled. I have had a number of Democrats and Republicans come to me and say it would be to everyone's advantage if we finished this bill earlier tonight rather than later. But whenever it is, whether it is late on Thursday, early on Thursday, or early Friday morning, we are going to finish this legislation tonight or in the morning.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts.

SENATOR HOWARD METZENBAUM

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, all of us are deeply saddened with the loss of an extraordinary Senator and a great human being: Howard Metzenbaum. We extend our condolences to Shirley and to the members of the Metzenbaum family.

He truly was the conscience of the Senate for so many years. This is an institution made up of 100 individuals, and all of us wonder whether any of us can make much of a difference in a group of 100. But history will show that Howard Metzenbaum made an extraordinary difference in this institution and for the working men and women of this country whom he championed.

He was an unabashed champion for those who were left out and left behind. So often their interests and their well-being are forgotten, but they never were when Howard Metzenbaum served in this institution.

Reference has been made to one of the great battles, among the many he fought, and that was on this issue of the deregulation of natural gas. Howard and Jim Abourezk and a few of us were interested in that issue. We were following the leadership of Howard Metzenbaum. He absolutely infuriated every Member of this body as he kept us here day and night, day and night, rollcall after rollcall, but he would not give up, and he would not give in.

All of the Members were in an uproar, until finally a solution was reached and the Senate went in adjournment. As Senator Metzenbaum walked out on the Senate steps, Senator after Senator came up and congratulated him. They all were expressing a viewpoint that was unsaid, but they were basically saying beneath their breath that they hoped they could be the champion for their interests as Howard Metzenbaum was a champion for the interests of working men and women in this country.

Howard could scold, he could hassle, he could provoke, he could cajole, but he also could smile and he could joke. He had a warm heart and a brilliant mind. He was a Senator's Senator. He will be greatly missed, but he will be greatly remembered as well for his service to this institution, which he loved, and for the people of Ohio, whom he served so nobly.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I was deeply saddened by the news of the death of our former colleague and friend, Howard Metzenbaum.

The Senator from Ohio was one of the most conscientious, hardest working, and influential Senators I have had the privilege to observe since I came to the Senate in 1979.

We were friends even though we would disagree on some subjects and be on the opposite sides of amendments he would offer on appropriations bills I was supporting. He was a fierce debater and would often become agitated and raise his voice level for effect. But, he always impressed me as sincere, honest, and relentless.

The Senate and the United States were well served by Howard Metzenbaum.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to speak today regarding the passing of former Senator Howard Metzenbaum, who passed away last night at his home in Fort Lauderdale, FL. I think I speak for many of my colleagues when I say that our Nation has lost a principled leader and that Senator Metzenbaum will be missed.

Senator Metzenbaum was born in Cleveland, OH in 1917 and spent much of his life serving the people of that great State. He graduated from Ohio State University in 1939 and received a law degree from that same institution in 1941. The early days of his legal practice were devoted to representing labor unions in Ohio.

In 1943, he began an 8-year period of service in the Ohio State Legislature, serving 4 years in the Ohio House of Representatives and 4 more in the Ohio Senate. He soon became a prominent figure in Ohio politics.

After his time in the Ohio Legislature, he continued his legal practice and also embarked on a very successful career in real estate development, becoming a self-made millionaire through a series of very successful investments. However, he did not stay out of public service for long.

In 1974, Senator Metzenbaum was appointed by Ohio Governor Jack Gilligan to fill the vacancy in the U.S. Senate left by Senator William B. Saxbe who had departed to serve as U.S. Attorney General. After losing a tough primary election to future Senator John Glenn later that year, Howard was elected to Ohio's other Senate seat in 1976, the same year I came to the Senate. He served three Senate terms before retiring in 1995.

I had the privilege of serving with Howard for his entire career in the Senate. It always amazed me how dedicated Howard was and how he dutifully watched out for his constituents' interests. It seemed like he was always on the floor at the right time and ready to stop any amendment that he thought might go against the principled views he held.

For many years, Howard's Senate office was across the hall from my office on the first floor of the Russell Senate Office Building. Frequently, when there was a vote, Howard and I would enter the hallway at the same time and he would immediately make a statement about the loud tie I was wearing. He never failed to notice the unique collection of ties I wore. However, over the years, I noticed his selection of tie choices began to grow louder and louder as well until eventually, we used to see who could wear the most outlandish ties to work each day. We sure did wear some ugly ties trying to outdo each other. We really developed quite a fondness for each other during those years.

As you might expect, Howard and I often found ourselves butting heads on many issues. He certainly had a tendency, at times, to frustrate some of our colleagues. However, we all admired him for his courage and conviction.

Howard was a tough politician. As we came to the close of each of our Senate work periods right before a recess began, you could always find Howard sitting at his desk on the Senate floor objecting to every piece of legislation that he did not agree with. He spent hour upon hour standing up for the people of Ohio.

Howard's enthusiasm in protecting the interests of Ohioans was probably the only thing that exceeded his zeal in guarding against legislation that he viewed as helping large corporations. I recall with some amusement an incident surrounding an amendment I was trying to add to a tax bill on the Senate floor that would have lowered excise taxes for certain companies that supplied materials to mining companies. This amendment had been cleared by the managers of the bill, who were the leaders of the Finance Committee. It appeared that acceptance of the amendment was a done deal.

That is, until Senator Metzenbaum found out that a potentially pro-corporation amendment was about to be accepted.

Howard began objecting to the unanimous consent request to include this amendment in the bill. During a call of the quorum, I went over to chat with him. I informed him that of the roughly two or three dozen mining supply companies that would be helped by this amendment, three were located in Ohio. I could see in his eyes the difficult nature of his dilemma—on the one hand he did not want to spend money on helping corporations and on the other hand, he always wanted to help his beloved Ohioans.

In the end, Howard made what he thought was the best decision for his constituents and agreed to let the amendment go, but not before he had a chance to weigh in his mind the importance of his decision. I remember thinking at the time that I had probably witnessed one of the only times Howard ever changed his mind regarding a piece of legislation.

Mr. President, I want to extend my deepest sympathies to the Metzenbaum family. As I said, Howard and I didn't often find ourselves on the same side of matters before the Senate, but I can say, without reservation, that he was a dedicated public servant, a man I have always admired and a dear friend.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I was saddened to learn that my good friend and former colleague, Senator Howard Metzenbaum, has passed away.

He was a man of courage, conviction, commitment, and toughness. He was a labor lawyer and union lobbyist, who grew up in poverty, and went on to become a champion of the rights of American workers. He was a self-made millionaire who became a dedicated adversary of big business.

I was honored to work with him in the Senate for 18 years. He was an unabashed liberal who brought such an intensity to any issue he was promoting, that it was a pleasure simply to watch him as he worked. It was the high level of energy and emotion that he brought to the issues about which he felt most deeply that prompted me to remark at one point, ''Some men have succeeded in politics through diplomacy and compromise, [but] Howard Metzenbaum's forte has been his passion.''

And he was passionate about liberal causes. During his career in the Senate, he wrote legislation on nutrition-labeling, funding for ''orphan drugs'' for rare diseases, airline safety, and penalties for violations of child-labor laws.

It was a delight to work with him in the incredibly productive 100th Congress—and he was one of the reasons that that particular Congress was so productive. Some of the legislation that Senator Metzenbaum sponsored during that Congress included plant-closing notification and a massive worker-retaining program.

Mr. President, Senator Metzenbaum's support for liberal causes earned him a variety of labels and descriptions. While the Wall Street Journal branded him ''Senator No'' for his determination and ability to block legislation that favored special interests, the Dayton Daily News called him ''Senator Can Do'' for his legislative accomplishments.

The Cleveland Plain Dealer described him as the ''watch dog for American consumers.'' The Gannet News service called him the ''millionaire friend of the little guy.'' The Congressional Quarterly depicted him as the ''Democratic Gatekeeper.'' In his weekly newspaper column, Senator Paul Simon called him ''the tiger of the Senate.'' The head of Handgun Control, Sara Brady, labeled him a ''hero'' for his leadership in fighting for the Brady bill and other gun-control measures. I was privileged to be able to call Senator Metzenbaum ''friend'' and ''colleague.''

American workers and American consumers, as well as members of the Senate, the State of Ohio, and the citizens of our beloved country are all so much better off because he served in this chamber for nearly two decades.

Mr. President, during one of his fights against special interests, the Washington Post editorialized, ''Thank God for Metzenbaum.'' I loved that remark because I, too, wish to ''thank God for [Senator] Metzenbaum.''

Mr. HARKIN, Mr. President, I was saddened to learn of the death, last night, of former Senator Howard Metzenbaum of Ohio. But my grief is leavened by wonderful memories of this extraordinary person and all that he accomplished during his nearly two decades in this body.

There are several essential, bedrock things you quickly learned about Howard Metzenbaum. He was proud, unreconstructed, irrepressible liberal. He was a fighter who never gave in or gave up. And he was utterly intolerant of injustice or discrimination toward any human being.

In many ways, he was a classic child of the Great Depression, raised amidst poverty and anti-Semitic prejudice, and reared on the speeches of his hero, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Howard was a self-made man who said that he was ''born knowing how to make money.'' And he did, indeed, make a fortune in the business world. But, for Howard, money was not an end in itself. It gave him the freedom to devote himself to public service and to the causes that he believed in so passionately.

Howard and I shared a common interest in combating child labor and child slavery around the world. I especially admired his work as a founding member of the RUGMARK Foundation, a non-profit organization dedicated to fighting child labor in the hand-made carpet industry, especially in countries like India and Pakistan.

He poured all his energy and prestige as a U.S. Senator into getting RUGMARK started, and building it into the successful humanitarian organization that it is today. And on many occasions, he joined with other anti-child-labor activists in picketing outside of rug stores that persisted in selling products made with abusive child labor.

Of course, Howard's fight for social and economic justice extended into many other arenas.

For many years, he worked as a lawyer for labor unions, and he always believed passionately in unions as instruments for lifting people up and fighting for justice. It was Senator Metzenbaum who passed the law requiring 60-day notice before a plant could be closed.

And I dare say that the Senate has never had a more outspoken advocate for the American consumer. In fact, after he retired from the Senate, Howard served as chairman of the Consumer Federation of America. He fought for access to affordable prescription drugs. And, with good reason, he was especially proud of the law he passed requiring nutrition labels on all processed food products.

Food labels—listing calories, fat, salt, and cholesterol content—have changed the way Americans shop, and they have given us an important tool for taking charge of our own health. Howard's work on food product labels was the inspiration for my own bill, which would require chain restaurants to provide similar information on the nutritional content of regular menu items.

Mr. President, those of us who were privileged to serve in the Senate with Howard Metzenbaum will never forget his sharp wit and equally sharp tongue. He didn't come to the Senate to be Mr. Popularity; he came here to get things done and to change the world for the better.

And that's exactly what Senator Metzenbaum did during his 19 years in this body. He was a tireless, outspoken voice for working families and union members, for the poor, and for anyone who is oppressed, exploited, or discriminated against.

Mr. President, there was one other great passion in Howard Metzenbaum's life, and that was his love for Shirley, his wife and partner for more than five decades. My thoughts and prayers, today, are with Shirley.

She is saying goodbye to her beloved husband. We are saying goodbye to one of the true giants of the Senate in the late 20th century.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1027

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 351, S. 1027; the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BUNNING. I object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. Con. Res. 70, which the clerk will report by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 70) setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2008 and 2010 through 2013.

Pending:

Baucus amendment No. 4160, to provide tax relief to middle-class families and small businesses, property tax relief to homeowners, relief to those whose homes were damaged or destroyed by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, and tax relief to America's troops and veterans.

Graham amendment No. 4170, to protect families, family farms, and small businesses by extending the income tax rate structure, raising the death tax exemption to $5,000,000 and reducing the maximum death tax rate to no more than 35 percent; to keep education

affordable by extending the college tuition deduction; and to protect senior citizens from higher taxes on their retirement income, maintain U.S. financial market competitiveness, and promote economic growth by extending the lower tax rates on dividends and capital gains.

Bingaman amendment No. 4173, to provide additional funding resources in fiscal year 2009 for investments in innovation and education in order to improve the competitiveness of the United States.

Gregg (for Specter/Craig) amendment No. 4189, to repeal section 13203 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 by restoring the Alternative Minimum Tax rates that had been in effect prior thereto.

Conrad amendment No. 4190, to add a deficit-neutral reserve fund for repealing the 1993 rate increase for the alternative minimum tax for individuals.

Kyl amendment No. 4191, to protect small businesses, family ranches, and farms from the Death Tax by providing a $5 million exemption, a low rate for smaller estates and a maximum rate no higher than 35%.

Conrad (for Salazar) modified amendment No. 4196, to reform the estate tax to avoid subjecting thousands of families, family businesses, and family farms and ranches to the estate tax.

Bunning amendment No. 4192, to repeal the tax increase on Social Security benefits imposed by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993.

Conrad amendment No. 4204, to add a deficit-neutral reserve fund for repealing the 1993 increase in the income tax on Social Security benefits.

Gregg (for Specter) amendment No. 4203, to increase funding for the National Institutes of Health and the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

Dorgan amendment No. 4198, to increase the Indian Health Service by $1,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2009.

Alexander amendment No. 4207, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve energy efficiency and production.

Kennedy amendment No. 4151, to add a deficit-neutral reserve fund for increasing federal student loan limits to protect students against disruptions in the private credit markets.

Sununu amendment No. 4221, to save lives, promote overall health care efficiency, and lower the cost for the delivery of health care services by facilitating the deployment and use of electronic prescribing technologies by physicians.

Murray (for Lincoln) amendment No. 4194, to provide the Veterans Benefits Administration with additional resources to more effectively meet their increasing workload and to better address the unacceptably large claims backlog.

Alexander amendment No. 4222, to take $670,000 used by the EEOC in bringing actions against employers that require their employees to speak English, and instead use the money to teach English to adults through the Department of Education's English Literacy/Civics Education State Grant program.

Sessions amendment No. 4231, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund for border security, immigration enforcement, and criminal alien removal programs.

Cornyn amendment No. 4242, to protect the family budget by providing for a budget point of order against legislation that increases income taxes on taxpayers, including hard-working middle-income families, entrepreneurs, and college students.

Conrad (for Pryor) amendment No. 4181, to add a deficit-neutral reserve fund for Science Parks.

Allard amendment No. 4246, to raise taxes by an unprecedented $1.4 trillion for the purpose of fully funding 111 new or expanded Federal spending programs.

Menendez amendment No. 4259, to establish a reserve fund for immigration reform and enforcement.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, we are on the budget resolution. We will complete work today or tomorrow at some point. It is important we complete the business.

Let me indicate this is the circumstance we inherit: The last balanced budget was in 2001. Since then, this administration has run up record deficits and record debt.

Mr. President, 2004 was the largest dollar deficit in history. In fact, we have now had the five largest deficits in our history under this administration. That dug a very deep hole as we began to write this budget resolution.

This is what has happened to the debt: At the end of the first year of the administration—we do not hold them responsible for the first year because they inherited a budget from the previous administration—the debt of the United States stood at $5.8 trillion. It will be, at the end of 2009, over $10.4 trillion. This administration will nearly have doubled the debt of our country.

In terms of who is financing that debt, increasingly we are dependent on the kindness of strangers because increasingly this money is being borrowed from abroad.

I show this chart: There are 42 Presidents pictured here. It took 224 years to run up $1 trillion of U.S. debt held abroad. This President has more than doubled that amount in 7 years. In fact, he has far more than doubled foreign holdings of U.S. debt in 7 years.

That brings us to this budget, which recognizes the economic weakness our country is confronting. So our first priority is to strengthen the economy and create jobs. We do that by investing in energy, to reduce our dependence on foreign oil. We invest in education, knowing we cannot be a first-class nation unless our people are the best educated, best trained in the world. We invest in our infrastructure, to help make us more competitive. We also expand health care coverage for our children because that is a wise investment that pays off over a lifetime. And we provide tax cuts for the middle class.

At the same time, we restore fiscal responsibility by balancing the budget in 4 years, and maintaining balance in the fifth year. We also seek to make America safer by supporting the troops by providing for veterans' health care, and by protecting the homeland by rejecting the President's proposed cuts in law enforcement, the COPS Program, and our first responders.

We all know the economic weakness the country is currently experiencing. Economic growth, in 2006, averaged 2.6 percent; in 2007, 2.5 percent. The Congressional Budget Office is now estimating for 2008 the economic growth will only be 1.6 percent. Many of us believe the economy is not growing at all at the present time. In fact, we may well be in a recession.

So in order to strengthen the economy, we have provided for stimulus in this budget resolution: some $35 billion in an insurance policy, standby authority in case this economy weakens further; providing relief in the hard-hit housing sector, where we know they are not in a recession, they are in a depression; also having the option of extending unemployment insurance; providing for additional resources for food stamps; and also having the opportunity for additional funding for low-income heating assistance, the WIC program, and infrastructure funding for 2008—projects that are ready to go: road building, highway construction, bridge construction, school construction—projects that are designed, that are engineered, all of the land has been acquired; they just need the money to begin construction and to hire people and to create jobs.

There is also substantial tax relief in this budget resolution: alternative minimum tax relief, so an additional 20 million families are not caught up in the alternative minimum tax; additional energy tax incentives, again to reduce our dependence on foreign oil; additional education tax cuts, in order to make college more affordable; the stimulus provisions we have discussed, especially targeted at the housing sector; and, of course, the all-important extenders—those tax provisions that are expiring that need to be extended.

The first amendment to the budget resolution will also extend the middle-class tax relief. It will extend the marriage penalty relief, the child tax credit, the 10-percent bracket. It will also provide for estate tax reform, providing for an exemption of $3.5 million a person—and all of that to keep pace with inflation as well. It also contains an important new property tax relief measure that the chairman of the Finance Committee will describe, tax relief for our troops and veterans, and tax relief for the victims of Hurricanes Katrina and Rita.

All of that is against the backdrop of a budget that is balanced. Once the Baucus amendment is adopted that extends the middle-class tax relief, we show that we are able to balance the budget in the fourth year, and maintain balance in the fifth year, showing a positive balance in the fourth year of $4 billion, and a similar amount in 2013.

We are also, under this resolution, once the Baucus amendment is adopted, taking the debt as a share of our national income down each and every year, from 69.6 percent, down to 66 percent in 2013. So we have the debt going in the right direction, going down as a share of our national economy.

We also have spending going down under this budget resolution as a share of our national income, from 20.8 percent of gross domestic product in 2009, stepped down each year, until in the

fourth and fifth years we have reduced Federal spending as a share of our national economy to 19.1 percent.

Now, we will hear on the other side assertions that this budget spends hundreds of billions of dollars more. I don't know what budget they are talking about because it is not this budget. This shows the difference between our budget and the President's budget in terms of spending. The red line is the President's spending line. The green line is the spending under this resolution. My colleagues can see, in relative terms, they are very close. There is only a 2-percent difference in spending over the 5 years, the difference between what is in the President's budget and what is in this budget. We use those additional resources for energy, for education, for infrastructure, for our veterans, and to maintain law enforcement programs such as the COPS Program.

One percent: What does this signify? One percent is the difference in the spending level for this next year between our budget and the President's budget. There is 1 percent more spending in our budget in total for 2009 than is in the President's budget. Again, those additional resources are devoted to primarily education, reducing our energy dependence, infrastructure, and veterans health care. Those are the primary areas of difference.

Here are the lines which show the difference between the revenue in our proposal and the revenue in the President's proposal. We will hear there is a $1 trillion tax increase somehow buried in this budget. There is no such thing. They made the same claims last year. There was no $1 trillion tax increase last year; there is no $1 trillion tax increase this year. I said yesterday that if I brought up the menu from the dining room downstairs and introduced it as a budget resolution, our colleagues would say there is a $1 trillion tax increase because that is what they always say.

The fact is the difference in revenue between the two is 2.6 percent. Here is the difference between the revenue in the President's budget and the revenue in our budget: 2.6 percent. That means we are able to pay the debt down more. That means we are able to balance the budget. That means we are able to put some additional resources in these high priority needs such as veterans health care, education, energy, and infrastructure to help create jobs and stimulate this economy and also position America to be fully competitive in the years ahead.

So how could we get 2.6 percent more revenue than the President and not have a tax increase? Well, I suggest we can do it by going after things such as the tax gap, the difference between what is owed and what is paid. The vast majority of us pay what we owe; some don't. That amount of money has become very large. The IRS says in 2001, that gap between what is owed and what is paid was $345 billion.

However, that is not the only place there is money that is not being secured. We have offshore tax havens. The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations has told us we are losing $100 billion a year to these offshore tax havens. Here is an example: A building in the Cayman Islands, a 5-story building that claims to be home to 12,748 companies. They all say they are doing business out of this little building. Does anybody believe that? The only business they are doing down there is monkey business. What they are doing is avoiding and evading their taxes in this United States. We ought to shut it down. If we do shut it down, there is a tremendous amount of money there, according to our Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

This article appeared on March 6 in the Boston Globe: ''Top Iraq contractor skirts U.S. taxes offshore.'' It is a perfect example of what I have been talking about. This story indicates that:

> Kellogg Brown & Root, the nation's top Iraq war contractor and until last year a subsidiary of Halliburton Corp., has avoided paying hundreds of millions of dollars in federal Medicare and Social Security taxes by hiring workers through shell companies based in this tropical tax haven.

I wish that was the exception. Unfortunately, our Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations says it is no exception. It is increasingly the case.

Let me close by saying on the other side, our colleagues will say a $1 trillion tax increase. They made the same claim last year. Now we can go back and check the record and see what actually happened. With Democrats in control of the House and the Senate, did they increase taxes by $1 trillion? What actually happened? Well, if you go check the record—this isn't a forecast, this isn't a projection, this isn't a claim; this is a fact—this Congress reduced taxes by $194 billion. They increased revenue through loophole closers by $7 billion, so a net reduction in taxes of $187 billion. That is what the Congress did. Congress, controlled by the Democrats in the House and the Senate, didn't increase taxes, as was claimed by the other side last year. They make the same claim this year. The fact is we cut taxes, and we cut taxes quite dramatically.

The stimulus package that will lead to checks being sent out to 100 million Americans, that was a tax cut. In addition, fixing the alternative minimum tax so more than 20 million American families weren't hit with increased taxes are in those numbers.

This is a budget resolution worthy of our colleagues' support, and I encourage each of our colleagues to carefully evaluate it and to support it.

Might I, before my colleague begins, thank him for his many courtesies during consideration of the budget resolution. As always, we have differences. My colleagues will hear them now, I am sure. On substantive issues, we have places where we disagree, but he has been an absolute professional in the conduct of the work of this committee and the handling of this resolution on the floor. I thank him for it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, let me join in complimenting the chairman of the committee. He is also a professional and a very enjoyable person to work with. Whether it is his birthday or he is sick, he does a great job around here. I think the comity which we have and the professionalism that is shown, between our staffs especially, who do an extraordinary job, under tremendous pressure, is the way the Senate should work. Obviously, we are debating and engaging on very significant issues of public policy, but they should stay as political and substantive policy debates. The actual operation of the Senate and the management of a piece of legislation such as this needs to be done through cooperation between the two sides, and as a result of the tenor the chairman sets in the committee, it is.

However, as he said, I do disagree. I do disagree with the bill that has been brought forward. In my opinion, it is a lost opportunity of immense proportions.

This Nation faces so many very significant issues—the most significant, of course, being the threat of Islamic terrorism and an attack on our shore again. But that is followed fairly closely by the equally significant issue, in my opinion, of the looming fiscal meltdown of this Nation as a result of the costs which we have put on our children, costs which they will have to bear dealing with paying for the benefits of the retirement of the baby boom generation.

In addition, there are issues such as tax policy and issues such as health care this country needs to deal with. Everybody who fills up their gas tank with gasoline any day of the week knows we better get our hands around the cost of energy or we are going to be in big trouble.

This budget does virtually nothing in any of these areas and, in many of these areas, in my humble opinion, significantly aggravates the problems. The opportunity was there to do things—to do significant things—to take significant steps, to be creative, to be imaginative, to even be bipartisan, which would have been nice, but those opportunities were passed.

Right upfront, this budget underfunds the troops in the field. Now, they are not alone. The administration sent up a budget that did the same thing. But then later, I give the administration credit for correcting their mistake and the Secretary of Defense came forward and said what the right number would be. Last year, the budget and the administration reflected a correct number on what was needed for the troops, but this budget grossly underfunds the troops in the

field. Even if you subscribe to the view of some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, which is that these troops should come home tomorrow and acknowledge surrender, you can't get them home. They are going to be left in the field without the equipment they need, without the tools they need to fight this war under the number in this budget.

In addition, this budget dramatically expands spending. My colleague loves to use a chart which shows two lines together and it is only 1 percent. Well, folks, 1 percent on $3 trillion is real money, at least in New Hampshire. That is $300 billion of increased spending on the discretionary side of the ledger. When you put in the entitlement side of the ledger, it adds up to over $700 billion of increased spending. Also, it gets built into the baseline. In other words, when you spend that extra $22 billion this year, which adds up to over $300 billion over 5 years, that becomes a figure off which the next year's spending occurs. So it gets bigger and bigger and bigger. It grows and grows and grows. There is no attempt in this budget to try to discipline spending on the discretionary side of the ledger but, more importantly, there is absolutely no attempt in this budget for disciplined spending on the entitlement side of the ledger.

We know we are facing a fiscal meltdown as a result of the costs of Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security when this huge generation, of which I am a member and of which my colleague is a member, retires. Sixty-six trillion dollars of unfunded liability will be put on the backs of our children. What does that mean? That means their taxes will go up so much in order to support our generation that they will be unable to afford the lifestyle of our generation. They will not be able to send their kids to college. They will not be able to buy that first house. They will not be able to enjoy the comforts of a lifestyle of affluence this country has obtained, the most affluent country in the world, because entitlement costs will not be able to be borne.

This bill does absolutely nothing in this area. Why? Why do we leave this problem to the next generation? We are the ones who are creating this problem. The administration at least had the courtesy to send up a whole series of ideas and they were all fair and they were all reasonable and none of them impacted the vast majority of Medicare beneficiaries or Social Security beneficiaries. Yes, they did impact Warren Buffett. They suggested the Warren Buffetts of this world—I guess there is only one Warren Buffett—the people who have high incomes, the people with over $80,000 of personal income or $160,000 of joint income, that they should pay a fair portion of the cost of their drug insurance under Medicare. Today, they pay virtually nothing—well, a very small amount anyway, less than a quarter of a percent—a quarter of it. But that idea was not included in this bill, although there will be an amendment to have it included in the bill.

Ideas on improving technology weren't included. Ideas on improving malpractice weren't included. All ideas to get entitlement spending at least partially under control—in fact, the administration proposals which would have reduced the outyear liability which we are passing on to our children and which they can't afford, reduce that liability by almost a third in the area of Medicare, nothing in this bill, absolutely zero.

How much saving is in this bill in discretionary accounts? Zero. How much saving is in this bill in entitlement accounts? Zero. In fact, in both accounts, there are significant expansions and spending.

Then there are the games. This bill is replete with games to try to make it look like it is more reasonable and fair and cost-effective than it is. The most obscene game being played around here is the reconciliation instructions. Reconciliation, as we know—those of us who work here—is the one tool of significance which the Budget Committee has. It allows us to change how entitlement programs are funded and slow their rate of growth—that was the purpose of reconciliation—and do it without the changes being subject to the filibuster rule. It is a vehicle basically directed on the purposes of the Senate.

What has happened in this bill? There is no talk of reconciliation. What happens on the House side? They have a $750 million reconciliation instruction, which is a fig-leaf instruction, under which they intend to build a massive expansion of programmatic activity. The House doesn't need reconciliation. The House is doing the dirty work of the Senate because the Senate leadership on the Democratic side is unwilling to put forward what they are planning to do. It is the ultimate, cynical game of hide and seek with the budget.

That is why I call this the fudge-it budget. There is another fudge-it number in this budget, and that is this alleged tax gap the Senator from North Dakota talks about so much. He talked about it last year. Last year, he said we could get $300 billion. We got zero. In fact, we ended up cutting the IRS last year—the other side did—so they couldn't even collect as effectively as they were collecting the dollars that were coming in. This tax gap number may exist at some level, but there is no record at all that it is ever going to get collected. And you certainly should not be taking credit for it, claiming that is the way you are going to pay for the tax increases in this budget.

This budget has tax increases. Again, the chairman says it is only 2.6 percent. Well, 2.6 percent on $3 trillion is approximately $800 billion. What does it mean in real terms? Well, it means they are going to allow to expire the tax rates on capital gains, dividends, estate taxes, R&D credit, energy credit, tuition tax credit—on a whole series of items that benefit a lot of America.

The claim we hear from their national candidates on the Democratic side is that we are just going to tax the rich; we can pay for everything we want to do if we just tax the rich. If you take the top tax rate from the present level of about 35 percent up to the Clinton years' level of 39.6 percent, you raise $25 billion year. You cannot pay for even 10 percent of what the Democratic party is planning to spend with $25 billion a year. They have $300 billion in this budget alone. Senator OBAMA has proposed another $300 billion of annual increases in spending. They are short hundreds of billions of dollars in tax revenue by taxing the rich. Where is that money going to come from? I will tell you where. It is obvious. It is going to come from hard-working middle-class American families. Our estimate is that this tax package is going to cost the average small business $4,100—small business, which is the backbone of American job creation. This budget is a direct attack on their capacity to create jobs with that type of a tax increase. This budget is going to cost the average senior in America—18 million seniors—$2,200 each. That is what this package is going to cost in tax increases to pay for the spending that is in the program.

My colleague on the other side of the aisle is fond of saying: We didn't raise taxes last year; our budget is not going to raise them. This budget has built into it the expectation that taxes are going to go up by $1.2 trillion. And then they spend the money. They spend the money, so they have to raise the taxes. So they cannot claim it both ways, but they try to. That is why I call it the ''fudge-it budget.''

Individuals in this country—43 million Americans—will have to pay $2,300 each to pay for this budget. That doesn't count what Senator OBAMA and Senator CLINTON are proposing on the campaign trail. As I said earlier, OBAMA has already proposed $300 billion of new spending every year. That is $1.2 trillion over the 5 years. That would double this figure, and it would mean American families would have to pay over $4,500 a year for all of the OBAMA plans for spending, which mirror Senator CLINTON's plan—I don't want to just pick on Senator OBAMA uniquely. On top of this budget, you would have $2,300 plus $2,300, or $4,600 of new taxes on every family in America. Those are not rich families. It is every family who pays taxes of any significance, families who make more than $50,000, to put it into context. Individuals who make more than $30,000 will have to pay this tax. The irony is that we hear, as I mentioned, we are going to just tax the rich.

In this budget, they already assume that the tax rates on the wealthy are going to go from 35 percent to 39.6 percent in years 11 and 12. Then they spend that money. So when these proposals come forward from their national candidates that we are going to

put another $300 billion on the books of new spending next year and we are going to get it from the rich—well, they have already taxed the rich. That is already assumed in here. Who will really pay for it? Working, average Americans and small businesses. Talk about stifling an economy. Nothing will stifle an economy more than that.

This check reflects it. Under this budget, Americans are going to have to write Uncle Sam a check for $2,300 a year. The spending is built into the baseline, and the taxes are coming down the road. It is, regrettably, in my opinion, a budget of missed opportunities and a budget that is misdirected.

What we need in this country is the willingness to step forward and take aggressive steps to get spending under control, especially in the area of entitlements, and to reform our tax laws so they are more efficient and more effective in collecting obligations. But none of that is assumed in this budget, and none of it is attempted in this budget.

We need to support our troops in the field. None of that is assumed in this budget. Whether or not you agree with the policies of fighting terrorism that the President is pursuing, you have to feel that the troops need our support. This budget does not have that support.

We need to have a budget that doesn't constantly game itself, where we set up alleged enforcement mechanisms, such as pay-go, and then manipulate the budget so we go around those enforcement mechanisms. We need to have something here that protects the integrity of the few disciplining initiatives we have, such as reconciliation, rather than right out of the box, with true cynicism, set up a scenario where you are going to game the reconciliation instructions to use them to expand the size of Government instead of controlling the rate of growth of Government.

Most importantly, we need a budget that understands that it is not our money, it is not the Federal Government's money, not the money of the Members of Congress. It is the money of the people who are working out there every day, trying to make ends meet, trying to fill up their gas tanks and pay for the heat in their houses, trying to send their kids to school, trying to pay their mortgage. It is their money, for goodness' sake. Around here, it is treated as if it is our money and as if it is a generous act on our part to let people keep their money. Well, the purpose of the budget should be to structure itself so that we control spending in a manner that allows us to keep taxes under control and doesn't raise the tax burden on working American families.

We are going to be here voting a long time on a lot of issues. A lot of these issues will be raised during those votes. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from North Dakota and the way we have gotten to this point. I, obviously, disagree with the budget as presented.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN). The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, with my time remaining, let me answer a few of the things that were said by my colleague.

No. 1, we fully fund the President's defense and war costs request. So let's not have any misunderstanding about that for the troops.

Mr. GREGG. Will the Senator entertain a question on that?

Mr. CONRAD. I don't have time for a question.

No. 2, the Senator says it is not our money, it is the people's money. He is exactly right. It is also the people's debt, and unfortunately the other side has run up the people's debt.

Finally, there are no tax increases assumed in this budget. In fact, there are significant tax reductions assumed in this budget in AMT, energy tax, incentives, college tax—all of that is in the budget.

A final point. Mr. President, when our colleague says over and over there are these tax increases, those tax increases must be in the President's budget, too, because there is only a 2.6-percent difference in the revenue.

I thank the Chair and our colleagues. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, we want to announce the first 10 votes for the information of our colleagues. This has been cleared on both sides. The Baucus amendment will be followed by the Graham amendment, followed by the Bingaman amendment, the Conrad amendment, the Specter amendment, the Salazar amendment, the Kyl amendment, the Conrad amendment, the Bunning amendment, and the Specter amendment. Those are the first 10 in order. That takes us now to Senator BAUCUS.

AMENDMENT NO. 4160

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 2 minutes, equally divided, on the Baucus amendment. Senators should know that after the 1 minute Senator BAUCUS speaks and Senator GREGG speaks, there will be a 15-minute vote. Senators should understand there will be several subsequent votes.

The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. GREGG. As I understand it, when we go into the vote to come after the first vote, it will be a hard 10-minute vote on each one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. There will be a 5-minute leeway on the first amendment, and we will go into subsequent hard 10-minute votes, with 1 minute of debate on each side. Members should stay here.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, this amendment would maximize the budget's help for America's working families. It would use the surplus to provide tax cuts to every American taxpayer.

Our amendment provides for permanent extensions of 2001 tax cuts that help working families, including the 10-percent bracket, marriage penalty relief, the refundable child credit, the adoption tax credit, and the child-care tax credit.

Our amendment provides for a new property tax deduction available to any American homeowner, even those who don't itemize.

Our amendment includes tax relief for America's military men and women, room to prevent the estate tax from rising above 2009 levels, and protection from unexpected taxes for gulf coast hurricane survivors.

Turning surplus dollars into tax relief for American families is the right thing to do. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I have no problem with this amendment, obviously. It extends tax cuts. I think it is a poster child for the ''fudge-it budget'' because last year the same amendment was offered. Actually, after that budget was adopted, none of those taxes cuts were extended. So now we are doing it again. It is sort of like the gift that keeps giving, reoffering this amendment when it has no actual impact or nothing comes from it. We are for it because it reduces some of the tax burdens in this bill, but it still leaves in place, by our calculation, hundreds of billions of dollars of new taxes on working Americans, which will lead to significant tax increases for working Americans because this doesn't relieve all of the tax burdens in this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time last expired. The question is on agreeing to the Baucus amendment.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 42 Leg.]

YEAS—99

Akaka	Cornyn	Landrieu
Alexander	Craig	Lautenberg
Allard	Crapo	Leahy
Barrasso	DeMint	Levin
Baucus	Dodd	Lieberman
Bayh	Dole	Lincoln
Bennett	Domenici	Lugar
Biden	Dorgan	Martinez
Bingaman	Durbin	McCain
Bond	Ensign	McCaskill
Boxer	Enzi	McConnell
Brown	Feinstein	Menendez
Brownback	Graham	Mikulski
Bunning	Grassley	Murkowski
Burr	Gregg	Murray
Byrd	Hagel	Nelson (FL)
Cantwell	Harkin	Nelson (NE)
Cardin	Hatch	Obama
Carper	Hutchison	Pryor
Casey	Inhofe	Reed
Chambliss	Inouye	Reid
Clinton	Isakson	Roberts
Coburn	Johnson	Rockefeller
Cochran	Kennedy	Salazar
Coleman	Kerry	Sanders
Collins	Klobuchar	Schumer
Conrad	Kohl	Sessions
Corker	Kyl	Shelby

Smith	Sununu	Warner
Snowe	Tester	Webb
Specter	Thune	Whitehouse
Stabenow	Vitter	Wicker
Stevens	Voinovich	Wyden

NAYS—1

Feingold

The amendment (No. 4160) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4170

Mr. BROWN. There are now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote on the Graham amendment, No. 4170.

Who yields time?

We are going to have 2 minutes of debate on each amendment. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I have a modification to the amendment, which I think has been cleared, that I would like to send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 3, line 10, decrease the amount by $245,000,000.

On page 3, line 11, decrease the amount by $949,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, decrease the amount by $3,215,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, decrease the amount by $93,791,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, decrease the amount by $127,024,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, decrease the amount by $151,137,000,000.

On page 3, line 19, decrease the amount by $245,000,000.

On page 3, line 20, decrease the amount by $949,000,000.

On page 3, line 21, decrease the amount by $3,215,000,000.

On page 3, line 22, decrease the amount by $93,791,000,000.

On page 3, line 23, decrease the amount by $127,024,000,000.

On page 3, line 24, decrease the amount by $151,137,000,000.

On page 4, line 4, increase the amount by $1,900,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by $18,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $110,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $2,487,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, increase the amount by $8,005,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, increase the amount by $15,207,000,000.

On page 4, line 13, increase the amount by $1,900,000.

On page 4, line 14, increase the amount by $18,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $110,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $2,487,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $8,005,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $15,207,000,000.

On page 4, line 22, increase the amount by $247,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, increase the amount by $967,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, increase the amount by $3,325,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, increase the amount by $96,278,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by $135,079,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by $166,344,000,000.

On page 5, line 7, increase the amount by $247,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, increase the amount by $1,214,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, increase the amount by $4,539,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, increase the amount by $100,817,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, increase the amount by $235,846,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, increase the amount by $402,190,000,000.

On page 5, line 15, increase the amount by $247,000,000.

On page 5, line 16, increase the amount by $1,214,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, increase the amount by $4,539,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, increase the amount by $100,817,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, increase the amount by $235,846,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, increase the amount by $402,190,000,000.

On page 26, line 12, increase the amount by $1,900,000.

On page 26, line 13, increase the amount by $1,900,000.

On page 26, line 16, increase the amount by $18,000,000.

On page 26, line 17, increase the amount by $18,000,000.

On page 26, line 20, increase the amount by $110,000,000.

On page 26, line 21, increase the amount by $110,000,000.

On page 26, line 24, increase the amount by $2,487,000,000.

On page 26, line 25, increase the amount by $2,487,000,000.

On page 27, line 3, increase the amount by $8,005,000,000.

On page 27, line 4, increase the amount by $8,005,000,000.

On page 27, line 7, increase the amount by $15,207,000,000.

On page 27, line 8, increase the amount by $15,207,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I know we are all busy and trying to catch up on a lot of business, but in 1 minute this is what I am trying to do. This amendment is not about me, it is about a lot of people paying taxes, and their taxes are going to go up if we don't pass this amendment.

The Baucus amendment passed 99 to 1. That was good for America. We are filling in a gap that exists when it comes to the budget and protecting tax cuts. My amendment would extend through 2013 the marginal rate cuts that are now in law. The current law is 25 percent. If we don't pass my amendment, in 2011 the tax will go up to 28 percent, a 10-percent increase, 35 percent becomes 39.6 percent, and that means 23 million Americans are going to pay higher taxes.

The estate tax relief in this amendment would protect families and small businesses from losing, through estate taxes, their deductions and exemptions. It will keep the rate at 45 percent versus 50 percent.

The capital gains rate. Nine million people depend on capital gains to help support their family. The rates go up to 20 percent, if my amendment does not pass, versus 15.

Dividend tax rates are great for our economy. We lock in the dividend tax rate cuts we have achieved the last couple years. Twenty-four million people are affected.

Small business expensing. Under the current law, you get $250,000 under small business expensing. If my amendment doesn't pass, it goes to $25,000.

There is a lot at stake if you vote against my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I checked with the two managers, and on the amendments that are pending, I ask unanimous consent that there be no second-degree amendments on the list of amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Who yields time?

The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, the Graham amendment, well-intentioned as it is, is the road to fiscal irresponsibility. This will absolutely blow a hole in the budget. We now have balance by 2012, and we maintain balance in 2013. If you adopt the Graham amendment—because none of it is paid for, there are no offsets, no spending reductions, no other revenue—it is put on the debt.

So if you want to borrow more from China, if you want to borrow more from Japan, vote for the Graham amendment. If you want to balance the budget, if you want to get this country back on the road to fiscal responsibility, vote no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the Graham amendment. This is a 10-minute vote, and the 10 minutes will be enforced.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 52, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 43 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Alexander	Cornyn	Inhofe
Allard	Craig	Isakson
Barrasso	Crapo	Kyl
Bennett	DeMint	Lugar
Bond	Dole	Martinez
Brownback	Domenici	McCain
Bunning	Ensign	McConnell
Burr	Enzi	Murkowski
Chambliss	Graham	Roberts
Coburn	Grassley	Sessions
Cochran	Gregg	Shelby
Coleman	Hagel	Smith
Collins	Hatch	Specter
Corker	Hutchison	

Stevens	Thune	Warner
Sununu	Vitter	Wicker

NAYS—52

Akaka	Feinstein	Nelson (NE)
Baucus	Harkin	Obama
Bayh	Inouye	Pryor
Biden	Johnson	Reed
Bingaman	Kennedy	Reid
Boxer	Klobuchar	Rockefeller
Brown	Kohl	Salazar
Byrd	Landrieu	Sanders
Cantwell	Lautenberg	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Snowe
Carper	Levin	Stabenow
Casey	Lieberman	Tester
Clinton	Lincoln	Voinovich
Conrad	McCaskill	Webb
Dodd	Menendez	Whitehouse
Dorgan	Mikulski	Wyden
Durbin	Murray	
Feingold	Nelson (FL)	

NOT VOTING—1

Kerry

The amendment (No. 4170), as modified, was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 4173

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are now 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote on the Bingaman amendment, No. 4173. The Senate will come to order.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, this amendment is to raise the caps in the appropriate accounts so there is room in this budget for the President's requested levels of spending for the National Science Foundation and for the Office of Science in the Department of Energy, for science and math education, for research and development. It is an amendment I am proposing for myself and Senator ALEXANDER, Senator DOMENICI, Senator KENNEDY, Senator MIKULSKI, Senator ENSIGN, Senator DURBIN, Senator LANDRIEU, Senator FEINSTEIN, Senator LIEBERMAN, and Senator SCHUMER.

This is bipartisan. It is something we should do. It follows on to the America COMPETES Act that we passed last year.

Let me defer to Senator ALEXANDER the remainder of the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. Who yields time?

Mr. CONRAD. On opposition time, I yield 30 seconds to the Senator.

Mr. GREGG. I look forward to the Senator's opposition.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, this is another example of Senators in this Chamber working together on an important matter and getting a good result. It makes room for us to meet the President's number, to keep our investment in science and technology so we can keep our brainpower advantage and keep jobs from going overseas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. Is there further debate? There are 30 seconds left for the opposition.

All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the Bingaman amendment.

The amendment (No. 4173) was agreed to.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CONRAD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, we can thank Senators BINGAMAN and ALEXANDER for setting a very good example, of taking an amendment on a voice vote.

AMENDMENT NO. 4190

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the Conrad amendment, No. 4190. Who yields time? The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, the alternative minimum tax will affect an additional 20 million families if it is not dealt with. In the budget resolution, we have a 1-year patch to prevent additional families from being hit. This is at a cost of some $62 billion. For the outyears, we are providing in this amendment for a reserve fund that is fully offset so it does not add to the deficit and debt. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, we need to defeat this amendment. This is not the usual AMT fix we are used to. This actually repeals rates of the AMT that were put into effect in 1993. The reality is we are not going to increase taxes in order to pay for the relief that would be provided to taxpayers here. This points out the difference between the Specter amendment, which we will deal with next, and the Conrad amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support the Specter amendment because it is the real deal. It is the real way we will deal with AMT, rather than the phony way that is presented by a mere indication that we will find revenues somewhere to offset against this tax cut. The question the majority would have to answer is: What taxes are you going to raise in order to pay for this rate reduction for the people who would otherwise pay the AMT?

There is certainly no suggestion that there is a spending cut in the offing. Therefore, what taxes would be raised to pay for this?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Conrad amendment.

The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, the Specter amendment puts it on the debt. The Conrad amendment is offset and paid for. I urge colleagues to vote for the Conrad amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I believe it is the practice of the Senate, under the 2-minute rule, that one person speaks for their time, the other person speaks for their time, and there isn't a tradition that you reserve 10 seconds or 15 seconds. If that is going to be the situation, we are going to go back and forth and everybody has to have a last word, we are going to be here for a long time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has not consumed his entire minute.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. That is the observation I was going to make; we had time remaining on our side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 4190, the Conrad amendment.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TESTER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 44 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Akaka	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Baucus	Harkin	Nelson (NE)
Bayh	Inouye	Obama
Bingaman	Johnson	Pryor
Boxer	Kennedy	Reed
Brown	Kerry	Reid
Byrd	Klobuchar	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Kohl	Salazar
Cardin	Landrieu	Sanders
Carper	Lautenberg	Schumer
Casey	Leahy	Snowe
Clinton	Levin	Stabenow
Collins	Lieberman	Tester
Conrad	Lincoln	Voinovich
Dodd	McCaskill	Webb
Dorgan	Menendez	Whitehouse
Durbin	Mikulski	Wyden
Feingold	Murray	

NAYS—46

Alexander	DeMint	McCain
Allard	Dole	McConnell
Barrasso	Domenici	Murkowski
Bennett	Ensign	Roberts
Bond	Enzi	Sessions
Brownback	Graham	Shelby
Bunning	Grassley	Smith
Burr	Gregg	Specter
Chambliss	Hagel	Stevens
Coburn	Hatch	Sununu
Cochran	Hutchison	Thune
Coleman	Inhofe	Vitter
Corker	Isakson	Warner
Cornyn	Kyl	Wicker
Craig	Lugar	
Crapo	Martinez	

NOT VOTING—1

Biden

The amendment (No. 4190) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4189

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the Specter amendment No. 4189. Who yields time?

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, my amendment would reduce the alternative minimum tax rate from 28 to 24 percent. When the tax increase was enacted in 1993, it raised the rates and that has caught many more people in the snare, because the alternative minimum tax was not indexed for inflation.

I provided for no offset, because this tax was never intended to capture the

millions of people to whom it now applies. Originally, it was intended to apply to a very small number of people. So, as a matter of equity, we ought not to have an offset when the tax was not intended to apply at all.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. The amendment that has just passed has dealt with this issue and done it in a deficit-neutral way. The Specter amendment, as he correctly describes, would not be paid for, would not be offset, but would simply add to the debt $185 billion and would mean this budget would not be in balance for any one of the 5 years.

I urge my colleagues to reject the Specter amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 45 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Alexander	DeMint	McConnell
Allard	Dole	Murkowski
Barrasso	Domenici	Nelson (NE)
Bayh	Ensign	Roberts
Bennett	Enzi	Sessions
Bond	Graham	Shelby
Brownback	Grassley	Smith
Bunning	Gregg	Snowe
Burr	Hagel	Specter
Chambliss	Hatch	Stevens
Coburn	Hutchison	Sununu
Cochran	Inhofe	Thune
Coleman	Isakson	Vitter
Collins	Kyl	Warner
Corker	Lugar	Wicker
Craig	Martinez	
Crapo	McCain	

NAYS—50

Akaka	Feinstein	Murray
Baucus	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Biden	Inouye	Obama
Bingaman	Johnson	Pryor
Boxer	Kennedy	Reed
Brown	Kerry	Reid
Byrd	Klobuchar	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Kohl	Salazar
Cardin	Landrieu	Sanders
Carper	Lautenberg	Schumer
Casey	Leahy	Stabenow
Clinton	Levin	Tester
Conrad	Lieberman	Voinovich
Dodd	Lincoln	Webb
Dorgan	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Durbin	Menendez	Wyden
Feingold	Mikulski	

NOT VOTING—1

Cornyn

The amendment (No. 4189) was rejected.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. CONRAD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. GREGG. I object. I object to laying it on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. GREGG. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 46 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Akaka	Feinstein	Murray
Baucus	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Biden	Inouye	Obama
Bingaman	Johnson	Pryor
Boxer	Kennedy	Reed
Brown	Kerry	Reid
Byrd	Klobuchar	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Kohl	Salazar
Cardin	Landrieu	Sanders
Carper	Lautenberg	Schumer
Casey	Leahy	Stabenow
Clinton	Levin	Tester
Conrad	Lieberman	Webb
Dodd	Lincoln	Whitehouse
Dorgan	McCaskill	Wyden
Durbin	Menendez	
Feingold	Mikulski	

NAYS—51

Alexander	Crapo	McCain
Allard	DeMint	McConnell
Barrasso	Dole	Murkowski
Bayh	Domenici	Nelson (NE)
Bennett	Ensign	Roberts
Bond	Enzi	Sessions
Brownback	Graham	Shelby
Bunning	Grassley	Smith
Burr	Gregg	Snowe
Chambliss	Hagel	Specter
Coburn	Hatch	Stevens
Cochran	Hutchison	Sununu
Coleman	Inhofe	Thune
Collins	Isakson	Vitter
Corker	Kyl	Voinovich
Cornyn	Lugar	Warner
Craig	Martinez	Wicker

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the motion to reconsider.

The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President: Where actually do we stand right now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider amendment No. 4189.

The motion is not debatable.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, what is the effect of agreeing to the motion to reconsider?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the motion to reconsider is agreed to, the Senate will revote on amendment No. 4189.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to reconsider.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant journal clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 47 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	Crapo	McCain
Allard	DeMint	McConnell
Barrasso	Dole	Murkowski
Bayh	Domenici	Roberts
Bennett	Ensign	Sessions
Bond	Enzi	Shelby
Brownback	Graham	Smith
Bunning	Grassley	Snowe
Burr	Gregg	Specter
Chambliss	Hagel	Stevens
Coburn	Hatch	Sununu
Cochran	Hutchison	Thune
Coleman	Inhofe	Vitter
Collins	Isakson	Voinovich
Corker	Kyl	Warner
Cornyn	Lugar	Wicker
Craig	Martinez	

NAYS—50

Akaka	Feinstein	Murray
Baucus	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Biden	Inouye	Nelson (NE)
Bingaman	Johnson	Obama
Boxer	Kennedy	Pryor
Brown	Kerry	Reed
Byrd	Klobuchar	Reid
Cantwell	Kohl	Rockefeller
Cardin	Landrieu	Salazar
Carper	Lautenberg	Sanders
Casey	Leahy	Schumer
Clinton	Levin	Stabenow
Conrad	Lieberman	Tester
Dodd	Lincoln	Webb
Dorgan	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Durbin	Menendez	Wyden
Feingold	Mikulski	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this question, the yeas are 50, the nays are 50. The Senate being equally divided, the Vice President votes in the affirmative, and the motion is agreed to.

The question now is on agreeing to the amendment upon reconsideration. The yeas and nays, having been ordered previously, are automatic.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 48 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Alexander	Crapo	McCain
Allard	DeMint	McConnell
Barrasso	Dole	Murkowski
Bayh	Domenici	Roberts
Bennett	Ensign	Sessions
Bond	Enzi	Shelby
Brownback	Graham	Smith
Bunning	Grassley	Snowe
Burr	Gregg	Specter
Chambliss	Hagel	Stevens
Coburn	Hatch	Sununu
Cochran	Hutchison	Thune
Coleman	Inhofe	Vitter
Collins	Isakson	Warner
Corker	Kyl	Wicker
Cornyn	Lugar	
Craig	Martinez	

NAYS—51

Akaka	Feinstein	Murray
Baucus	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Biden	Inouye	Nelson (NE)
Bingaman	Johnson	Obama
Boxer	Kennedy	Pryor
Brown	Kerry	Reed
Byrd	Klobuchar	Reid
Cantwell	Kohl	Rockefeller
Cardin	Landrieu	Salazar
Carper	Lautenberg	Sanders
Casey	Leahy	Schumer
Clinton	Levin	Stabenow
Conrad	Lieberman	Tester
Dodd	Lincoln	Voinovich
Dorgan	McCaskill	Webb
Durbin	Menendez	Whitehouse
Feingold	Mikulski	Wyden

The amendment (No. 4189) was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 4196, AS MODIFIED

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, we now go to the Salazar amendment No. 4196. I see the Senator from Colorado in the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in support of amendment No. 4196. This is about estate tax reform and providing the Finance Committee, Chairman BAUCUS, the opportunity to craft a package that makes sense. This will help make sure that our farmers and ranchers are able to stay on the ranch, that family businesses will be able to keep their family businesses together, and that we can provide certainty for the future in terms of those who will be hit with the estate tax.

There is an alternative amendment that will be coming up by our friend from Arizona, Senator KYL. The problem with that amendment is it is not paid for. We will then continue to build upon this mountain of debt, which has already reached $10 trillion in the last 7 years.

This amendment is paid for and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, the question here is whether we are serious about estate tax reform. We went through the exercise last year and passed it in the budget, and we didn't do anything. We are going to repeat that same thing this year unless we commit ourselves to actually passing a bill, saying we are going to raise taxes—because I am sure we are not going to reduce spending—and that is akin to saying it is not going to happen. Once again, we would be passing an amendment we know we are not going to act on. We need to be accountable to the American people and pass something in the budget that we know we are going to do, with real legislation.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment and to vote for the next amendment, which is the real vote in favor of estate tax return.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TESTER). The question is on agreeing to the Salazar amendment.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 62, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 49 Leg.]

YEAS—38

Akaka	Bayh	Boxer
Baucus	Biden	Byrd
Cantwell	Kohl	Nelson (NE)
Casey	Landrieu	Obama
Clinton	Lautenberg	Pryor
Collins	Leahy	Salazar
Conrad	Lieberman	Snowe
Dodd	Lincoln	Stabenow
Feingold	McCaskill	Tester
Feinstein	Menendez	Voinovich
Inouye	Mikulski	Webb
Johnson	Murray	Wyden
Klobuchar	Nelson (FL)	

NAYS—62

Alexander	Dole	McCain
Allard	Domenici	McConnell
Barrasso	Dorgan	Murkowski
Bennett	Durbin	Reed
Bingaman	Ensign	Reid
Bond	Enzi	Roberts
Brown	Graham	Rockefeller
Brownback	Grassley	Sanders
Bunning	Gregg	Schumer
Burr	Hagel	Sessions
Cardin	Harkin	Shelby
Carper	Hatch	Smith
Chambliss	Hutchison	Specter
Coburn	Inhofe	Stevens
Cochran	Isakson	Sununu
Coleman	Kennedy	Thune
Corker	Kerry	Vitter
Cornyn	Kyl	Warner
Craig	Levin	Whitehouse
Crapo	Lugar	Wicker
DeMint	Martinez	

The amendment (No. 4196), as modified, was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 4191

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the Kyl amendment No. 4191. Who yields time?

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, last year this amendment received 56 votes, Democratic and Republican votes. It was then in the form of a motion to instruct conferees, but the provisions are the same.

This is the amendment on the estate tax that has a top rate not to exceed 35 percent, and it has a $5 million exemption for each spouse, for a total of $10 million.

This amendment is endorsed by small business groups such as the NFIB and by other pro-estate tax reform groups.

I hope my colleagues will agree it is a way to send a very strong signal through the budget process that we are serious about reforming the estate tax this year.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to vote against the amendment of my friend from Arizona because at the end of the day, it does not hold up to the principle of fiscal responsibility. All that the amendment of my friend will do is continue to make the mountain of debt bigger and bigger. It is a mountain of debt that is already at $10 trillion and going beyond. The pay-go rules we have in this Chamber are important for us to maintain if we are going to be fiscally responsible stewards of America's financial treasure.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Kyl amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has 17 seconds remaining.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague's comments. The question is what taxes are we going to raise in order to provide tax relief. I don't think it is realistic that we are going to raise taxes, and I certainly don't expect we will reduce spending. If we are serious about it, we need to send a signal through this amendment if we want to reform the estate tax.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has 22 seconds remaining.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. President, I respond to my friend from Arizona, at the end of the day, if we are going to be fiscally responsible in the Senate, we have to pay for those items that are creating this mountain of debt. We are either serious about paying down the debt in this country and getting a handle on the fiscal responsibility of the last 8 years or we are not. Senator CONRAD has been right in terms of pay-go. I ask my colleagues to vote no.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 4191.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 50 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	DeMint	Martinez
Allard	Dole	McCain
Barrasso	Domenici	McConnell
Bennett	Ensign	Murkowski
Bond	Enzi	Roberts
Brownback	Graham	Sessions
Bunning	Grassley	Shelby
Burr	Gregg	Smith
Chambliss	Hagel	Snowe
Coburn	Hatch	Specter
Cochran	Hutchison	Stevens
Coleman	Inhofe	Sununu
Collins	Isakson	Thune
Corker	Kyl	Vitter
Cornyn	Landrieu	Warner
Craig	Lincoln	Wicker
Crapo	Lugar	

NAYS—50

Akaka	Feingold	Nelson (FL)
Baucus	Feinstein	Nelson (NE)
Bayh	Harkin	Obama
Biden	Inouye	Pryor
Bingaman	Johnson	Reed
Boxer	Kennedy	Reid
Brown	Kerry	Rockefeller
Byrd	Klobuchar	Salazar
Cantwell	Kohl	Sanders
Cardin	Lautenberg	Schumer
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Levin	Tester
Clinton	Lieberman	Voinovich
Conrad	McCaskill	Webb
Dodd	Menendez	Whitehouse
Dorgan	Mikulski	Wyden
Durbin	Murray	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has every Senator voted? Does any Senator wish to change his or her vote?

With 49 in the affirmative, 48 in the negative, the——

Mr. REID. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. REID of Nevada is recorded in the negative.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, the time of the vote has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired. The clerk will tally the vote.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, how am I recorded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recorded in the negative.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, parliamentary inquiry: Once the Presiding Officer has announced the clerks will tally the vote, is the vote not concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators are permitted to change their vote.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, might I inquire as to whether any of the persons who have cast a vote since the Presiding Officer made that comment have changed their vote? The reality is they cast their vote after the time for voting expired by at least 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I appreciate my friend, the distinguished Senator from Arizona, but it has always been the standard here, when there is a close vote—and this is a close vote, I have to acknowledge that; I think now it is 50 to 50—people have the opportunity to change their vote.

We are doing our very best to hold it to the 10-minute limit. To go through the charade of reconsidering because somebody is—it is really unnecessary. This is the vote total, and I think people just have to be very patient. We are going to adhere to the 10-minute limit as much as we can. Everyone knows that if there is a problem on the other side, we do the same thing. We are not playing favorites with anyone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With 50 votes in the affirmative and 50 in the negative, amendment No. 4191 is not agreed to.

The amendment (No. 4191) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote on the Conrad amendment, No. 4204, as modified.

Mr. KYL. Parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. REID. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the motion to lay on the table?

Without objection, the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KYL. Parliamentary inquiry for the benefit of the Senators who are here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, if we are within two or three votes of a tie vote, is it going to be the rule that the Chair will leave the time for voting open by at least 4 minutes, as was just explained?

My second question is, Given the fact that the time was closed and Senator CORNYN was not given the opportunity to vote earlier, what would the Chair's opinion be with respect to having a revote on that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, would the Senator be kind enough to direct his inquiry, through the Chair, to me?

Mr. KYL. I had a parliamentary inquiry, but I will be happy to always have the majority leader comment on whatever.

Mr. REID. I am sorry, I think a lot of us didn't hear the question.

Mr. KYL. I am sorry, Mr. President, I am perhaps confused because I have two questions.

The first was, since the time for voting had clearly expired by at least 4 minutes and the vote was within two or three of being tied and the majority leader said it was the case that Members could continue to change their votes or vote if it was a close vote, whether we had now established a precedent for the remainder of the day that if we are within two or three of a tie vote, even though we are 4 minutes beyond the time for voting, that the Chair would then, according to this precedent, allow people to change their vote or cast a vote?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if I can just respond.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. And certainly I am not taking the place of the Chair. I personally didn't know if Senator CORNYN was coming to vote or not. If you or Senator MCCONNELL or anyone else had indicated that he was on his way, or one of those we have heard that of before—on his way—no one was trying to take advantage of anyone on the vote. No one was trying to take advantage of anyone. But I think we went through a lot of wasted time, and I probably would have done the same thing had I been in your position. But nobody was trying to take advantage of Senator CORNYN. It was late, and that is too bad. We will try to be as fair as we can.

At this stage, we have about 25 votes left.

Mr. GREGG. We have about 40 votes left.

Mr. REID. Okay, so 40. That was the last count I looked at. And we are going to try to move through these as expeditiously as possible. There will be other close votes, and we are going to try to be as fair as we can to you and to us. So no one is trying to take advantage of anyone, and I think there is an order in effect. The order is we are going to have 10-minute votes.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, if I could just address this question to the majority leader. That is exactly the question I had. Since we announced the 10 minutes, in the last vote we went over by about 5 minutes. We need to be consistent and our Members need to know what the rules are going to be. We made an exception here.

My inquiry to the Chair is whether, as a result of that exception, which did change the result of the vote, that the precedent would now be that we actually would have up to 15 minutes to cast votes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, certainly the Chair can respond to this, but there is an order now in effect that we are going to do 10-minute votes. Everybody agreed to that this morning.

I would simply say this: I do say, and I am glad the Senator from Arizona raises this as an issue, that there is not time for lunch, there is no time for meetings, unless you go to the reception area. In the future, I think people are going to have to start missing votes. It is really not fair to both sides if we have people simply off doing other things. Everyone is busy, and the reason we have the 10-minute rule is because we need to work our way through these votes.

So I think you have made a very good point, I say to my friend. I think we need to stick to the 10-minute rule. So we will stick with the 10-minute rule. If you have a problem when people are here shifting votes around—but I think they should be in the Chamber—that is how we will proceed. If anyone can figure a better way to do it, I am happy to listen, but I think the 10-minute rule should apply.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, one final question. I think I need to address this to the Chair as a purely parliamentary inquiry; that is, once the clerk's tally has been requested by the Presiding Officer, is the vote closed or not, except for Members who might wish to change their vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conventional practice of the Senate has been that Senators have been permitted to vote or change their vote at that time.

The Senator from North Dakota.

AMENDMENT NO. 4204, AS MODIFIED

Mr. CONRAD. In regular order, is my amendment next?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. There is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the vote on the Conrad amendment, No. 4204, as modified.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, the alternative I have offered would provide for a reserve fund that would allow the repeal of the 1993 tax increase on Social Security benefits in a way that would protect Social Security and Medicare and not increase the deficit or the debt over the period of the resolution.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who rises in opposition? The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, this is a very interesting amendment, since I have had this amendment the last two times a budget went through the Senate. Senator CONRAD, the chairman of

the Budget Committee, has offered this alternative, but I would note that it contains an instruction that he himself, as chairman, should come up with the savings.

This is a very odd instruction that we put in the budget resolution because it does not say where the savings will occur. I hope he has no intention of raising taxes on other Americans to pay for this amendment.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SALAZAR). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 51 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Akaka	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Baucus	Harkin	Nelson (NE)
Bayh	Inouye	Obama
Biden	Johnson	Pryor
Bingaman	Kennedy	Reed
Boxer	Kerry	Reid
Brown	Klobuchar	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Kohl	Salazar
Cardin	Landrieu	Sanders
Carper	Lautenberg	Schumer
Casey	Leahy	Snowe
Clinton	Levin	Stabenow
Collins	Lieberman	Tester
Conrad	Lincoln	Voinovich
Dodd	McCaskill	Webb
Dorgan	Menendez	Whitehouse
Durbin	Mikulski	Wyden
Feingold	Murray	

NAYS—46

Alexander	DeMint	McCain
Allard	Dole	McConnell
Barrasso	Domenici	Murkowski
Bennett	Ensign	Roberts
Bond	Enzi	Sessions
Brownback	Graham	Shelby
Bunning	Grassley	Smith
Burr	Gregg	Specter
Chambliss	Hagel	Stevens
Coburn	Hatch	Sununu
Cochran	Hutchison	Thune
Coleman	Inhofe	Vitter
Corker	Isakson	Warner
Cornyn	Kyl	Wicker
Craig	Lugar	
Crapo	Martinez	

NOT VOTING—1

Byrd

The amendment (No. 4204) was agreed to.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4192, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the Bunning amendment No. 4192.

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, there is a modification at the desk to my amendment. The Chairman has been notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 3, line 11, decrease the amount by $14,300,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, decrease the amount by $15,600,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, decrease the amount by $17,500,000,000.

On page 3, line 14, decrease the amount by $19,800,000,000.

On page 3, line 15, decrease the amount by $21,600,000,000.

On page 3, line 20, decrease the amount by $14,300,000,000.

On page 3, line 21, decrease the amount by $15,600,000,000.

On page 3, line 22, decrease the amount by $17,500,000,000.

On page 3, line 23, decrease the amount by $19,800,000,000.

On page 3, line 24, decrease the amount by $21,600,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, decrease the amount by $14,300,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, decrease the amount by $15,600,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, decrease the amount by $17,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, decrease the amount by $19,800,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, decrease the amount by $21,600,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, decrease the amount by $14,300,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, decrease the amount by $15,600,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by $17,500,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by $19,800,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by $21,600,000,000.

On page 27, line 16, decrease the amount by $14,300,000,000.

On page 27, line 17, decrease the amount by $14,300,000,000.

On page 27, line 20, decrease the amount by $15,600,000,000.

On page 27, line 21, decrease the amount by $15,600,000,000.

On page 27, line 24, decrease the amount by $17,500,000,000.

On page 27, line 25, decrease the amount by $17,500,000,000.

On page 28, line 3, decrease the amount by $19,800,000,000.

On page 28, line 4, decrease the amount by $19,800,000,000.

On page 28, line 7, decrease the amount by $21,600,000,000.

On page 28, line 8, decrease the amount by $21,600,000,000.

On page 32, line 10, decrease the amount by $21,500,000,000.

On page 32, line 11, decrease the amount by $14,300,000,000.

Mr. BUNNING. This is the third time I have addressed on the Senate floor this amendment, the unfair tax that has been on the senior citizens of this country since 1993 when the additional 35 percent was put on. This time it is paid for, not like the last one we voted on. This time it is paid for in my modification.

It specifically states it is paid for by an across-the-board cut in discretionary spending. We do not touch the entitlement spending, but discretionary spending is cut by the amount of money we need to pay for this cut for our senior citizens.

This is the real cut of taxes for senior citizens. The last one was a ''cover some part of your body'' rather than the real kind of tax cut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, there are real cuts, the Senator is right about that. This would cut, across the board by $21 billion, education, veterans' health, homeland security, law enforcement. If you want to do that, vote for the Bunning amendment.

I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mr. BUNNING. But the other one did not pay for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

Mr. CONRAD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 52 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Alexander	DeMint	McCain
Allard	Dole	McConnell
Barrasso	Domenici	Murkowski
Bennett	Ensign	Roberts
Bond	Enzi	Sessions
Brownback	Graham	Shelby
Bunning	Grassley	Smith
Burr	Gregg	Specter
Chambliss	Hagel	Stevens
Coburn	Hatch	Sununu
Cochran	Hutchison	Thune
Coleman	Inhofe	Vitter
Corker	Isakson	Voinovich
Cornyn	Kyl	Warner
Craig	Lugar	Wicker
Crapo	Martinez	

NAYS—53

Akaka	Feingold	Murray
Baucus	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Bayh	Harkin	Nelson (NE)
Biden	Inouye	Obama
Bingaman	Johnson	Pryor
Boxer	Kennedy	Reed
Brown	Kerry	Reid
Byrd	Klobuchar	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Kohl	Salazar
Cardin	Landrieu	Sanders
Carper	Lautenberg	Schumer
Casey	Leahy	Snowe
Clinton	Levin	Stabenow
Collins	Lieberman	Tester
Conrad	Lincoln	Webb
Dodd	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Dorgan	Menendez	Wyden
Durbin	Mikulski	

The amendment (No. 4192), as modified, was rejected.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the previous vote.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4203

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the Specter amendment No. 4203.

The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I offer this amendment on behalf of 31 Senators. It adds $2.1 billion to NIH funding which would bring it to a total of

$32 billion. NIH has been grossly underfunded for many years. Enormous progress was made during the NIH doubling; major advances on cancer, Parkinson's, and Alzheimer's. It also adds $1 billion for LIHEAP, which is significantly underfunded, bringing the total to $3.5 billion. I urge support of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, it is important to note this is a reprioritization within the budget. I happen to agree with this reprioritization, but it comes out of what is known as the 920 account, which means in order to pay for this, it is an across-the-board cut to all other accounts. I think the Senator is correct that if we are going to prioritize spending, I am willing to do an across-the-board cut to all accounts to put more money into NIH and more money into LIHEAP. I suggest we take it on a voice vote, unless the Senator wants a recorded vote.

Mr. SPECTER. I ask for the yeas and nays. I think it is important people know the strength of this body's support for the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. I encourage Members to support the amendment. The Senator has made a very powerful case for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 4203. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 53 Leg.]

YEAS—95

Akaka	Crapo	Lincoln
Alexander	Dodd	Lugar
Allard	Dole	Martinez
Barrasso	Domenici	McCain
Baucus	Dorgan	McCaskill
Bayh	Durbin	McConnell
Bennett	Ensign	Menendez
Biden	Enzi	Mikulski
Bingaman	Feingold	Murkowski
Bond	Feinstein	Murray
Boxer	Graham	Nelson (FL)
Brown	Grassley	Nelson (NE)
Brownback	Gregg	Obama
Bunning	Hagel	Pryor
Burr	Harkin	Reed
Byrd	Hatch	Reid
Cantwell	Hutchison	Roberts
Cardin	Inouye	Rockefeller
Casey	Isakson	Salazar
Chambliss	Johnson	Sanders
Clinton	Kennedy	Schumer
Coburn	Kerry	Sessions
Cochran	Klobuchar	Shelby
Coleman	Kohl	Smith
Collins	Landrieu	Snowe
Conrad	Lautenberg	Specter
Corker	Leahy	Stabenow
Cornyn	Levin	Stevens
Craig	Lieberman	Sununu
Tester	Warner	Wicker
Thune	Webb	Wyden
Voinovich	Whitehouse	

NAYS—4

Carper	Inhofe
DeMint	Kyl

NOT VOTING—1

Vitter

The amendment (No. 4203) was agreed to.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to reconsider the vote.

Ms. STABENOW. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, the next amendment is an amendment by Senator DORGAN; then there would be a side by side to Senator ALEXANDER's energy reserve amendment; then the Senator ALEXANDER amendment; then the Senator KENNEDY amendment; followed by Senator SUNUNU; followed by Senator LINCOLN; followed by Senator ALEXANDER; a side by side to Alexander; then Alexander; then Menendez; then Sessions; then Cornyn; then Pryor; then Allard. That is the regular order previously entered, for the notice of Senators.

We would note that none of them are subject to second degrees. We will make that request. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that none of these amendments be subject to second degrees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Nebraska). Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, that takes us to the Dorgan amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

AMENDMENT NO. 4198

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, this amendment has to do with Indian health care. We have both a trust responsibility and treaty responsibilities for the health care of American Indians. They are the first Americans.

Let me tell you how we meet our responsibility. We also have a responsibility to provide health care for incarcerated Federal prisoners. We spend twice as much money for health care for our incarcerated prisoners as we do to meet our promise to American Indians for health care. This amendment provides $1 billion restoration of funding for the Indian health care program. It is paid for by a general reduction in function 920.

Let me say again, people are dying as a result of the underfunding for health care for American Indians. It is a promise we have made, and it is long past the time we keep that promise. This amendment is a step in that direction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition in opposition?

The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota has made an exceptional case regarding the failure of the Indian health program, especially as it relates to his citizenry and other citizenry throughout this country. He has pointed out that it involves rationing, poor medical care, and that it involves inconsistent and spotty medical care. I think he has probably made one of the best cases you could possibly make for why we do not want the Federal Government running health care. The Indian health care system is a Federal system.

So however people vote on this amendment, I think we should understand that this vote is a condemnation of the idea of nationalizing our health care system.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 4198.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 54 Leg.]

YEAS—69

Akaka	Dorgan	Mikulski
Bayh	Durbin	Murkowski
Bennett	Feingold	Murray
Biden	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Graham	Nelson (NE)
Boxer	Grassley	Obama
Brown	Harkin	Pryor
Brownback	Inhofe	Reed
Byrd	Inouye	Reid
Cantwell	Johnson	Rockefeller
Cardin	Kennedy	Salazar
Casey	Kerry	Sanders
Clinton	Klobuchar	Schumer
Coburn	Kohl	Smith
Cochran	Landrieu	Specter
Coleman	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Collins	Leahy	Stevens
Conrad	Levin	Tester
Craig	Lieberman	Thune
Crapo	Lincoln	Webb
Dodd	McCain	Whitehouse
Dole	McCaskill	Wicker
Domenici	Menendez	Wyden

NAYS—30

Alexander	DeMint	Martinez
Allard	Ensign	McConnell
Barrasso	Enzi	Roberts
Bond	Gregg	Sessions
Bunning	Hagel	Shelby
Burr	Hatch	Snowe
Carper	Hutchison	Sununu
Chambliss	Isakson	Vitter
Corker	Kyl	Voinovich
Cornyn	Lugar	Warner

NOT VOTING—1

Baucus

The amendment (No. 4198) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4329

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 4329.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Florida [Mr. NELSON], for himself, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. SALAZAR, and Mr. MENENDEZ, proposes an amendment numbered 4329.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve energy efficiency and production)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND PRODUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution by the amounts provided by a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would encourage—

(1) consumers to replace old conventional wood stoves with new clean wood, pellet, or corn stoves certified by the Environmental Protection Agency;

(2) consumers to install smart electricity meters in homes and businesses;

(3) the capture and storage of carbon dioxide emissions from coal projects; and

(4) the development of oil and natural gas resources beneath the outer Continental Shelf in areas not covered by a Presidential or Congressional moratorium.

(b) DEFICIT NEUTRALITY.—Subsection (a) applies only if the legislation described in subsection (a) would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 2 minutes of debate equally divided.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, the Alexander amendment that is coming up unwisely attempts to override the moratorium we have which Congress adopted and the President signed 3 months ago to prevent commercial oil shale leasing, before the impacts of those proposed technologies are known and before the R&D projects in Colorado or Utah have produced any results. So my amendment takes that out.

My amendment also takes out his portion, where he is going to allow oil and gas drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf. Senator ALEXANDER is going to change that just to have gas drilling off Virginia. But I would argue, that is the proverbial camel's nose under the tent and what we fight about each year: Oil drilling off the coast.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, there are only 2 ways to bring down the price of $3.50 gasoline and to keep electricity from going up. One is to reduce demand and one is to increase supply.

The Senator from Florida and I agree on our amendments on several provisions, but he would take out the parts that will increase the supply of natural gas and increase the supply of oil, which will tend to reduce the price of gasoline and reduce the price of natural gas and make us less dependent on people in other countries who are trying to kill us.

I urge a ''no'' vote if you want lower energy prices.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant journal clerk called the roll.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. KLOBUCHAR). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 55 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Akaka	Durbin	Murray
Baucus	Feingold	Nelson (FL)
Bayh	Feinstein	Nelson (NE)
Biden	Harkin	Obama
Bingaman	Inouye	Pryor
Boxer	Johnson	Reed
Brown	Kennedy	Reid
Byrd	Kerry	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Salazar
Cardin	Kohl	Sanders
Carper	Lautenberg	Schumer
Casey	Leahy	Smith
Clinton	Levin	Snowe
Coleman	Lieberman	Stabenow
Collins	Lincoln	Tester
Conrad	Martinez	Webb
Dodd	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Dole	Menendez	Wyden
Dorgan	Mikulski	

NAYS—43

Alexander	DeMint	McConnell
Allard	Domenici	Murkowski
Barrasso	Ensign	Roberts
Bennett	Enzi	Sessions
Bond	Graham	Shelby
Brownback	Grassley	Specter
Bunning	Gregg	Stevens
Burr	Hagel	Sununu
Chambliss	Hatch	Thune
Coburn	Hutchison	Vitter
Cochran	Inhofe	Voinovich
Corker	Isakson	Warner
Cornyn	Kyl	Wicker
Craig	Landrieu	
Crapo	Lugar	

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The amendment (No. 4329) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4207, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote on amendment No. 4207, offered by the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. ALEXANDER.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I have sent a modification of my amendment to the desk.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND PRODUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution by the amounts provided by a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would encourage—

(1) consumers to replace old conventional wood stoves with new clean wood, pellet, or corn stoves certified by the Environmental Protection Agency;

(2) consumers to install smart electricity meters in homes and businesses;

(3) the capture and storage of carbon dioxide emissions from coal projects;

(4) the development of natural gas resources beneath the outer Continental Shelf but only off the coastline of the State of Virginia; and

(5) the development of oil shale resources on public land pursuant to section 369(d) of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15927(d)), without regard to section 433 of the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–161).

(b) DEFICIT NEUTRALITY.—Subsection (a) applies only if the legislation described in subsection (a) would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, my amendment limits the encouragement of the development of natural gas resources beneath the Outer Continental Shelf to the coastline, off the coastline of the State of Virginia.

Madam President, the estimates are that this year 400 billion American dollars are going overseas to buy oil. This amendment has some conservation measures in it, but it also allows us to proceed with the Department of Interior to develop oil from oil shale in the western part of the United States. It allows Virginia, which has asked to do it, to explore for natural gas off the coastline of Virginia. A ''yes'' vote is to bring down $3.50 gasoline prices. The supply of oil and gas is important if we want to bring down the price of oil and gas to Americans and make us less dependent upon foreign oil.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Madam President, I point out that the Alexander amendment takes away the sensible moratorium, which Congress just adopted and the President signed 3 months ago, which prevents commercial oil shale leasing before the impacts of those technologies are known, with the R&D projects in Colorado and Utah. It further starts the process of drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf, which you just protected by adopting my amendment. By doing what Senator ALEXANDER said, the camel's nose is under the tent to start drilling off of Virginia.

I urge a ''no'' vote on Senator ALEXANDER's side-by-side amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have 1 minute to answer the statement made by the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MENENDEZ. Reserving the right to object, if the Senator will amend his request for a minute on each side, I would be happy not to object. I would like to talk about it too.

Mr. DOMENICI. I don't care if the Senator wants 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to a minute on each side? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Madam President, what happened in this case, with reference to shale oil, is the United States has as much shale oil in these two States—Colorado and Utah—as the Saudi Arabians have oil. We had that arranged in our Energy bill, where it was being researched by major American oil companies. In the dead of night, the appropriators changed the law in an appropriations bill and put a moratorium on final regulations so that those who are investing money to see if we can produce this with $100-a-barrel oil out there, or not, they have to look at a moratorium as to whether they should invest money.

There should not be a moratorium. It is protected by law. This is somebody up in one of these States putting a moratorium on in appropriations with nobody around. This Senator wasn't there. If I were there, it would not have happened. We would not have had a bill. We would have had to filibuster that bill because it is so wrong to, in appropriations, say no to the largest body of ore in America that could substitute for crude oil. You might say: Why didn't we do it before? We didn't do it because oil wasn't high enough. Now it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I oppose this amendment because what this will do, as Senator NELSON said, is undo a quarter century of bipartisan agreement where there is a moratorium on the Outer Continental Shelf, both west and east. If we want to end our addiction and if we care about prices, then don't do it by striking another vein, ultimately, of the same energy resource. You do it by considering alternatives. This amendment does nothing about that, but it does undermine the moratorium in the Outer Continental Shelf.

I yield to my colleague from Colorado.

Mr. SALAZAR. Madam President, I urge my colleagues to vote no on this amendment because it deals with the State of Colorado and the oil shale reserves there. We have a thoughtful way to move forward with that program. This is putting the horse ahead of the cart. This is the wrong way to go.

I urge a ''no'' note.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD, is necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 56 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Alexander	DeMint	Lugar
Allard	Domenici	McConnell
Barrasso	Dorgan	Murkowski
Bennett	Ensign	Nelson (NE)
Bond	Enzi	Roberts
Brownback	Graham	Sessions
Bunning	Grassley	Shelby
Burr	Gregg	Specter
Chambliss	Hagel	Stevens
Coburn	Hatch	Sununu
Cochran	Hutchison	Thune
Coleman	Inhofe	Vitter
Corker	Isakson	Voinovich
Cornyn	Johnson	Warner
Craig	Kyl	Wicker
Crapo	Landrieu	

NAYS—51

Akaka	Feingold	Murray
Baucus	Feinstein	Nelson (FL)
Bayh	Harkin	Obama
Biden	Inouye	Pryor
Bingaman	Kennedy	Reed
Boxer	Kerry	Reid
Brown	Klobuchar	Rockefeller
Cantwell	Kohl	Salazar
Cardin	Lautenberg	Sanders
Carper	Leahy	Schumer
Casey	Levin	Smith
Clinton	Lieberman	Snowe
Collins	Lincoln	Stabenow
Conrad	Martinez	Tester
Dodd	McCaskill	Webb
Dole	Menendez	Whitehouse
Durbin	Mikulski	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Byrd	McCain

The amendment (No. 4207), as modified, was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 4151

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, I believe the pending amendment is the amendment I offered earlier; am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendment No. 4151. There is 2 minutes of debate equally divided.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, everyone is aware of the credit crisis and its impact on homeowners. This amendment is designed to ensure that the crisis does not impact students.

The amendment ensures that Congress can act to provide low-interest loans to students who need them. It will bring stability and security to our higher education system. My amendment strengthens the Federal Student Loan Program so that secure, low-interest student loans will always be available to Main Street America, even when Wall Street is in turmoil.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Madam President, the only cost in this country that has risen faster than medical care has been college education. There is no shortage of student loan money under Government-guaranteed loans. We sent $77 billion to colleges and universities last year, half of them through earmarks.

The more money we send to universities, the higher the tuitions go. That is one of the reasons it is higher than it is today. According to the Secretary, in a study issued this last week, there is no shortage of available student loans among the federally backed Student Loan Guarantee Program. There is a slight shortage in the 10-percent private.

This amendment does not address or increase at all the availability that is already there. So we are not doing anything with this amendment other than spending the very money these kids are going to have to pay back. By borrowing now, they will have to pay it back two and threefold.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty seconds remains.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, as I understand, the time has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 4151.

The amendment (No. 4151) was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DURBIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes equally divided on the Sununu amendment.

The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, as I understand it, Senator SUNUNU and Senator KERRY are discussing this amendment. I suggest we move to the next regular order item, if there is no objection, which is Senator LINCOLN's amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 4194

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes equally divided on the Lincoln amendment, No. 4194.

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I will give a moment to the Senator to collect herself and indicate that we are making very good progress. We have a long way to go. We thank colleagues for being so cooperative, but I do indicate that if we have any hope of getting done tonight, even late tonight, it is going to take forbearance on the part of colleagues because we have probably 45, even 50 amendments still pending. That means at three an hour—my colleagues can do the math—we will be well into tomorrow. I ask colleagues, if there is an ability to withhold amendments on this vehicle for another vehicle, that would certainly be helpful.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Madam President, my amendment is a simple one, and that is to better ensure that the men and women who have so courageously served our Nation in uniform receive the benefits to which they are entitled, and certainly have earned, in a more timely manner.

I join my colleague Senator SNOWE in offering this amendment. Last year, we got around $70 million in the budget resolution and then again through the appropriations to specifically go to the Veterans Benefits Administration to hire more claims processing staff.

We have seen a tremendous backlog. I know other Senators in their offices and in their casework find the same situation I do, and that is, these incredible men and women who have served our Nation in uniform and done so in such a courageous and brave way are not getting the benefits they need or deserve. And they are not getting them in a timely way—anywhere from 180 days to more in terms of backlog.

The VBA certainly needs more resources. They need the resources to train these individuals who are working with them to ensure that those benefits are delivered to these brave men and women.

I certainly thank the chairman and the ranking member for working with us, and certainly Senator SNOWE, and urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I am a cosponsor of the Lincoln, Mikulski, and Snowe amendment.

Our military people don't stand in line when they have to serve this country, and they shouldn't have to stand in line to file for their disability claims. This is outrageous. We need to put enough money into the checkbook to protect the troops over there and when they come back here.

Let us vote for this Lincoln amendment. If you support the troops, let us end the backlog.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 4194) was agreed to.

Mr. GREGG. Madam President, I believe we are back to the Sununu amendment. We have a side-by-side, I understand, with Senator KERRY.

AMENDMENT NO. 4221

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is now 2 minutes of debate equally divided on the Sununu amendment.

The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. SUNUNU. Madam President, this is an amendment that simply adds language to the deficit-neutral fund that emphasizes health care IT.

We all know the value of technology and improving health care efficiency, lowering costs, and reducing medical errors. Our language—my language—would ensure that health care IT focuses first on electronic prescriptions. We know we can reduce the number of errors, the mistakes in prescribing, improve the quality of care, and improve health care costs for all our seniors by moving to electronic prescribing, with incentives for doctors, grants for doctors to accelerate this process.

This is based on legislation introduced by Senators KERRY and STABENOW on the Democratic side and Senator ENSIGN and me on the Republican side. It is a strong bipartisan effort that will save money and improve the cost of care. I know Senator KERRY has a similar amendment that adds further language to this section, and I hope the Senate will accept both of the amendments.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, we have no objection to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent that the Sununu amendment pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 4221) was agreed to.

Mr. CONRAD. I move to reconsider, and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 4332

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 4332.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY], for himself, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE, proposes an amendment numbered 4332.

Mr. KERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To promote the modernization of the health care system through the adoption of electronic prescribing technology)

On page 64, line 1, insert '', including incentives or other supports for the adoption of electronic prescribing technology,'' after ''technology''.

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, as the Senator from New Hampshire has said, this is a slight variation of the amendment we just passed. It is an idea we have been working on, on a bipartisan basis and hopefully in the conference the two amendments can be melded into one. We didn't have time to do it now, but I look forward to seeing it pass.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, can we go to consideration of the Kerry amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 4332) was agreed to.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, that takes us to the Kennedy amendment, which is a side-by-side to the Alexander amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

AMENDMENT NO. 4350

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, we are going to have, in a moment, the Alexander amendment. This is an option which I hope the Senate will accept.

The Alexander amendment would undermine our civil rights laws. The Alexander amendment would cut the EEOC's budget at a time when they have reported a 9-percent increase in the charges of discrimination. We should be giving the EEOC more money to fight the problem, not less.

In addition, the kinds of cases the Senator from Tennessee opposes are extremely rare. The EEOC filed only 29 suits in the past 11 years involving English-only policies, and only when speaking English was unnecessary to do the job.

If we want to fund English literacy—and I favor that we should do it—we should do so, but not by harming the EEOC's ability to fight discrimination. So my amendment provides the needed support for English language education, and funds it across the board for the cut, without harming the EEOC's ability to fight discrimination.

Madam President, this is amendment No. 4350.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Massachusetts [Senator KENNEDY] proposes an amendment numbered 4350.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase funding for the Department of Education's English Literacy-Civics Education State Grant program, with an offset)

On page 18, line 16, increase the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 18, line 17, increase the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 27, line 16, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 27, line 17, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, as I understand the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts, he would increase funding for the adult literacy programs to help Americans learning English. I think that is a terrific idea. Since 1906, immigrants have been required to learn English. No Child Left Behind, which the Senator helped to write, measures their progress in English. Legislation I have offered, and which the Senate has passed, gives people who are legally here and who seek to become a citizen a chance to become

a citizen a year early if they become proficient in English.

I support Senator KENNEDY's amendment. In a moment, I will offer my amendment, which will stop the Government from suing the Salvation Army for requiring its employees to speak English on the job. That is a different matter. The Senator is right on this amendment, and I look forward to voting for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. CONRAD. Would the Chair yield for a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I would ask if both Senators would be willing to take voice votes on these two amendments?

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, no, I wish to have the rollcall vote on our amendment.

Mr. GREGG. We are agreeable to a voice vote on the Kennedy amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I would be glad to take it if the Senator from Tennessee wanted a voice vote. I am glad to take it. If he insists on a rollcall, then we will necessitate a rollcall on our side. But I would be glad to voice vote it if the Senator from Tennessee wants to do that.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I admire the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts and I plan to vote for it, but there is not so much admiration for my amendment by some Senators. I wish to have a rollcall vote on it because I think it is time it became the law, and it has already been passed here before. So I will require a rollcall vote on my amendment.

Mr. GREGG. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CONRAD. I ask for the yeas and nays on the Kennedy amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant journal clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. OBAMA) are necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 57 Leg.]

YEAS—95

Akaka	Domenici	Menendez
Alexander	Dorgan	Mikulski
Allard	Durbin	Murkowski
Barrasso	Ensign	Murray
Baucus	Enzi	Nelson (FL)
Bayh	Feingold	Nelson (NE)
Bennett	Feinstein	Pryor
Biden	Graham	Reed
Bingaman	Grassley	Reid
Bond	Gregg	Roberts
Boxer	Hagel	Rockefeller
Brown	Harkin	Salazar
Brownback	Hatch	Sanders
Bunning	Hutchison	Schumer
Burr	Inouye	Sessions
Cantwell	Isakson	Shelby
Cardin	Johnson	Smith
Carper	Kennedy	Snowe
Casey	Kerry	Specter
Chambliss	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Clinton	Kohl	Stevens
Cochran	Kyl	Sununu
Coleman	Landrieu	Tester
Collins	Lautenberg	Thune
Conrad	Leahy	Vitter
Corker	Levin	Voinovich
Cornyn	Lieberman	Warner
Craig	Lincoln	Webb
Crapo	Lugar	Whitehouse
DeMint	Martinez	Wicker
Dodd	McCaskill	Wyden
Dole	McConnell	

NAYS—2

Coburn	Inhofe

NOT VOTING—3

Byrd	McCain	Obama

The amendment (No. 4350) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4222

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on amendment No. 4222, offered by the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. ALEXANDER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, in the 1990s, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., a prominent Democrat, a great friend of the Senator from Massachusetts, wrote a book about the ''Disuniting of America.'' He deplored the balkanization of our country. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is balkanizing our country when it sues the Salvation Army, as it did, for requiring its employees to speak our common language on the job. Any employer may require any employee to speak whatever language, but that is our national language. Only a few things unite us—our common history, the principles in our founding documents, and our common language. We should be valuing rather than devaluing our common language. A vote yes is for uniting America, a vote no on this amendment is for disuniting America, in the words of Arthur Schlesinger.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam President, let's look at what the law is and what the Alexander amendment provides. The law currently says that if there is a need to speak English on the job, fine; employers can require that. But employers cannot use English-only rules as an excuse when they want to fire minorities who are performing the job correctly. In this fact situation, those employees had performed the job correctly for 5 years.

In addition, this amendment reduces the EEOC's ability to fight all forms of discrimination because it cuts the entire budget. That means race, age, religion, and disability cases will be harmed.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. GREGG. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia, (Mr. BYRD), is necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 58 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Alexander	Crapo	McConnell
Allard	DeMint	Murkowski
Barrasso	Dole	Nelson (NE)
Baucus	Domenici	Pryor
Bayh	Ensign	Roberts
Bennett	Enzi	Sessions
Bond	Graham	Shelby
Brownback	Grassley	Smith
Bunning	Gregg	Snowe
Burr	Hagel	Specter
Chambliss	Hatch	Stevens
Coburn	Hutchison	Sununu
Cochran	Inhofe	Tester
Coleman	Isakson	Thune
Collins	Kyl	Vitter
Corker	Landrieu	Voinovich
Cornyn	Lincoln	Warner
Craig	Lugar	Wicker

NAYS—44

Akaka	Feinstein	Mikulski
Biden	Harkin	Murray
Bingaman	Inouye	Nelson (FL)
Boxer	Johnson	Obama
Brown	Kennedy	Reed
Cantwell	Kerry	Reid
Cardin	Klobuchar	Rockefeller
Carper	Kohl	Salazar
Casey	Lautenberg	Sanders
Clinton	Leahy	Schumer
Conrad	Levin	Stabenow
Dodd	Lieberman	Webb
Dorgan	Martinez	Whitehouse
Durbin	McCaskill	Wyden
Feingold	Menendez	

NOT VOTING—2

Byrd	McCain

The amendment (No. 4222) was agreed to.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I think it would be useful at this point to recap the next tranche of amendments. The following amendments are in order: Menendez, 4259; Sessions, 4231; Cornyn, 4242; Pryor, 4181; Allard, 4246;

Nelson, 4212, Ensign 4240; Sanders, 4218; Conrad, undesignated; Gregg, 4305; Reed, 4154; DeMint 4328; Biden, 4164; Dole, 4208; Dodd, 4254; Allard, 4232; Brown, 4155; Brownback, 4284; Kohl, 4197; Baucus side-by-side, undesignated; Hatch, 4280. That is the order of the next tranche of amendments.

Let me say for the benefit of our colleagues that it is going to take real restraint if we are going to have any kind of reasonable ending by any kind of reasonable time. All of those amendments are in order. We are prepared to vote on them. To the extent colleagues could withhold on additional amendments, that would certainly be helpful.

We are rapidly approaching the point at which we will have had the average number of amendments on a budget resolution. It runs from 32 to 36, roughly, on a budget resolution for rollcall votes. If we get through this tranche, I think we will be well over that number. But colleagues have a right, we understand that. We ask people to think if there is a possibility to withhold.

Senator MENENDEZ is next.

AMENDMENT NO. 4259

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided on the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. MENENDEZ.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, my amendment creates a deficit reserve fund to support increased border security and enforcement of immigration laws. But instead of going down the same old tired way that has not created results, as you will be asked to do in the amendment from Senator SESSIONS, what we do is actually go after the magnet that brings people to this country; that is, jobs and those who employ them illegally.

So we have the ability, under this amendment, to pursue civil penalties against bad-actor employers, to render them ineligible to receive Federal contracts; to also go after criminal aliens in Federal, State, and local prisons to make sure we deport them; and finally, to implement the exit data portion of the US-VISIT entry and exit data system so we know who is coming into this country and how to track them. These are the ways we will begin to address some of our immigration challenges.

Finally, we make sure we allow the National Guard to go to the border but not until we have it declared that it will not impede or render unsafe our troops abroad, which the National Guard are supporting.

For all those reasons, I urge my colleagues to support our amendment and oppose the amendment from Senator SESSIONS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, the amendment offered by my colleague is an amendment that does not effectively replace the amendment I have offered.

My amendment that will be coming up next is a broad amendment. But this amendment contains immigration reform language that suggests once again that enforcement cannot be effectively done without a comprehensive amnesty approach. It fails to include any provision for State and local law enforcement, fails to include any provision for border fencing, fails to include any provision to advance specifically the effective operations streamline policy that is being done now in four border areas, that needs to be done in 20, and that has resulted in a 60-percent reduction in illegal entry in those four areas. The Menendez amendment does not particularly cover that area. I would ask that it not be passed and that my amendment coming up next would be the one more appropriately effective to carry out the will of this Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD, is necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 59 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Akaka	Feinstein	Murray
Baucus	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Bayh	Inouye	Nelson (NE)
Biden	Johnson	Obama
Bingaman	Kennedy	Pryor
Boxer	Kerry	Reed
Brown	Klobuchar	Reid
Cantwell	Kohl	Rockefeller
Cardin	Landrieu	Salazar
Carper	Lautenberg	Sanders
Casey	Leahy	Schumer
Clinton	Levin	Snowe
Coleman	Lieberman	Stabenow
Collins	Lincoln	Sununu
Conrad	Martinez	Tester
Dodd	McCaskill	Whitehouse
Durbin	Menendez	Wyden
Feingold	Mikulski	

NAYS—45

Alexander	DeMint	Lugar
Allard	Dole	McConnell
Barrasso	Domenici	Murkowski
Bennett	Dorgan	Roberts
Bond	Ensign	Sessions
Brownback	Enzi	Shelby
Bunning	Graham	Smith
Burr	Grassley	Specter
Chambliss	Gregg	Stevens
Coburn	Hagel	Thune
Cochran	Hatch	Vitter
Corker	Hutchison	Voinovich
Cornyn	Inhofe	Warner
Craig	Isakson	Webb
Crapo	Kyl	Wicker

NOT VOTING—2

Byrd	McCain

The amendment (No. 4259) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4231

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on amendment No. 4231 offered by the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SESSIONS.

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, this Senate has repeatedly voted on issue after issue after issue that would move us toward a lawful system of immigration. But for one reason or the other, those votes have not been translated into action or funding. As a result, we have not made the progress we should have made. We have created a lack of confidence in the American people who are cynical about what we do. My amendment is broad. It would allow a budget-neutral reserve fund for any immigration factor, but it specifically mentions six. It does not in any way suggest these enforcement measures should be delayed until some amnesty proposal or comprehensive reform is passed. The programs include Operation Streamline. Four of twenty southern border sectors now are prosecuting illegal entries, and they have seen a 60-percent reduction in illegality. We would like to see that in all 20, of course. It would commit us to construction of the fence and four other areas.

I urge support for this amendment, which would clearly move us in the direction we have been voting in the past.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. The Senate, in a significant vote, voted to get to the heart of the matter, the draw of jobs and those who offer them illegally. That is where the whole issue is. The Senate acted intelligently in that respect. It was tough and smart. But under the Sessions amendment, we are going to deploy another 6,000 National Guard, without conditions, to the border at a time in which we are overstretched with the National Guard in Iraq, Afghanistan, and for challenges that States have for emergencies in their own States. We are going to go ahead and deputize local police in local departments. I believe that is a mistake. We have had these before. They have not succeeded. We succeeded in passing an amendment that is going to be tough and smart and deal with the heart of the matter—employers who illegally hire people. It will make sure they get sanctioned, make sure we proceed against those who have Federal contracts doing this and makes sure we get rid of criminal aliens in the jails—local, State and Federal. That is the way to pursue it.

Vote against the Sessions amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 4231.

Mr. REID. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) is necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Nebraska). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 60 Leg.]

YEAS—61

Alexander	Dole	Murkowski
Allard	Domenici	Nelson (NE)
Barrasso	Dorgan	Pryor
Baucus	Ensign	Roberts
Bayh	Enzi	Sessions
Bennett	Graham	Shelby
Bond	Grassley	Smith
Brownback	Gregg	Snowe
Bunning	Hagel	Specter
Burr	Hatch	Stevens
Carper	Hutchison	Sununu
Chambliss	Inhofe	Tester
Coburn	Isakson	Thune
Cochran	Klobuchar	Vitter
Coleman	Kyl	Voinovich
Collins	Landrieu	Warner
Corker	Lincoln	Webb
Cornyn	Lugar	Wicker
Craig	Martinez	Wyden
Crapo	McCaskill	
DeMint	McConnell	

NAYS—37

Akaka	Feinstein	Murray
Biden	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Inouye	Obama
Boxer	Johnson	Reed
Brown	Kennedy	Reid
Cantwell	Kerry	Rockefeller
Cardin	Kohl	Salazar
Casey	Lautenberg	Sanders
Clinton	Leahy	Schumer
Conrad	Levin	Stabenow
Dodd	Lieberman	Whitehouse
Durbin	Menendez	
Feingold	Mikulski	

NOT VOTING—2

Byrd	McCain

The amendment (No. 4231) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4242

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WEBB). There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on amendment No. 4242, offered by the Senator from Texas, Mr. CORNYN.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this amendment creates a 60-vote point of order against any legislation that will increase income tax rates on taxpayers, including, of course, middle-class families and others.

If this looks familiar, it is because it is. Last year, we had a vote on this precise amendment. You will see that we had 63 Senators vote in support of this point of order against raising income tax rates, including our friends on the other side of the aisle whose names are indicated on this chart.

I understand from the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee he may offer a procedural objection to this amendment, but we are prepared at the appropriate time to offer a motion to waive any objection.

I ask for support on this bipartisan legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, might I ask the Parliamentarian, through the Presiding Officer, a series of questions about this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state his inquiries.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, No. 1, is this amendment germane to the budget resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, it is not germane.

Mr. CONRAD. No. 2, if this amendment were to be adopted, is it corrosive to the privileged nature of a budget resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, the amendment would be corrosive to the budget resolution.

Mr. CONRAD. No. 3, if this amendment came back from the conference committee, would it be fatal to the privileged nature of the budget resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would be fatal to the privileged nature of the budget resolution.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, that is the problem with this amendment. This is not in the jurisdiction——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CONRAD. It is not in the jurisdiction of the committee.

Is all time yielded back?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time has expired.

Mr. CORNYN. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I inquire whether adding the amendment at this point—that is, prior to any conference committee—would endanger the privileged nature of the budget resolution as opposed to offering it and adding it in conference? In other words, is there any difference between doing it now and adding it later?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is corrosive, but not fatal, to add the amendment at this point in terms of the privilege.

Mr. CORNYN. So it would not affect the privileged status of the budget resolution to agree to my amendment at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would not fatally affect it at this time.

Mr. CORNYN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, it would fatally affect it if it came back from conference committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. CONRAD. I raise a point of order that the Cornyn amendment is not germane and therefore violates section 305 of the Budget Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, pursuant to Section 904(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I move to waive section 305(b)2 of the Budget Act for consideration of this amendment to S. Con. Res. 70, and I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) is necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANDERS). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 58, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 61 Leg.]

YEAS—58

Alexander	DeMint	Murkowski
Allard	Dole	Nelson (NE)
Barrasso	Domenici	Pryor
Baucus	Ensign	Roberts
Bayh	Enzi	Salazar
Bennett	Graham	Sessions
Bond	Grassley	Shelby
Brownback	Gregg	Smith
Bunning	Hagel	Snowe
Burr	Hatch	Specter
Cantwell	Hutchison	Stevens
Chambliss	Inhofe	Sununu
Coburn	Isakson	Tester
Cochran	Kohl	Thune
Coleman	Kyl	Vitter
Collins	Lincoln	Voinovich
Corker	Lugar	Warner
Cornyn	Martinez	Wicker
Craig	McCaskill	
Crapo	McConnell	

NAYS—40

Akaka	Feinstein	Murray
Biden	Harkin	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Inouye	Obama
Boxer	Johnson	Reed
Brown	Kennedy	Reid
Cardin	Kerry	Rockefeller
Carper	Klobuchar	Sanders
Casey	Landrieu	Schumer
Clinton	Lautenberg	Stabenow
Conrad	Leahy	Webb
Dodd	Levin	Whitehouse
Dorgan	Lieberman	Wyden
Durbin	Menendez	
Feingold	Mikulski	

NOT VOTING—2

Byrd	McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 59, nays 39. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected. The point of order is sustained and the amendment falls.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, we have now cast roughly 19 rollcall votes. We have another 20 pending. For the background of Senators, in 2005, we had 37 recorded rollcall votes; in 2006, we had 36 recorded rollcall votes; in 2007, we

had 32 recorded rollcall votes. So with the votes we have already had and the votes in the train, we will have exceeded the recorded rollcall votes of any of the last 3 years.

I say that knowing Senators have a right to continue to ask for amendments, certainly. But to put it into some perspective, with 20 additional amendments to be voted on, that would take 7 hours, which would put us at midnight. I know sometimes the Senate does its best work after dark, but I hope we will think seriously about relinquishing some of these amendments and save them for a later vehicle.

AMENDMENT NO. 4181

Mr. CONRAD. The next vote in order is the vote on the amendment by the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. PRYOR. We have indicated that on both sides we would be willing to take that as a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. President, this is amendment No. 4181. The cosponsors are Senators SNOWE, BINGAMAN, and KERRY. It is a deficit-neutral reserve fund for science parks. These are sometimes called technology parks or business incubators. But there is no doubt these science parks have a great track record of spurring innovation and job creation at a time when the economy is slowing and international competition is growing. We need to do everything we can to provide good-paying jobs for American workers.

More than 300,000 workers in North America work in a university science park. Every job there generates an average of 2.57 jobs in the economy.

With that, I think we have an agreement that we will voice vote this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 4181) was agreed to.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mrs. BOXER. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4246

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, that would take us to the Allard amendment No. 4246.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 2 minutes equally divided. Who yields time?

The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I call for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, on the campaign trial, Senator OBAMA has called for about 188 proposals of new spending. What this amendment consists of is this. We take 111 of those new spending proposals and we put them in this amendment. If you look at it with the 2009 5-year budget, it will cost this country around $1.4 trillion. The argument has been made on the campaign trail this will be paid for by taxing the rich. That is not possible.

If you apply tax increases to those who make $250,000, or more per year, all you come up with is about $225 billion. That is not even close to what it takes to pay for all these new proposals. What you are going to do is have to cram your hands into the pockets of small businesses and the middle-class families and yank the money out of their pockets and send it to Washington to pay for a bloated bureaucracy.

The point of this amendment is you cannot pay for all the spending by taxing the rich.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, this amendment is a concoction. It is a complete fabrication. Senator OBAMA is not the President of the United States. Senator OBAMA has not presented a budget to this body. This is make-believe.

I think it is unfortunate the Senator has offered this amendment styled in this way. We have not done that. I think this is beneath the dignity of the Senate. I urge my colleagues to vote no against what is a complete fiction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) would vote ''no.''

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 0, nays 97, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 62 Leg.]

NAYS—97

Akaka	Coleman	Hutchison
Alexander	Collins	Inhofe
Allard	Conrad	Inouye
Barrasso	Corker	Isakson
Baucus	Cornyn	Johnson
Bayh	Craig	Kennedy
Bennett	Crapo	Kerry
Biden	DeMint	Klobuchar
Bingaman	Dodd	Kohl
Bond	Dole	Kyl
Boxer	Domenici	Landrieu
Brown	Dorgan	Lautenberg
Brownback	Durbin	Leahy
Bunning	Ensign	Levin
Burr	Enzi	Lieberman
Cantwell	Feingold	Lugar
Cardin	Feinstein	Martinez
Carper	Graham	McCaskill
Casey	Grassley	McConnell
Chambliss	Gregg	Menendez
Clinton	Hagel	Mikulski
Coburn	Harkin	Murkowski
Cochran	Hatch	Murray
Nelson (FL)	Schumer	Thune
Nelson (NE)	Sessions	Vitter
Obama	Shelby	Voinovich
Pryor	Smith	Warner
Reed	Snowe	Webb
Reid	Specter	Whitehouse
Roberts	Stabenow	Wicker
Rockefeller	Stevens	Wyden
Salazar	Sununu	
Sanders	Tester	

NOT VOTING—3

Byrd	Lincoln	McCain

The amendment (No. 4246) was rejected.

Mr. DORGAN. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEAHY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4212

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, the next amendment in order is the Nelson amendment on construction. I understand the Senator has a modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NELSON of Nebraska. Mr. President, the modification is not in the body of the amendment but in the stated purpose. To make the statement of purpose acceptable to the other side, we have stricken the word ''emergency.'' That meets with the approval of the other side, so it is now as changed.

As we all know, the budget resolution before us includes room in the budget in 2008 and 2009 for an additional stimulus package. The distinguished chairman included this ''insurance policy'' against further economic downturn, and I commend him for it. I also thank him and Senator BAUCUS and all the distinguished bipartisan cosponsors for working with me to adopt this amendment.

The amendment simply allocates more of the stimulus money for ''ready to go'' infrastructure projects. The amendment moves $3.5 billion from the allowances functions to the transportation function and designates it as fiscal year 2008 discretionary funding. This existing money is already assumed in the resolution.

I reiterate this point: The $3.5 billion is already assumed in the resolution. The idea behind this amendment is simple. If we are going to spend, we should invest. This amendment injects money into the economy and creates jobs, over 40,000 jobs per billion dollars of infrastructure expenditures, but it also makes a lasting investment in infrastructure that will remain long after the economy recovers.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant journal clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NELSON], for himself, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. BAUCUS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. CONRAD, and Ms. STABENOW, proposes an amendment numbered 4212.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To create additional jobs and make a lasting investment in our national infrastructure by increasing Fiscal Year 2008 infrastructure stimulus funding by designating $3.5 billion in existing stimulus funding in the resolution as discretionary funding)

On page 16, line 9, increase the amount by $3,500,000,000.

On page 16, line 10, increase the amount by $3,500,000,000.

On page 27, line 12, decrease the amount by $3,500,000,000.

On page 27, line 13, decrease the amount by $3,500,000,000.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 4212) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4240

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, the next amendment is the Ensign amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. President, briefly, this amendment is to means test Medicare Part D the same way we means test Medicare Part B. An individual making over $82,000 a year, a couple making over $164,000—seniors—would be expected to pay a little over $10 a month extra. That is all we are doing.

This amendment saves a couple billion dollars over the next 5 years. It is very reasonable. There is nothing else in this budget that does anything on entitlement reform, and we all know entitlements are heading for a train wreck in this country. We ought to at least do this little bit for our children for deficit reduction.

I encourage all Senators to vote for this amendment. It is very reasonable. It is modeled exactly after Medicare Part B means testing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant journal clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. ENSIGN], for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. DEMINT, proposes an amendment numbered 4240.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require wealthy Medicare beneficiaries to pay a greater share of their Medicare Part D premiums)

On page 4, line 5, decrease the amount by $125,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, decrease the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, decrease the amount by $375,000,000.

On page 4, line 8, decrease the amount by $450,000,000.

On page 4, line 9, decrease the amount by $550,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, decrease the amount by $125,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, decrease the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by $375,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by $450,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, decrease the amount by $550,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, decrease the amount by $125,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, decrease the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, decrease the amount by $375,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, decrease the amount by $450,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, decrease the amount by $550,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by $125,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $425,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $800,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $1,250,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $1,800,000,000.

On page 5, line 16, decrease the amount by $125,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, decrease the amount by $425,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, decrease the amount by $800,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, decrease the amount by $1,250,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, decrease the amount by $1,800,000,000.

On page 20, line 16, decrease the amount by $125,000,000.

On page 20, line 17, decrease the amount by $125,000,000.

On page 20, line 20, decrease the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 20, line 21, decrease the amount by $300,000,000.

On page 20, line 24, decrease the amount by $375,000,000.

On page 20, line 25, decrease the amount by $375,000,000.

On page 21, line 3, decrease the amount by $450,000,000.

On page 21, line 4, decrease the amount by $450,000,000.

On page 21, line 7, decrease the amount by $550,000,000.

On page 21, line 8, decrease the amount by $550,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, the problem with this amendment is exactly what the sponsor said: It is exactly like Part B. Part B, as we know, is a premium that is paid with respect to doctors' examinations and Medicare reimbursement. Part D is the drug benefit. Part D premiums vary significantly nationwide according to geography and according to the plans offered. It is nothing like Part B.

To say we should pattern this off Part B is a statement not fully appreciative of the sophistication of the changes in the Part D. That is one reason not to support this amendment.

Second, any change in Part D is required to be in any Medicare bill if it comes up. We may want to make other Medicare changes. We don't want to be restricted to means testing.

Third, this should be considered broad health care reform, at least Medicare reform, and not be isolated in this case.

I strongly urge this amendment not be adopted.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 4240.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant journal clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) is necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARPER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 56, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 63 Leg.]

YEAS—42

Alexander	Cornyn	Kyl
Allard	Craig	Lugar
Barrasso	Crapo	McCaskill
Bennett	DeMint	McConnell
Bond	Dole	Murkowski
Brownback	Ensign	Roberts
Bunning	Enzi	Sessions
Burr	Graham	Shelby
Carper	Grassley	Stevens
Chambliss	Gregg	Sununu
Coburn	Hagel	Thune
Coleman	Hatch	Vitter
Collins	Inhofe	Voinovich
Corker	Isakson	Warner

NAYS—56

Akaka	Harkin	Nelson (NE)
Baucus	Hutchison	Obama
Bayh	Inouye	Pryor
Biden	Johnson	Reed
Bingaman	Kennedy	Reid
Boxer	Kerry	Rockefeller
Brown	Klobuchar	Salazar
Cantwell	Kohl	Sanders
Cardin	Landrieu	Schumer
Casey	Lautenberg	Smith
Clinton	Leahy	Snowe
Cochran	Levin	Specter
Conrad	Lieberman	Stabenow
Dodd	Lincoln	Tester
Domenici	Martinez	Webb
Dorgan	Menendez	Whitehouse
Durbin	Mikulski	Wicker
Feingold	Murray	Wyden
Feinstein	Nelson (FL)	

NOT VOTING—2

Byrd	McCain

The amendment (No. 4240) was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 4218

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 4218.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], for himself, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. BROWN, proposes an amendment numbered 4218.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To put children ahead of millionaires and billionaires by restoring the pre-2001 top income tax rate for people earning over $1 million, and use this revenue to invest in LIHEAP; IDEA; Head Start; Child Care; nutrition; school construction and deficit reduction)

On page 3, line 11, increase the amount by $10,800,000,000.

On page 3, line 12, increase the amount by $16,600,000,000.

On page 3, line 13, increase the amount by $5,100,000,000.

On page 3, line 20, increase the amount by $10,800,000,000.

On page 3, line 21, increase the amount by $16,600,000,000.

On page 3, line 22, increase the amount by $5,100,000,000.

On page 4, line 5, increase the amount by $9,800,000,000.

On page 4, line 6, increase the amount by $15,600,000,000.

On page 4, line 7, increase the amount by $4,100,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, increase the amount by $4,196,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, increase the amount by $11,966,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, increase the amount by $9,443,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, increase the amount by $3,187,000,000.

On page 4, line 18, increase the amount by $708,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, decrease the amount by $6,604,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, decrease the amount by $4,634,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, increase the amount by $4,343,000,000.

On page 5, line 1, increase the amount by $3,187,000,000.

On page 5, line 2, increase the amount by $708,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by $6,604,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $11,238,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $6,895,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $3,708,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $3,000,000,000.

On page 5, line 16, decrease the amount by $6,604,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, decrease the amount by $11,238,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, decrease the amount by $6,895,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, decrease the amount by $3,708,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, decrease the amount by $3,000,000,000.

On page 18, line 16, increase the amount by $6,200,000,000.

On page 18, line 17, increase the amount by $1,244,000,000.

On page 18, line 20, increase the amount by $9,800,000,000.

On page 18, line 21, increase the amount by $6,766,000,000.

On page 18, line 24, increase the amount by $2,000,000,000.

On page 18, line 25, increase the amount by $6,459,000,000.

On page 19, line 4, increase the amount by $2,843,000,000.

On page 19, line 8, increase the amount by $688,000,000.

On page 21, line 16, increase the amount by $3,600,000,000.

On page 21, line 17, increase the amount by $2,952,000,000.

On page 21, line 20, increase the amount by $5,800,000,000.

On page 21, line 21, increase the amount by $5,200,000,000.

On page 21, line 24, increase the amount by $2,100,000,000.

On page 21, line 25, increase the amount by $2,984,000,000.

On page 22, line 4, increase the amount by $344,000,000.

On page 22, line 8, increase the amount by $20,000,000.

On page 32, line 10, increase the amount by $8,600,000,000.

On page 32, line 11, increase the amount by $2,996,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I thank Senators DURBIN, KENNEDY, CLINTON, HARKIN, SCHUMER, MIKULSKI, BROWN, CASEY, and MENENDEZ for cosponsoring this amendment. I also thank dozens of national organizations representing tens of millions of Americans for supporting it, including the AFL–CIO, the SCIU, the Children's Defense Fund, the YWCA, and many other organizations.

This amendment cannot be simpler. The wealthiest people in the country have not had it so good since the 1920s. Their incomes are soaring, while at the same time the middle class is shrinking, and we have by far the highest rate of childhood poverty of any major country. The time is now to begin changing our national priorities and moving this country in a different direction.

This amendment restores the top income tax bracket for households earning more than $1 million a year, it raises $32.5 billion over 3 years, and invests that in our kids, including $10 billion for special education, because the time is long overdue that we kept our word regarding special education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. Who yields time? The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, the problem is we are in the game here, spending the same dollar three or four times, it appears. Under the Sanders amendment, it is paid for by raising taxes another $32.5 billion, ostensibly from the rich; that is to say, by raising taxes on people who make over $1 million a year. Here is the problem with that. The budget on the floor already assumes the expiration of the current tax rates; that is to say, the rates on the highest level go from 35 to 39.6, and that money is spent. If you took all the top-rate income, you would come up with $25 billion a year, not even enough to meet what is here, and that money has already been spent.

The reality is somewhere or other, somehow, more taxes would have to be raised. I don't think the American people want to do that, particularly in the current environment.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) is necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 55, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 64 Leg.]

YEAS—43

Akaka	Feinstein	Mikulski
Bayh	Harkin	Murray
Biden	Inouye	Nelson (FL)
Bingaman	Johnson	Obama
Boxer	Kennedy	Pryor
Brown	Kerry	Reed
Cardin	Klobuchar	Reid
Casey	Kohl	Rockefeller
Clinton	Landrieu	Sanders
Collins	Lautenberg	Schumer
Conrad	Leahy	Stabenow
Dodd	Levin	Webb
Dorgan	Lieberman	Whitehouse
Durbin	McCaskill	
Feingold	Menendez	

NAYS—55

Alexander	DeMint	Nelson (NE)
Allard	Dole	Roberts
Barrasso	Domenici	Salazar
Baucus	Ensign	Sessions
Bennett	Enzi	Shelby
Bond	Graham	Smith
Brownback	Grassley	Snowe
Bunning	Gregg	Specter
Burr	Hagel	Stevens
Cantwell	Hatch	Sununu
Carper	Hutchison	Tester
Chambliss	Inhofe	Thune
Coburn	Isakson	Vitter
Cochran	Kyl	Voinovich
Coleman	Lincoln	Warner
Corker	Lugar	Wicker
Cornyn	Martinez	Wyden
Craig	McConnell	
Crapo	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—2

Byrd	McCain

The amendment (No. 4218) was rejected.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I want to, one more time, implore our colleagues—we have some colleagues who have multiple amendments pending. By the time we end this tranche, we will have had nearly 40 votes. That is significantly more than any of the last 3 years we have had a budget resolution in terms of recorded rollcall votes. But we have some colleagues—I do not know whether this is their staff speaking for them or whether Members are actually so wedded to those amendments. I would ask colleagues to ask their staffs how many amendments they have on these lists. We have a list here of 50 more amendments. That really is not reasonable. That is not reasonable by any historic standard.

The next amendment in order is the amendment by the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I believe the next amendment was my amendment, but we have agreed to pass over it.

Mr. CONRAD. Yes, that is correct. Senator GREGG's amendment is next in line, but we have agreed to drop that down. Some work is being done on that

amendment, which makes the next amendment in order the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 4154

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, my amendment would increase LIHEAP funding by an additional $2.6 billion to bring it up to the fully authorized amount.

I call up amendment No. 4154.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. REED], for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. BOND, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. DODD, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KERRY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. OBAMA, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SUNUNU, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE, proposes an amendment numbered 4154.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To reduce the energy burden of low-income families, seniors, and individuals with disabilities by increasing funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) by $2.6 billion in FY 2009)

On page 19, line 16, increase the amount by $2,600,000,000.

On page 19, line 17, increase the amount by $1,820,000,000.

On page 19, line 21, increase the amount by $728,000,000.

On page 19, line 25, increase the amount by $52,000,000.

On page 27, line 16, decrease the amount by $2,600,000,000.

On page 27, line 17, decrease the amount by $1,820,000,000.

On page 27, line 21, decrease the amount by $728,000,000.

On page 27, line 25, decrease the amount by $52,000,000.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this amendment would raise the LIHEAP spending to the authorized total of $5.1 billion. I wish to recognize the work of Senator SPECTER and Senator HARKIN, who earlier today passed an amendment that increased LIHEAP funding. I have worked very closely with my colleagues, especially Senator COLLINS.

Let me point out what is obvious to everyone today: Oil reached $111 a barrel. That translates very quickly into excruciatingly high prices for seniors or low-income Americans. LIHEAP is a program that can help them. I would urge passage.

I see my colleague, Senator COLLINS, on the other side.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I, too, urge adoption of this amendment. This has been a very hard winter in the Northeast, with extreme cold and very high prices. We can make a big difference by increasing this account to bring it to the authorized level. In my State of Maine, the last allocation was used up in a matter of 4 days.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition to the amendment?

AMENDMENT NO. 4154, AS MODIFIED

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to modify the amendment in order to reflect the previous amendment passed by Senators HARKIN and SPECTER. It has been agreed to by both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REED. I send a modification to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 21, line 16, increase the amount by $1,600,000,000.

On page 21, line 17, increase the amount by $1,120,000,000.

On page 21, line 21, increase the amount by $448,000,000.

On page 21, line 25, increase the amount by $32,000,000.

On page 27, line 16, decrease the amount by $1,600,000,000.

On page 27, line 17, decrease the amount by $1,120,000,000.

On page 27, line 21, decrease the amount by $448,000,000.

On page 27, line 25, decrease the amount by $32,000,000.

Mr. GREGG. I urge adoption of the amendment and ask unanimous consent that it be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 4154), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I understand we are going to Senator DEMINT next.

AMENDMENT NO. 4328

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 4328 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant journal clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DEMINT] proposes an amendment numbered 4328.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide for a deficit-neutral reserve fund for Social Security reform)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. ____. RESERVE FUND FOR SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM.

If the Senate Committee on Finance reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment is offered thereto, or a conference report is submitted thereon, that provides changes to the Federal Old Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance Benefits Program established under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) by—

(1) requiring that the Federal Old Age and Survivors Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are to be used only to finance expenditures to provide retirement income of future beneficiaries of such program;

(2) ensuring that there is no change to current law scheduled benefits for individuals born before January 1, 1952;

(3) providing participants with the benefits of savings and investment while permitting the pre-funding of at least some portion of future benefits; and

(4) ensuring that the funds made available to finance such legislation do not exceed the amounts of the Chief Actuary of the Social Security Administration's intermediate actuarial estimates of the Federal Old Age and Survivors Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, as published in the most recent report of the Board of Trustees of such Trust Funds;

the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution by the amounts provided by such legislation, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, every Senator here today knows we need to address the problem with Social Security. Within the next 8 or 10 years, the current surplus we have for Social Security will run out and we will be in the red as far as cashflow goes. We will begin to transfer money from the general fund to pay for Social Security.

Over the last two decades, we have taken over $2 trillion of Social Security surplus and spent it on other things. In the next 5 years alone, counting interest, we will take another trillion of this surplus and spend it elsewhere. This amendment simply says we should spend this Social Security surplus that is in front of us only on Social Security.

The last time this bill was on the floor, it got 45 votes. Several of you who voted against it said you thought it set up private accounts, so you voted against it. There is nothing in this amendment about setting up private accounts or how we save it. It simply says that we spend Social Security on Social Security and save it for the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON of Florida.) The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, this amendment is privatization of Social Security. This body rejected an amendment of this nature in 2006. We also voted last year and rejected it. The country rejected the privatization in 2005.

This will increase insolvency of the Social Security trust fund, not help it. Despite what the Senator said, let me quote what it says:

Providing participants with the benefits of savings and investment while permitting the prefunding . . .

Essentially, this, as stated in the language, sets up private accounts for the benefits of investments and savings. We all know that the volatility of the stock market is not the best thing for seniors.

This is privatization of Social Security. We have voted on this many times in the past. I urge the same vote today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CONRAD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The assistant journal clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) is necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 57, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 65 Leg.]

YEAS—41

Alexander	DeMint	Martinez
Allard	Dole	McCaskill
Barrasso	Ensign	McConnell
Bond	Enzi	Murkowski
Brownback	Graham	Roberts
Bunning	Grassley	Sessions
Burr	Gregg	Specter
Chambliss	Hagel	Stevens
Coburn	Hatch	Sununu
Coleman	Hutchison	Thune
Corker	Inhofe	Vitter
Cornyn	Isakson	Warner
Craig	Kyl	Wicker
Crapo	Lugar	

NAYS—57

Akaka	Durbin	Nelson (FL)
Baucus	Feingold	Nelson (NE)
Bayh	Feinstein	Obama
Bennett	Harkin	Pryor
Biden	Inouye	Reed
Bingaman	Johnson	Reid
Boxer	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Brown	Kerry	Salazar
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Sanders
Cardin	Kohl	Schumer
Carper	Landrieu	Shelby
Casey	Lautenberg	Smith
Clinton	Leahy	Snowe
Cochran	Levin	Stabenow
Collins	Lieberman	Tester
Conrad	Lincoln	Voinovich
Dodd	Menendez	Webb
Domenici	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Dorgan	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Byrd	McCain

The amendment (No. 4328) was rejected.

Mr. CONRAD. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. GREGG. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Kansas be recognized to change a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I wish to be recorded ''yea'' on DeMint amendment No. 4328. It was my intent to vote yea. I did vote nay. That was a mistake. This would not change the vote, as it was 40 to 58.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, the next amendment is the amendment by Senator BIDEN, No. 4164.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 4164

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I have been instructed by the Budget Committee that I have to ask for a modification of the amendment. The pagination on the amendment was off. First, I call up amendment No. 4164.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN], for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. KOHL, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. REED, and Mr. FEINGOLD, proposes an amendment numbered 4164.

Mr. BIDEN. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase 2009 funding for the COPS program to $1.15 billion, with an offset)

On page 24, line 16, increase the amount by $551,000,000.

On page 24, line 17, increase the amount by $66,000.000.

On page 24, line 21, increase the amount by $154,000,000.

On page 25, line 25, increase the amount by $138,000,000.

On page 26, line 4, increase the amount by $110,000.000.

On page 25, line 8, increase the amount by $83,000,000.

On page 27, line 16, decrease the amount by $551,000,000.

On page 27, line 17, decrease the amount by $66,000,000.

On page 27, line 21, decrease the amount by $154,000,000.

On page 27, line 25, decrease the amount by $138,000,000.

On page 28, line 4, decrease the amount by $110,000,000.

On page 28, line 8, decrease the amount by $83,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 4164, AS MODIFIED

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I send a modification to the desk. As I explained to my colleagues, the pagination in the amendment was incorrect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 24, line 16, increase the amount by $551,000,000.

On page 24, line 17, increase the amount by $66,000,000.

On page 24, line 21, increase the amount by $154,000,000.

On page 24, line 25, increase the amount by $138,000,000.

On page 25, line 4, increase the amount by $110,000,000.

On page 25, line 8, increase the amount by $83,000,000.

On page 27, line 16, decrease the amount by $551,000,000.

On page 27, line 17, decrease the amount by $66,000,000.

On page 27, line 21, decrease the amount by $154,000,000.

On page 27, line 25, decrease the amount by $138,000,000.

On page 28, line 4, decrease the amount by $110,000,000.

On page 28, line 8, decrease the amount by $83,000,000.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. My amendment will support full funding for the COPS Program. It is fully offset by an across-the-board cut in nondefense discretionary spending. The chairman asked whether I would be willing to have a voice vote. At this hour of the night, I would be willing to do about anything he asked me to do, including a voice vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I think there is no time in opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate on the amendment, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 4164, as modified.

The amendment (No. 4164), as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. CONRAD. I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4208

Mr. CONRAD. The next amendment is the amendment by Senator DOLE, No. 4208.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mrs. DOLE. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 4208 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from North Carolina [Mrs. DOLE], for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. VITTER, proposes an amendment numbered 4208.

Mrs. DOLE. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase amounts budgeted for States and local governments for expenses related to immigration enforcement training and support under section 287(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, with an offset)

On page 24, line 16, increase the amount by $75,000,000.

On page 24, line 17, increase the amount by $60,000,000.

On page 24, line 21, increase the amount by $7,500,000.

On page 24, line 25, increase the amount by $7,500,000.

On page 27, line 16, decrease the amount by $75,000,000.

On page 27, line 17, decrease the amount by $60,000,000.

On page 27, line 21, decrease the amount by $7,500,000.

On page 27, line 25, decrease the amount by $7,500,000.

Mrs. DOLE. Mr. President, my amendment would direct $75 million for ICE to expand the 287(g) program so that more local law enforcement agencies have the resources to identify and help process criminal illegal aliens. To

address the problems presented by individuals who are not only here illegally but who have self-identified themselves because of their criminal behavior, we must provide the funding for ICE to make the necessary resources available to local law enforcement officials who are on the front lines. Greater funding for ICE, specifically the 287(g) program, is sorely needed. I urge my colleagues to support this important amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, there is no opposition. We ask colleagues to accept the amendment on a voice vote, if the Senator would agree.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 4208.

The amendment (No. 4208) was agreed to.

Mr. CONRAD. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DODD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4254

Mr. CONRAD. Next in order is an amendment by Senator DODD, No. 4254.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I call up the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. KENNEDY, proposes an amendment numbered 4254.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To increase funding for the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Health Resources and Services Administration for autism research, education, and early detection with an offset)

On page 19, line 16, increase the amount by $197,000,000.

On page 19, line 17, increase the amount by $73,000,000.

On page 19, line 21, increase the amount by $93,000,000.

On page 19, line 25, increase the amount by $22,000,000.

On page 20, line 4, increase the amount by $4,000,000.

On page 27, line 16, decrease the amount by $197,000,000.

On page 27, line 17, decrease the amount by $73,000,000.

On page 27, line 21, decrease the amount by $93,000,000.

On page 27, line 25, decrease the amount by $22,000,000.

On page 28, line 4, decrease the amount by $4,000,000.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I offer this amendment on behalf of myself, Senator COLLINS of Maine, and Senator KENNEDY, and I ask unanimous consent that Senators KLOBUCHAR, OBAMA, MENENDEZ, LIEBERMAN, DURBIN, and CLINTON be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, we are aware of the growing problem of autism. It used to be, not that long ago, that 1 child in 166 was afflicted with autism. Those numbers have now dropped to 1 in 150. It is the fastest growing neurological disability in the United States and becoming more and more serious. It is highly complex. Senator Santorum and I offered the combating autism legislation a year or so ago, which passed overwhelmingly. This legislation increases the funding by $197 million. It is completely offset by dealing with the function 920. Therefore, it is paid for completely and revenue neutral. We urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, there has been an alarming increase in the diagnosis of autism in this country. Back in the 1980s, it was 1 in 2,500 children. As the Senator from Connecticut has indicated, the current statistics are 1 in 150. That means that some 1.5 million children and their families are coping with this disease. This is an area where more research can make a tremendous difference. I urge adoption of the Dodd-Collins amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it is the fastest growing developmental disability in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 4254.

The amendment (No. 4254) was agreed to.

Mr. CONRAD. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DODD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4232

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, that takes us to Allard amendment No. 4232.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 4232 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. DEMINT], for Mr. ALLARD, proposes an amendment numbered 4232.

Mr. DEMINT. I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To pay down the Federal debt and eliminate government waste by reducing spending 5 percent on programs rated (as mandated under the Government Performance and Results Act (Public Law 103–62)) ineffective by Office of Management and Budget Program Assessment Rating Tool)

On page 4, line 5, decrease the amount by $750,000,000.

On page 4, line 14, decrease the amount by $375,000,000.

On page 4, line 15, decrease the amount by $225,000,000.

On page 4, line 16, decrease the amount by $150,000,000.

On page 4, line 23, decrease the amount by $375,000,000.

On page 4, line 24, decrease the amount by $225,000,000.

On page 4, line 25, decrease the amount by $150,000,000.

On page 5, line 8, decrease the amount by $375,000,000.

On page 5, line 9, decrease the amount by $600,000,000.

On page 5, line 10, decrease the amount by $750,000,000.

On page 5, line 11, decrease the amount by $750,000,000.

On page 5, line 12, decrease the amount by $750,000,000.

On page 5, line 16, decrease the amount by $375,000,000.

On page 5, line 17, decrease the amount by $600,000,000.

On page 5, line 18, decrease the amount by $750,000,000.

On page 5, line 19, decrease the amount by $750,000,000.

On page 5, line 20, decrease the amount by $750,000,000.

On page 27, line 16, decrease the amount by $750,000,000.

On page 27, line 17, decrease the amount by $375,000,000.

On page 27, line 21, decrease the amount by $225,000,000.

On page 27, line 25, decrease the amount by $150,000,000.

On page 32, line 10, decrease the amount by $750,000,000.

On page 32, line 11, decrease the amount by $375,000,000.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I would ask Senator ALLARD to take a minute. I have called the amendment up. If the Senator will explain what it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, my amendment will cut the Federal deficit and eliminated Government waste by reducing spending 5 percent on programs rated ''ineffective'' by the OMB and use the savings to pay down the Federal debt.

Five percent is the expected increase under this budget. We are not cutting any programs or zeroing anything out, just saying that an ''ineffective'' rating probably means they do not deserve an increase.

The PART program was initiated by Congress, a result of the Government Performance and Results Act, Public Law No. 103–62. It is time we followed through on our efforts to increase Government accountability and efficiency. I urge a ''yes'' vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I think there is a kernel of a good idea here. Unfortunately, I think the PART program has been defective in its analysis. It says, for example, the Community Development Block Grant program is defective because it lacks a clear purpose. Ask your mayors and your Governors about that. It says Amtrak's purpose is ambiguous. Ask the millions of people who go to work every day on Amtrak. It says the Department of Homeland Security security grants have an ineffective risk assessment formula and a lack of consistent performance. Ask that of the first responders

around the country who have the responsibility of protecting the homeland.

This would cut programs $750 million—programs that are vital to the security of the country, to the economic growth of the country. I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, do I have any time left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 4232.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) is necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 68, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 66 Leg.]

YEAS—29

Allard	Crapo	Kyl
Barrasso	DeMint	Martinez
Bond	Ensign	McConnell
Brownback	Enzi	Sessions
Bunning	Graham	Shelby
Chambliss	Gregg	Sununu
Coburn	Hatch	Thune
Corker	Hutchison	Vitter
Cornyn	Inhofe	Wicker
Craig	Isakson	

NAYS—68

Akaka	Durbin	Nelson (FL)
Alexander	Feingold	Nelson (NE)
Baucus	Feinstein	Obama
Bayh	Grassley	Pryor
Bennett	Harkin	Reed
Biden	Inouye	Reid
Bingaman	Johnson	Roberts
Boxer	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Brown	Kerry	Salazar
Burr	Klobuchar	Sanders
Cantwell	Kohl	Schumer
Cardin	Landrieu	Smith
Carper	Lautenberg	Snowe
Casey	Leahy	Specter
Clinton	Levin	Stabenow
Cochran	Lieberman	Stevens
Coleman	Lincoln	Tester
Collins	Lugar	Voinovich
Conrad	McCaskill	Warner
Dodd	Menendez	Webb
Dole	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Domenici	Murkowski	Wyden
Dorgan	Murray	

NOT VOTING—3

Byrd	Hagel	McCain

The amendment (No. 4232) was rejected.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have had a conversation with the distinguished managers of the bill, and we are not there yet, but we are at a point where maybe in the next 20 or 30 minutes we can have a final list of amendments. Whatever that number is, we will lock those in and spend the rest of the time working through those. So I hope we can do that. No one has been cut off from offering any amendments, but I hope people will work with the staffs. The staffs of Senator GREGG and Senator CONRAD have worked very hard all this week, and I hope people will work with them and be considerate of not only them but these people up here who make the Senate work. They have been here since we started voting. So we hope we can do that. We will report back in a half hour or so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, the next amendment in order is amendment No. 4155 by Senator BROWN from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 4155

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 4155 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], for himself and Ms. STABENOW, proposes an amendment numbered 4155.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the training of manufacturing workers)

On page 51, line 9, insert after the comma, the following: ''by increasing efforts to train and retrain manufacturing workers,''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, this amendment is cosponsored by Senators SNOWE, STABENOW, FEINGOLD, and CLINTON.

To increase employment in manufacturing, Congress needs to address training and retraining of manufacturing workers. This amendment does that.

More than 3 million manufacturing jobs have been lost since 2000, more than 200,000 in my State of Ohio alone.

Susan Helper, a business professor at Case Western Reserve University in Cleveland, wrote in the Washington Post recently about ''paving the high road'' for American manufacturing. The high road manufacturing agenda includes significant Federal investment in Federal tax credits for research in the Manufacturing Extension Partnership and in worker training and retraining programs, which is what this amendment does. Manufacturing training is a tool to help businesses succeed, especially small manufacturers.

I urge my colleagues to support the Brown-Snowe-Stabenow-Feingold-Clinton amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 4155) was agreed to.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, next in order is an amendment by Senator BROWNBACK of Kansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 4284

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 4284 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. BROWNBACK] proposes an amendment numbered 4284.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide funds for a Commission on Budgetary Accountability and Review of Federal Agencies)

On page 25, line 16, increase the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 25, line 17, increase the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 25, line 20, increase the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 25, line 21, increase the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 25, line 24, increase the amount by $8,000,000.

On page 25, line 25, increase the amount by $8,000,000.

On page 26, line 3, increase the amount by $8,000,000.

On page 26, line 4, increase the amount by $8,000,000.

On page 26, line 7, increase the amount by $4,000,000.

On page 26, line 8, increase the amount by $4,000,000.

On page 27, line 16, decrease the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 27, line 17, decrease the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 27, line 20, decrease the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 27, line 21, decrease the amount by $6,000,000.

On page 27, line 24, decrease the amount by $8,000,000.

On page 27. line 25. decrease the amount by $8,000,000.

On page 28, line 3, decrease the amount by $8,000,000.

On page 28, line 4, decrease the amount by $8.000.000.

On page 28, line 7, decrease the amount by $4,000,000.

On page 28, line 8, decrease the amount by $4,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, this is a very direct and well-known process that I wish to take to the rest of Government and ask my colleagues to consider it.

I think we are all familiar with the Base Realignment and Closure Commission. It is a process by which we try to correct where our military bases are—where we have closed some, where we have put more resources in other places. I might note to my colleagues that it has saved us $65 billion since BRAC has been in place. It has worked. It is one of the things that has worked.

I wish to take that BRAC process to the rest of the Government programs and have a commission identified, just as the BRAC Commission, to review all of the Federal programs and recommend for elimination those that are duplicative or wasteful or have not accomplished their purposes and then give us one vote in a whole package—35 programs, 200 programs—eliminate them or keep them, deal or no deal, and put that on the line.

So I am asking for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second.

Who yields time?

The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I would just ask the Senator from Kansas if he would be willing to accept a voice vote.

Mr. BROWNBACK. I would like a recorded vote. We have done this by voice, and I think it is time to really seriously consider it and see where Members are on this issue.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. I will not oppose the amendment of the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 4284.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) is necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 67 Leg.]

YEAS—49

Alexander	Ensign	Lugar
Allard	Enzi	Martinez
Barrasso	Feingold	McCaskill
Bayh	Graham	McConnell
Brownback	Grassley	Mikulski
Bunning	Gregg	Roberts
Burr	Harkin	Sessions
Chambliss	Hatch	Shelby
Coburn	Hutchison	Smith
Coleman	Inhofe	Specter
Corker	Inouye	Sununu
Cornyn	Isakson	Thune
Craig	Johnson	Vitter
Crapo	Klobuchar	Voinovich
DeMint	Kyl	Wicker
Dole	Landrieu	
Dorgan	Leahy	

NAYS—48

Akaka	Dodd	Obama
Baucus	Domenici	Pryor
Bennett	Durbin	Reed
Biden	Feinstein	Reid
Bingaman	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Bond	Kerry	Salazar
Boxer	Kohl	Sanders
Brown	Lautenberg	Schumer
Cantwell	Levin	Snowe
Cardin	Lieberman	Stabenow
Carper	Lincoln	Stevens
Casey	Menendez	Tester
Clinton	Murkowski	Warner
Cochran	Murray	Webb
Collins	Nelson (FL)	Whitehouse
Conrad	Nelson (NE)	Wyden

NOT VOTING—3

Byrd	Hagel	McCain

The amendment (No. 4284) was agreed to.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. LEVIN. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 4197

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up my amendment No. 4197.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KOHL], for himself, Mr. DOMENICI, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. COLEMAN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CASEY, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR, proposes an amendment numbered 4197.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund for a 3-year extension of the pilot program for national and State background checks on direct patient access employees of long-term care facilities or providers)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. _____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR 3-YEAR EXTENSION OF PILOT PROGRAM FOR NATIONAL AND STATE BACKGROUND CHECKS ON DIRECT PATIENT ACCESS EMPLOYEES OF LONG-TERM CARE FACILITIES OR PROVIDERS.

If the Senate Committee on Finance reports a bill or joint resolution or an amendment is offered thereto or a conference report is submitted thereon, that provides for a 3-year extension of the pilot program for national and State background checks on direct patient access employees of long-term care facilities or providers under section 307 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 (42 U.S.C. 1395aa note) and removes the limit on the number of participating States under such pilot program, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes up to $160,000,000, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator KLOBUCHAR be added as a cosponsor of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I speak today in support of my amendment, which would allow for the creation of a comprehensive nationwide system of background checks for long-term care workers. As it now stands, thousands of individuals with a history of abuse or a criminal record are hired every year to work closely with defenseless seniors within our Nation's nursing homes and other long-term care facilities. These individuals evade detection throughout the hiring process, securing jobs that allow them to assault, abuse, and steal from one of our most vulnerable populations.

I ask that my colleagues support the amendment I offer today with Senators DOMENICI, LINCOLN, WHITEHOUSE, BINGAMAN, CLINTON, COLEMAN, STABENOW, LEVIN, CASEY, and KLOBUCHAR, which will allow us to expand the outstanding results of the pilot program nationwide. The amendment proposes that the Senate reserve $160 million over 3 years in a deficit-neutral reserve fund to pay for such an expansion. I hope we can get this amendment passed. I ask for its support.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) are necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 7, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 68 Leg.]

YEAS—89

Akaka	Durbin	Mikulski
Alexander	Ensign	Murkowski
Barrasso	Enzi	Nelson (FL)
Baucus	Feingold	Nelson (NE)
Bayh	Feinstein	Obama
Bennett	Graham	Pryor
Biden	Grassley	Reed
Bingaman	Gregg	Reid
Bond	Harkin	Roberts
Boxer	Hatch	Rockefeller
Brown	Hutchison	Salazar
Brownback	Inouye	Sanders
Burr	Isakson	Schumer
Cantwell	Johnson	Shelby
Cardin	Kennedy	Smith
Carper	Kerry	Snowe
Casey	Klobuchar	Specter
Chambliss	Kohl	Stabenow
Clinton	Kyl	Stevens
Cochran	Landrieu	Sununu
Coleman	Lautenberg	Tester
Collins	Leahy	Thune
Conrad	Levin	Vitter
Corker	Lieberman	Voinovich
Cornyn	Lincoln	Warner
Craig	Lugar	Webb
Crapo	Martinez	Whitehouse
Dodd	McCaskill	Wicker
Domenici	McConnell	Wyden
Dorgan	Menendez	

NAYS—7

Allard	DeMint	Sessions
Bunning	Dole	
Coburn	Inhofe	

NOT VOTING—4

Byrd	McCain
Hagel	Murray

The amendment (No. 4197) was agreed to.

Mr. CONRAD. I move to reconsider the vote, and I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, we now can go to Senator INHOFE who has an amendment.

AMENDMENT NO. 4239

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 4239 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE] proposes an amendment numbered 4239.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate on funding for national defense in future fiscal years)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SENSE OF SENATE ON FUNDING FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE IN FUTURE FISCAL YEARS.

(a) FINDING.—The Senate finds that the budget of the President for fiscal year 2009 requests funds for national defense, exclusive of wartime costs and supplemental appropriations, that constitute an amount equal to approximately 3.3 percent of the current gross domestic product of the United States.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the amount of funds for national defense, exclusive of wartime costs and supplemental appropriations, for fiscal year 2010 should be not less than an amount equal to 3.7 percent of the then-current gross domestic product of the United States;

(2) it should be the policy of the United States to fund national defense, exclusive of such costs and appropriations, for fiscal year 2011 in an amount equal to not less than 4 percent of the then-current gross domestic product of the United States; and

(3) the amount of funding for national defense, exclusive of such costs and appropriations, for each fiscal year after fiscal year 2011 should be the amount of funds for national defense for the preceding fiscal year as adjusted pursuant to the most appropriate cost adjustment index.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, it is my intention to withdraw this amendment, but I wish to use this moment to serve notice that this is something that not just myself but several of us are concerned about, particularly those of us on the Senate Armed Services Committee.

We have gone through a period of time, up until the early nineties, when our defense spending was somewhere around—in fact, for the entire 100 years in the 20th century, it averaged 5.7 percent of GDP. At the end of the nineties, it got down to just under 3 percent. If we are to anticipate the needs we will have in the future, it is going to be necessary to have some kind of a floor.

What this amendment says is we will have to start the process by putting 4 percent of the GDP into the defense system. It is one that would accomplish three things.

First, it would allow us to build the next generation of weapons and equipment. As we know, we are doing one weapon right now that will take the next 30 years.

Second, it will add predictability to the industrial base.

And third, it sends a clear message to our military, allies, and enemies that we are committed to the security of our Nation.

It shocks a lot of people when they find out we have platform weapons systems that are not as good as our potential adversaries. This would correct that problem.

AMENDMENT NO. 4239 WITHDRAWN

Mr. President, I ask that this amendment be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from North Dakota, the chairman of the committee, is going to make a request as to schedule. But I will simply say we are trying to develop a final finite list, and anybody on our side who has an amendment who has not contacted us—I believe everybody has; I believe we know what all the amendments are that people want—it is very important they tell us about them because we are developing a final finite list. And we will even accept amendments from your side if you want to tell us about them. That is OK too.

As a practical matter, I would encourage people on the Republican side to tell us what they want so we can pull up this final finite list.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, if everyone cooperates in these final hours, I think we could reach conclusion. It will be late, but we could reach conclusion at a reasonable time tonight—at least before midnight. But it really is going to require everybody's cooperation.

If you have an amendment that you could reserve until a later vehicle, please do. We have already had nearly 30 rollcall votes. That is very close to what the average has been in the last 3 years in terms of recorded votes. We still have more rollcall votes that are going to have to be done.

We think at this point it would be wise to take a half-hour break to give people a chance to match the paperwork that is out there and try to conclude on a finite list.

Mr. DORGAN. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CONRAD. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I would ask the chair and the ranking member, I know there are a good number of amendments on both sides that are bipartisan and noncontroversial, and my hope would be that in this break and in future breaks packages of amendments could be put together that are noncontroversial and bipartisan and move them as a block because I think there are a good many of them, and that would be very helpful.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, the Senator has made a good suggestion and one that Senator GREGG and I have just discussed that we will do during this break, and that is to try to put together, No. 1, a finite list of amendments that still require a vote; and, No. 2, a managers' amendment of bipartisan, noncontroversial amendments that could be agreed to as a package.

Mr. GREGG. I stress, Mr. President, when we come out of this break, we hope to have a finite list and hope to lock it in, so we need to hear from folks. We are, as the Senator from—the junior or senior Senator, I never know—from North Dakota suggested, Senator DORGAN, we will be working on a group of amendments that everyone can agree to and doing those as just a package.

RECESS

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we take a recess for 30 minutes.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:32 p.m., recessed until 8:03 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. WHITEHOUSE).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have been back in the Republican cloakroom meeting with Senators GREGG and CONRAD. I think we are at a point where we should be able to enter a finite list of amendments. That should be momentarily, I hope. Once we get those listed, then the managers and staffs will look to see which can be accepted on each side and which have to be voted on. Some will be taken by voice, perhaps.

It is now 8 o'clock and we have quite a few amendments. I hope everyone will be cooperative. I think we are at a point where we can do a pretty good job of working through these.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, we are now going to go to a series of amendments involving sanctuary cities. Leader REID will offer an amendment

on this side, and then Senator VITTER will have an amendment on the minority side.

AMENDMENT NO. 4373

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] proposes an amendment numbered 4373.

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish a reserve fund for studying the effect of cooperation with local law enforcement)

On page 69, after line 25, add the following:

SEC. 308. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR STUDYING THE EFFECT OF COOPERATION WITH LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports, by the amounts provided in such legislation for the purposes described in this subsection, that would require an assessment of the impact of local ordinances that prohibit cooperation with the Department of Homeland Security, with respect to—

(1) the effectiveness of law enforcement, success rates of criminal prosecutions, reporting of criminal activity by immigrant victims of crime, and level of public safety;

(2) changes in the number of reported incidents or complaints of racial profiling; or

(3) wrongful detention of United States Citizens and Lawful Permanent Residents.

(b) LIMITATION.—The authority under subsection (a) may not be used unless the legislation described in subsection (a) would not increase the deficit over—

(1) the total period comprised of fiscal years 2008 through 2013; or

(2) the total period comprised of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, there is a problem on whose behalf I am offering this. We will get this resolved very quickly. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the record should reflect this is not being offered on behalf of Senator CARDIN or Senator MENENDEZ. It is being offered by me.

This is an important amendment. We believe in the COPS Program. The purpose of the program is to stop crime and the sanctuary city program, that is being advocated by my friend from Louisiana will not alleviate crime. In fact, it will stop people from even going to law enforcement if there is a crime committed, because if they go to a police officer, the police officer, under this provision Senator VITTER has, would have to ask whether citizenship is up to date, and I don't think that does anyone any good. We want immigrants to report crimes. We don't want people taking advantage of them. We want safety. That is what the COPS Program is all about.

We have a Federal form of Government, and that is what this is all about. I certainly ask my friends to vote in favor of this amendment. This is for law enforcement and it is for safe cities and it is to protect our form of Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time in opposition?

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I have no objection to this study amendment. I will support it. I will be happy to support it by voice vote.

For the record, I would like to correct two things. First, I do not support any sanctuary city program. What my amendment does, which is coming up, would be to say that sanctuary cities, which defy Federal law, are going to have to pay some consequence for going completely contrary to Federal law. Do you believe there should be some appropriate consequence for defying Federal immigration law?

With regard to that amendment, I hope to get bipartisan support.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Parliamentary inquiry. We were in the middle of a vote. Is it possible to curtail the vote while we were in the middle of a vote and suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, it is.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, the leader has indicated that he would be willing to take a voice vote on his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. VITTER. This is a vote on which amendment?

Mr. CONRAD. The leader's amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The vote is on the majority leader's amendment.

The amendment (No. 4373) was agreed to.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GREGG. I believe Senator VITTER is the next speaker in order.

AMENDMENT NO. 4309

Mr. VITTER. I call up the Vitter sanctuary city amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. VITTER], for himself and Mr. INHOFE, proposes an amendment numbered 4309.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 4309) is as follows:

(Purpose: To create a reserve fund to ensure that Federal assistance does not go to sanctuary cities that ignore the immigration laws of the United States and create safe havens for illegal aliens and potential terrorists)

On page 69, after line 25, add the following:

SEC. 308. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PREVENT FUNDING FOR SANCTUARY CITIES.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would ensure that funds appropriated for the Community Oriented Policing Services Program are not used in violation of section 642(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373(a)), provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over—

(1) the 6-year period comprised of fiscal years 2008 through 2013; or

(2) the 11-year period comprised of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I was happy to support that study amendment. But this is the meat of the issue. There are so-called sanctuary cities all across the country which establish, as an official policy of their jurisdiction, an official action by vote of the council: We are not going to cooperate with Federal immigration enforcement officials. That is wrong. What is more, it is completely contrary to Federal immigration law.

My amendment says: We are going to put some consequence to that defiance of Federal law. We are not going to give them COPS funds. We are going to send those funds, instead, to all of those other jurisdictions which abide by Federal law.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, my understanding is that there are sanctuary cities in about 23 different States across America. What the Vitter amendment will do is to take away the COPS funding from those cities.

The offeror of this amendment has not spoken to the police departments. If you will speak to the policemen, they will tell you they need the cooperation of everyone to solve crimes and stop crime. If you create fear in

the minds of those who are here in an undocumented status that any cooperation with the police will result in their arrest, they will not cooperate and criminals will go free. There will be more people who will become victims—exactly the opposite of what we want to see in America.

Let's not use the COPS Program as some sort of threat. If you want to deal with immigration, deal with it responsibly in a comprehensive way. Please, let's defeat the Vitter amendment.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 19 seconds.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, if folks feel that way, they should come to Congress and change Federal law, not simply defy Federal law. This is another amnesty vote. Are we going to give folks in sanctuary cities amnesty for defying Federal law and refusing to cooperate, as Federal law demands, with Federal immigration officials?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. CONRAD. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

Mr. CONRAD. I move to table the Vitter amendment.

Mr. VITTER. Parliamentary inquiry: Is that motion in order even though you have already asked for the yeas and nays?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

The question is on the motion to table.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) is necessarily absent.

Mr. KYL. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 69 Leg.]

YEAS—58

Akaka	Hagel	Nelson (NE)
Baucus	Harkin	Obama
Bayh	Inouye	Pryor
Biden	Johnson	Reed
Bingaman	Kennedy	Reid
Boxer	Kerry	Rockefeller
Brown	Klobuchar	Salazar
Cantwell	Kohl	Sanders
Cardin	Lautenberg	Schumer
Carper	Leahy	Snowe
Casey	Levin	Specter
Clinton	Lieberman	Stabenow
Collins	Lincoln	Stevens
Conrad	Lugar	Tester
Dodd	McCaskill	Voinovich
Dole	Menendez	Webb
Dorgan	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murkowski	Wyden
Feingold	Murray	
Feinstein	Nelson (FL)	

NAYS—40

Alexander	Craig	Landrieu
Allard	Crapo	Martinez
Barrasso	DeMint	McConnell
Bennett	Domenici	Roberts
Bond	Ensign	Sessions
Brownback	Enzi	Shelby
Bunning	Graham	Smith
Burr	Grassley	Sununu
Chambliss	Gregg	Thune
Coburn	Hatch	Vitter
Cochran	Hutchison	Warner
Coleman	Inhofe	Wicker
Corker	Isakson	
Cornyn	Kyl	

NOT VOTING—2

Byrd	McCain

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CONRAD. I move to reconsider the vote and to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 4214, 4244, 4229, 4269, 4297, 4264, 4349, 4248, 4261, 4243, 4153, 4215, 4287, 4148, 4166, 4225, 4253, 4286, 4183, 4210, 4199, 4249, 4285, 4162, 4211, 4176, 4172, 4219, 4227, 4352, 4364, 4195 EN BLOC

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, the following amendments have been cleared: Nos. 4214, Senator ENZI; 4244, Senator ROBERTS; 4229, Senator MARTINEZ; 4269, Senator THUNE; 4297, Senator HATCH; 4264, Senator COLEMAN; 4349, Senator DOLE; 4248, Senator BARRASSO; 4261, Senator GRASSLEY; 4243, Senator VITTER; 4153, Senator BURR; 4215, Senator ENZI. In addition, these amendments have been cleared on both sides: Nos. 4287, Senator KLOBUCHAR; 4148, Senator KENNEDY; 4166, Senator BIDEN; 4225, Senator FEINSTEIN; 4253, Senator DODD; 4286, Senator KLOBUCHAR; 4183, Senator PRYOR; 4210, Senator LAUTENBERG; 4199, Senator DORGAN; 4289, Senator DORGAN; 4285, Senator NELSON of Florida; 4162, Senator REID. The following bipartisan amendments have been cleared: Nos. 4211, Lieberman-Collins; 4176, Carper-Coburn; 4172, Sessions-Casey; 4219, Voinovich-Stabenow; 4227, Clinton-Warner; 4352, Casey-Grassley; 4364, Smith-Clinton; and 4195, Lincoln-Snowe.

Let me indicate, if I may, this is the first managers' package. There are others that are being considered that have not yet been vetted. If your name is not on this list, it does not mean your amendment has been rejected. There are still amendments being reviewed by the committees of jurisdiction. The process we go through, the Budget Committee staff has to review them, as well as the committees of jurisdiction on both sides. That is the process for clearing amendments. So there are a fair number of amendments still in the queue going through that process.

Mr. GREGG. I ask unanimous consent that the managers' package be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments were agreed to, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 4214

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to terminate certain deductions from mineral revenue payments made to States)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO TERMINATE DEDUCTIONS FROM MINERAL REVENUE PAYMENTS TO STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution by the amounts provided by a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would terminate the authority to deduct certain amounts from mineral revenues payable to States under the second undesignated paragraph of the matter under the heading ''ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS'' under the heading ''MINERALS MANAGEMENT SERVICE'' of title I of the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2008 (Public Law 110–161; 121 Stat. 2109).

(b) DEFICIT NEUTRALITY.—Subsection (a) applies only if the legislation described in subsection (a) would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 4244

(Purpose: To ensure the viability of small businesses by helping them provide to their employees access to quality child care)

On page 21, line 16, increase the amount by $20,000,000.

On page 21, line 17, increase the amount by $15,200,000.

On page 21, line 20, increase the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 21, line 21, increase the amount by $12,200,000.

On page 21, line 24, increase the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 21, line 25, increase the amount by $10,100,000.

On page 22, line 3, increase the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 22, line 4, increase the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 22, line 8, increase the amount by $2,400,000.

On page 27, line 16, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.

On page 27, line 17, decrease the amount by $15,200,000.

On page 27, line 20, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 27, line 21, decrease the amount by $12,200,000.

On page 27, line 24, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 27, line 25, decrease the amount by $10,100,000.

On page 28, line 3, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 28, line 4, decrease the amount by $10,000,000.

On page 28, line 8, decrease the amount by $2,400,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 4229

(Purpose: To provide a deficit-neutral reserve fund to provide for State disclosure, through a publicly accessible Internet site, of information relating to payments made under the State Medicaid program to hospitals, nursing facilities, outpatient surgery centers, intermediate care facilities for the mentally retarded, institutions for mental diseases, or other institutional providers and the number of patients treated by such providers)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF STATE INTERNET SITES FOR THE DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION RELATING TO PAYMENTS MADE UNDER THE STATE MEDICAID PROGRAM.

If the Senate Committee on Finance reports a bill or joint resolution or an amendment is offered thereto or a conference report is submitted thereon, that provides for States to disclose, through a publicly accessible Internet site, each hospital, nursing facility, outpatient surgery center, intermediate care facility for the mentally retarded, institution for mental diseases, or other institutional provider that receives payment under the State Medicaid program, the total amount paid to each such provider each fiscal year, the number of patients treated by each such provider, and the amount of dollars paid per patient to each such provider, and provided that the Committee is within its allocation as provided under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may make the appropriate adjustments in the allocations and aggregates to reflect such legislation if any such measure would not increase the deficit over either the total of the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the total of the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 4269

(Purpose: To provide for a total of $99,000,000 in COPS Hot Spots funding, as authorized in the Combat Meth Act)

On page 24, line 16, increase the amount by $29,000,000.

On page 24, line 17, increase the amount by $26,100,000.

On page 24, line 21, increase the amount by $2,900,000.

On page 27, line 16, decrease the amount by $29,000,000.

On page 27, line 17, decrease the amount by $26,100,000.

On page 27, line 21, decrease the amount by $2,900,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 4297

(Purpose: To provide for a reserve fund for legislation that funds the traumatic brain injury program)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that provide at least $9,000,000 for fiscal year 2009 to funds traumatic brain injury programs under sections 393A, 393B, 1252, and 1253 of the Public Health Service Act, if such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 4264

(Purpose: To deny funding for the United Nations Durban II Anti-Racism Conference, which has been used as a platform to advance anti-Semitism and for this reason opposed by the United States and 45 other members of the United Nations General Assembly during a vote on December 22, 2007 and direct the savings to veterans)

On page 10, line 12, decrease the amount by $1,584,000.

On page 10, line 13, decrease the amount by $1,584,000.

On page 23, line 16, increase the amount by $1,584,000.

On page 23, line 17, increase the amount by $1,584,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 4349

(Purpose: To provide the Secretary of Agriculture with the necessary funding to effectively address the critical community facility infrastructure needs of our rural areas across the United States)

On page 17, line 14, increase the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 17, line 15, increase the amount by $2,700,000.

On page 17, line 18, increase the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 17, line 19, increase the amount by $11,400,000.

On page 17, line 22, increase the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 17, line 23, increase the amount by $18,900,000.

On page 18, line 2, increase the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 18, line 3, increase the amount by $22,800,000.

On page 18, line 6, increase the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 18, line 7, increase the amount by $25,800,000.

On page 27, line 16, decrease the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 27, line 17, decrease the amount by $2,700,000.

On page 27, line 20, decrease the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 27, line 21, decrease the amount by $11,400,000.

On page 27, line 24, decrease the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 27, line 25, decrease the amount by $18,900,000.

On page 28, line 3, decrease the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 28, line 4, decrease the amount by $22,800,000.

On page 28, line 7, decrease the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 28, line 8, decrease the amount by $25,800,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 4248

(Purpose: To provide for a deficit-neutral reserve fund that preserves and promotes Medicare payment policies that support rural health care providers)

On page 62, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

(3) RURAL EQUITY PAYMENT POLICIES.—The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that—

(A) preserves existing Medicare payment provisions supporting America's rural health care delivery system; and

(B) promotes Medicare payment policies that increase access to quality health care in isolated and underserved rural areas,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 4261

(Purpose: To reduce waste in Department of Defense contracting)

On page 37, line 4, strike ''spare parts,'' and insert ''spare parts; subject contracts performed outside the United States to the same ethics, control, and reporting requirements as those performed domestically,''.

AMENDMENT NO. 4243

(Purpose: To fully fund authorized amounts to implement the Adam Walsh Act that will increase enforcement to catch and detain child predators, combat child pornography, and make the Internet safer for our children)

On page 24, line 16, increase the amount by $26,000,000.

On page 24, line 17, increase the amount by $26,000,000.

On page 24, line 20, increase the amount by $26,000,000.

On page 24, line 21, increase the amount by $26,000,000.

On page 24, line 24, increase the amount by $26,000,000.

On page 24, line 25, increase the amount by $26,000,000.

On page 25, line 3, increase the amount by $26,000,000.

On page 25, line 4, increase the amount by $26,000,000.

On page 25, line 7, increase the amount by $26,000,000.

On page 25, line 8, increase the amount by $26,000,000.

On page 27, line 16, decrease the amount by $26,000,000.

On page 27, line 17, decrease the amount by $26,000,000.

On page 27, line 20, decrease the amount by $26,000,000.

On page 27, line 21, decrease the amount by $26,000,000.

On page 27, line 24, decrease the amount by $26,000,000.

On page 27, line 25, decrease the amount by $26,000,000.

On page 28, line 3, decrease the amount by $26,000,000.

On page 28, line 4, decrease the amount by $26,000,000.

On page 28, line 7, decrease the amount by $26,000,000.

On page 28, line 8, decrease the amount by $26,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 4153

(Purpose: To develop biodefense medical countermeasures by fully funding the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority (BARDA) in a fiscally responsible manner)

On page 19, line 16, increase the amount by $148,000,000.

On page 19, line 17, increase the amount by $89,000,000.

On page 19, line 21, increase the amount by $44,000,000.

On page 19, line 25, increase the amount by $15,000,000.

On page 27, line 16, decrease the amount by $148,000,000.

On page 27, line 17, decrease the amount by $89,000,000.

On page 27, line 21, decrease the amount by $44,000,000.

On page 27, line 25, decrease the amount by $15,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 4215

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve the animal health and disease program)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 3_____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE ANIMAL HEALTH AND DISEASE PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution by the amounts provided by a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that would ensure that the animal health and disease program established under section 1433 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3195) is fully funded.

(b) DEFICIT NEUTRALITY.—Subsection (a) applies only if the legislation described in subsection (a) would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 4287

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund for implementation of the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program for members of the National Guard and Reserve)

At the end of title III, add the following:

SEC. 308. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF YELLOW RIBBON REINTEGRATION PROGRAM FOR MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for one more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would provide for the implementation of the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program for members of the National Guard and Reserve under section 582 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Public Law 110–181), by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the total of the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013.

AMENDMENT NO. 4148

(Purpose: To increase by $71 million the resources available to the Food and Drug Administration in FY 2009 for food and drug safety)

On page 19, line 16, increase the amount by $71,000,000.

On page 19, line 17, increase the amount by $54,000,000.

On page 19, line 21, increase the amount by $12,000,000.

On page 19, line 25, increase the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 20, line 4, increase the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 27, line 16, decrease the amount by $71,000,000.

On page 27, line 17, decrease the amount by $54,000,000.

On page 27, line 21, decrease the amount by $12,000,000.

On page 27, line 25, decrease the amount by $3,000,000.

On page 28, line 4, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 4166

(Purpose: To increase FY 2009 funding for Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) by $100 million, with an offset)

On page 24, line 16 increase the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 24, line 17, increase the amount by $22,000,000.

On page 24, line 21, increase the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 24, line 25, increase the amount by $20,000,000.

On page 25, line 4, increase the amount by $15,000,000.

On page 25, line 8, increase the amount by $13,000,000.

On page 27, line 16, decrease the amount by $100,000,000.

On page 27, line 17, decrease the amount by $22,000,000.

On page 27, line 21, decrease the amount by $30,000,000.

On page 27, line 25, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.

On page 28, line 4, decrease the amount by $15,000,000.

On page 28, line 8, decrease the amount by $13,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 4225

(Purpose: To provide for a total of $950,000,000 in outlays for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program in fiscal year 2009)

On page 24, line 16, increase the amount by $533,000,000.

On page 24, line 17, increase the amount by $117,000,000.

On page 24, line 21, increase the amount by $160,000,000.

On page 24, line 25, increase the amount by $107,000,000.

On page 25, line 4, increase the amount by $80,000,000.

On page 25, line 8, increase the amount by $69,000,000.

On page 27, line 16, decrease the amount by $533,000,000.

On page 27, line 17 decrease the amount by $117,000,000.

On page 27, line 21, decrease the amount by $160,000,000.

On page 27, line 25, decrease the amount by $107,000,000.

On page 28, line 4, decrease the amount by $80,000,000.

On page 28, line 8, decrease the amount by $69,000,000.

At the end of the resolution, insert the following:

SEC. ____. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REIMBURSING STATES FOR THE COSTS OF HOUSING UNDOCUMENTED CRIMINAL ALIENS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the aggregates, allocations, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for 1 or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would reimburse States and units of local government for costs incurred to house undocumented criminal aliens, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 4253

(Purpose: To increase spending for the Maternal and Child Health Block Grant by $184,000,000 in fiscal year 2009, with an offset)

On page 19, line 16, increase the amount by $184,000,000.

On page 19, line 17, increase the amount by $96,000,000.

On page 19, line 21, increase the amount by $70,000,000.

On page 19, line 25, increase the amount by $9,000,000.

On page 20, line 4, increase the amount by $9,000,000.

On page 27, line 16, decrease the amount by $184,000,000.

On page 27, line 17, decrease the amount by $96,000,000.

On page 27, line 21, decrease the amount by $70,000,000.

On page 27, line 25, decrease the amount by $9,000,000.

On page 28, line 4, decrease the amount by $9,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 4286

(Purpose: To provide in the deficit-neutral reserve fund for America's veterans and wounded servicemembers and for a Post 9/11 GI bill for access of rural veterans to health care and other services)

On page 58, line 23, strike ''family members;'' and insert ''family members; or

(4) enhance programs and activities to increase the availability of health care and other veterans services for veterans living in rural areas;

AMENDMENT NO. 4183

(Purpose: To add a deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve student achievement during secondary education, including middle school completion, high school graduation and preparing students for higher education and the workforce)

At the end of Sec. 302, insert the following:

(b) The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other levels and limits in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would improve student achievement during secondary education, including middle school completion, high school graduation and preparing students for higher education and the workforce, by the amounts provided in such legislation for such purpose, provided that such legislation would not ncrease the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 4210

(Purpose: To include rail (including high-speed passenger rail), airport, and seaport projects in the eligibility requirements of the Deficit Neutral Reserve Fund for Investments in America's Infrastructure)

On page 56, line 12, insert ''rail (including high-speed passenger rail), airport, seaport,'' after ''transit''.

AMENDMENT NO. 4199

(Purpose: To provide for the use of the deficit-neutral reserve fund for tax relief to reinstate and expand the charitable IRA rollover)

On page 50, line 20, insert '', reinstatement of expired tax relief, such as enhanced charitable giving from individual retirement accounts, including life-income gifts,'' after ''expiring tax relief''.

AMENDMENT NO. 4249

(Purpose: To increase the number of organ donations by funding the programs authorized by the Organ Donation and Recovery Improvement Act of 2004)

On page 19, line 16, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 19, line 17, increase the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 19, line 21, increase the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 19, line 25, increase the amount by $1,000,000.

On page 27, line 16, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 27, line 17, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 27, line 21, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 27, line 25, decrease the amount by $1,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 4285

(Purpose: To make funds available to ensure that Survivor Benefit Plan annuities are not reduced by the amount of veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation received by military families)

On page 58, line 24, insert after ''family members'' the following: ''or veterans (including the elimination of the offset between Survivor Benefit Plan annuities and veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 4211

(Purpose: To increase funding for operations and management of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, with an offset)

On page 17, line 14, increase the amount by $141,000,000.

On page 17, line 15, increase the amount by $92,000,000.

On page 17, line 19, increase the amount by $24,000,000.

On page 17, line 23, increase the amount by $20,000,000.

On page 18, line 3, increase the amount by $5,000,000.

On page 27, line 16, decrease the amount by $141,000,000.

On page 27, line 17, decrease the amount by $92,000,000.

On page 27, line 21, decrease the amount by $24,000,000.

On page 27, line 25, decrease the amount by $20,000,000.

On page 28, line 4, decrease the amount by $5,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 4162

(Purpose: To establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to provide for the acceleration of the phased-in eligibility of members of the Armed Forces for concurrent receipt of retired pay and veterans' disability compensation)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ACCELERATION OF PHASED-IN ELIGIBILITY FOR CONCURRENT RECEIPT OF BENEFITS.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels and limits in this resolution for a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that provides for changing the date by which eligibility of members of the Armed Forces for concurrent receipt of retired pay and veterans' disability compensation under section 1414 of title 10, United States Code, is fully phased in from December 31, 2013, to September 30, 2008, by the amounts provided in that legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 4176

(Purpose: To provide for a deficit-neutral reserve fund for the increased use of recovery audits)

On page 69, after line 25, add the following:

SEC. 308. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INCREASED USE OF RECOVERY AUDITS.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that achieves savings by requiring that agencies increase their use of recovery audits authorized under subchapter VI of chapter 35 of title 31, United States Code, (commonly referred to as the Erroneous Payments Recovery Act of 2001) and uses such savings to reduce the deficit, by the amounts provided in such legislation for such purpose, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 4172

(Purpose: To include in the deficit-neutral reserve funds for America's veterans and wounded servicemembers and for a post 9/11 GI bill provision for the continuing payment to members of the Armed Forces who are retired or separated from the Armed Forces due to a combat-related injury after September 11, 2001, of bonuses that such members were entitled to before the retirement or separation and would continue to be entitled to such members were not retired or separated)

On page 58, line 23, strike ''family members;'' and insert ''family members; or

(4) providing for the continuing payment to members of the Armed Forces who are retired or separated from the Armed Forces due to a combat-related injury after September 11, 2001, of bonuses that such members were entitled to before the retirement or separation and would continue to be entitled to such members were not retired or separated;

AMENDMENT NO. 4219

(Purpose: To provide for the use of the deficit-neutral reserve fund for tax relief to encourage struggling companies to invest in new equipment and stimulate the United States economy by allowing the use of accumulated alternative minimum tax and research and development credits in lieu of bonus depreciation)

On page 50, line 21, insert ''and incentivizing utilization of accumulated alternative minimum tax and research and development credits'' after ''refundable tax relief''.

AMENDMENT NO. 4227

(Purpose: To increase funding for the Administration on Aging by the authorized level of $53,000,000 in fiscal year 2009 for the Lifespan Respite Care Act, which provides much-needed respite care to our nation's dedicated family caregivers for the elderly and disabled)

On page 18, line 16, increase the amount by $53,000,000.

On page 18, line 17, increase the amount by $34,000,000.

On page 18, line 21, increase the amount by $17,000,000.

On page 18, line 25, increase the amount by $2,000,000.

On page 27, line 16, decrease the amount by $53,000,000.

On page 27, line 17, decrease the amount by $34,000,000.

On page 27, line 21, decrease the amount by $17,000,000.

On page 27, line 25, decrease the amount by $2,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 4352

(Purpose: To add a deficit-neutral reserve fund for the protection and safety of the Nation's food supply)

At the end of title III, insert the following:

SEC. ___. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR FOOD SAFETY.

The Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other levels in this resolution for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, motions, or conference reports that would expand the level of Food and Drug Administration and Department of Agriculture food safety inspection services, develop risk-based approaches to the inspection of domestic and imported food products, provide for infrastructure and information technology systems to enhance the safety of the food supply, expand scientific capacity and training programs, invest in improved surveillance and testing technologies, provide for foodborne illness awareness and education programs, and enhance the Food and Drug Administration's recall authority, by the amounts provided in such legislation for such purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2013 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2008 through 2018.

N O T I C E

Incomplete record of Senate proceedings.

Today's Senate proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING ROSAMOND PAYNE

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Rosamond Payne, a Senior Associate Director in emergency medicine at Kings County Hospital Center. Mrs. Payne is also a Family Nurse Practitioner in emergency medicine as well. It behooves us to honor Mrs. Payne who immigrated to the United States from Grenada where she had vast political involvement in solving community issues and needs.

For many years, Mrs. Payne has been a preceptor for Advance Practice Nurse Practitioner students; has been a mentor in the African-American Nursing Leadership Program at New York University. Additionally, Rosamond has been a professor of nursing for three years at the City University of New York serving on the curriculum committee and as the liaison between the City University of New York and the College of Nursing in the Netherlands.

Mrs. Payne is well respected among the medical profession, having been drafted as a visiting clinical instructor at Columbia and Malloy Universities. To her credit, she entered the medical profession as a registered nurse in 1991, and with her enthusiasm and drive, she empowered people and encouraging them to improve themselves.

She also does community outreach medical educational seminars on stroke and stroke education through the American Heart Association. Along the way, Mrs. Payne has given testimony before the legislators in Albany, New York regarding the drafting of the nursing curriculum to provide an excellent education for nursing students and to improve nursing student graduates to pass their licensing examinations in order to ameliorate the nursing shortage statewide.

Finally, Rosamond has volunteered for years on medical missions to Guyana, South America and even drafted her twenty-year old daughter, Ann Marie, who volunteered in December 2006 and is on her way to medical school herself in the near future.

Madam Speaker, Mrs. Payne is a proud wife and mother who loves her profession. It is important for us to recognize her accomplishments and her selfless service.

CAROLINE PELTON

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Caroline Pelton of Cameron, Missouri. Caroline is a very special young woman who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Girl Scouts of America, and earning the most prestigious award of Girl Scout Gold Award.

Caroline has been very active with her troop, participating in many scout activities. In order to receive the prestigious Gold Award, Caroline has completed all seven requirements that promote community service, personal and spiritual growth, positive values and leadership skills.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Caroline Pelton her accomplishments with the Girl Scouts of America and for her efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Girl Scout Gold Award.

LIVING BY THE SWORD

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, it has been said that "he who lives by the sword shall die by the sword." And in the case of Eliot Spitzer this couldn't be more true. In his case it's the political sword, as his enemies rejoice in his downfall. Most people, it seems, believe he got exactly what he deserved.

The illegal tools of the state brought Spitzer down, but think of all the harm done by Spitzer in using the same tools against so many other innocent people. He practiced what could be termed "economic McCarthyism," using illegitimate government power to build his political career on the ruined lives of others.

No matter how morally justified his comeuppance may be, his downfall demonstrates the worst of our society. The possibility of uncovering personal moral wrongdoing is never a justification for the government to spy on our every move and to participate in sting operations.

For government to entice a citizen to break a law with a sting operation—that is, engaging in activities that a private citizen is prohibited by law from doing—is unconscionable and should clearly be illegal.

Though Spitzer used the same tools to destroy individuals charged with economic crimes that ended up being used against him, gloating over his downfall should not divert our attention from the fact that the government spying on American citizens is unworthy of a country claiming respect for liberty and the fourth amendment.

Two wrongs do not make a right. Two wrongs make it doubly wrong.

Sacrifice of our personal privacy has been ongoing for decades, but has rapidly accelerated since 9/11. Before 9/11 the unstated goal of collecting revenue was the real reason for the erosion of our financial privacy. When 19 suicidal maniacs attacked us on 9/11, our country became convinced that further sacrifice of personal and financial privacy was required for our security.

The driving force behind this ongoing sacrifice of our privacy has been fear and the emotional effect of war rhetoric—war on drugs, war against terrorism, and the war against third world nations in the Middle East who are claimed to be the equivalent to Hitler and Nazi Germany.

But the real reason for all this surveillance is to build the power of the state. It arises from a virulent dislike of free people running their own lives and spending their own money. Statists always demand control of the people and their money.

Recently we've been told that this increase in the already intolerable invasion of our privacy was justified because the purpose was to apprehend terrorists. We were told that the massive amounts of information being collected on Americans would only be used to root out terrorists. But as we can see today, this monitoring of private activities can also be used for political reasons. We should always be concerned when the government accumulates information on innocent citizens.

Spitzer was brought down because he legally withdrew cash from a bank—not because he committed a crime. This should prompt us to reassess and hopefully reverse this trend of pervasive government intrusion in our private lives.

We need no more Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act! No more Violent Radicalization & Homegrown Terrorism Prevention Acts! No more torture! No more Military Commissions Act! No more secret prisons and extraordinary rendition! No more abuse of habeas corpus! No more PATRIOT Acts!

What we need is more government transparency and more privacy for the individual!

INTRODUCTION OF THE CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION WITH INDIAN TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS ACT

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker. Today I am introducing the "Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments Act."

Normally, I would be pleased to offer a bill that strengthens the government-to-government relationship between the United States and Indian tribes. But today, I am disappointed that such legislation is necessary.

It is undisputed that the United States has a legal and political relationship with Indian tribes and Alaska Natives. As such, when the Federal government interacts with Indian tribes, it does so on a government-to-government basis. This, combined with the history of treatment of Indian tribes by the United States, imposes a moral obligation on the United

States to consult with Indian tribes before enacting policies that have a direct effect on them.

The history of Federal-Tribal relations has shown that consultation with Indian tribes works. The Federal Indian policies that have failed have been those that were developed without tribal input or are contrary to tribal input. On the other hand, the Federal Indian policy that has succeeded is that which allows Indian tribes the most input and control over their own affairs—tribal self-governance and self-determination. Indian tribes know what is best for themselves and for their members.

So it is disappointing that over 30 years after passage of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act that this Administration refuses to engage in timely and meaningful consultation with Indian tribes.

Despite the political and moral obligation, as well as Presidential Executive Order 13175 requiring the administration to consult with Indian tribes, this administration has flagrantly ignored this responsibility. Instead, the administration takes actions that often have serious and negative consequences on Indian country, without any consultation at all. The House Committee on Natural Resources hears from Indian tribes on a continuous basis about the lack of government-to-government consultation between the administration and Indian tribes.

This bill will require the Department of the Interior, the Indian Health Service, and the National Indian Gaming Commission to enter into a true consultation process with Indian tribes and Alaska Natives before new policies or actions are taken, which will directly affect them.

This bill will mandate that Federal Indian policy is formulated only with input from Indian country while respecting Indian tribal self-government, sovereignty, and with honor for treaties signed long ago.

This bill will ensure that the United States will not repeat the mistaken policies of the past where the Great White Father makes decisions and policies in a vacuum.

This bill will make sure that the United States as a government sits at the table with Indian tribal governments when decisions are to be made affecting the lives of our First Americans.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

RECONNECTING HOMELESS YOUTH ACT OF 2008

HON. JUDY BIGGERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mrs. BIGGERT. Madam Speaker, I rise today as the lead Republican Sponsor of H.R. 5524, the Reconnecting Homeless Youth Act of 2008. I am pleased to join with my good friend Congressman JOHN YARMUTH to introduce this important hill reauthorizing and strengthening programs for runaway and homeless youth programs set to expire this year.

Madam Speaker, each year, between one and three million children in the United States find themselves on their own and on the street. Throughout our Nation, local shelters, like Naperville Community Outreach and Aunt Martha's in my district, rely on Federal support to keep these kids safe and off the streets.

Congress first enacted the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, RHYA, in 1974 and has regularly reauthorized it to ensure a basic level of support for unaccompanied youth. The Reconnecting Homeless Youth Act does more than reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act. It gives children whose lives have been disrupted an opportunity to overcome homelessness and get on track for a successful future.

This bill gives needed flexibility to shelters receiving Basic Center Program, BCP, funds, which provide children with emergency short-term shelter while attempts are made at family reunification. It strengthens Transitional Living Programs, TLP, that provide older youth with lite skills, education and employment services to help them become self-sufficient and independent. The bill also strengthens outreach efforts aimed at educating runaways on the services available and preventing youth from running away in the first place.

While the bill improves key components of runaway and homeless youth programs, I do have some concerns that I look forward to addressing as the bill moves through the Education and Labor Committee. First, I am concerned that raising minimum small state and territory allotments could adversely affect other States and territories if RHYA funding levels remain flat. Secondly, while I support the intent of more accurate research on runaway and homeless youth, I believe we can find a more cost-effective alternative to the research mandated in this bill. Lastly, I am concerned that the grant appeals process created in the bill attempts to fix a problem that simply does not exist and, in doing so, raises costs associated with administering the program.

I very much appreciate the assurances I've been given by the majority and minority on the Education and Labor Committee that we will discuss these and other issues in a bipartisan manner to make a good bill great, and, most importantly, to keep children off the streets.

IN RECOGNITION OF DELIA P. SANCHEZ IN HONOR OF WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. KATHY CASTOR

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Speaker, in recognition of Women's History Month, I rise today to honor Delia P. Sanchez, a champion for children in Florida. Ms. Sanchez is a wonderful example of the power of women to shape future generations and make a difference in their communities.

Ms. Sanchez is a lifelong learner. She obtained her bachelor's degree from Florida State University in social work with minors in education and spanish in 1945 and went on to get her master's in social work at Columbia University in 1947. Until 1991, nearly 50 years later, she took graduate level courses in areas such as pupil personnel services, education, and rehabilitation.

All the while, Ms. Sanchez was affecting enormous change in lives of hundreds of children in the Tampa Bay area. One of the greatest services that Delia Sanchez provided to the Tampa community was to work with Congressman Sam Gibbons to bring the first Head Start program to Hillsborough County. She began her career as a child welfare worker for the Florida State Welfare Board. From there Ms. Sanchez went on to work for the School Board of Hillsborough County as a school social worker and a case work consultant, working her way up the ranks to eventually serve as the administrative supervisor for Head Start for 9 years. Then, in the last 3 years of her career, she went into private practice to counsel troubled children.

Throughout her career and in her retirement, Ms. Sanchez has served as a board member or local representative to a number of community organizations. The list is too large to mention them all, but they range from the University of South Florida's Latin Community Advisory Committee, the Citizen's Advisory Council, the Child Abuse Council, the Ybor City Museum Society, to the National Association of Social Workers.

For all of her hard work for the education and welfare of children, countless organizations have recognized her. Ms. Sanchez is the recipient of the U.S. State Department Fellowship Award, the American Red Cross Service Award twice, the Mayor's Brotherhood/Sisterhood Award, the USF Social Work Alumni Society Award for Outstanding Community Service, the Channel 8 WFLA Volunteer of the Year Award, the Commemoration Committee Award for Dedicated Community Service, the Retired Social Worker Outstanding Achievement Award, the St. John Presbyterian Early Childhood Hand Print Award, the Ybor City Museum Society Pizzo Award to preserve Tampa's Latin heritage, the Hillsborough County Martin Luther King, Jr. Award, the Louis De La Parte Mental Health Advisory Council Award, and the National Head Start Association Lifetime Achievement Award.

And, if all of that wasn't enough, she is also a member of Sigma Delta Pi Spanish Honor Society, was named Social Worker of the Year by the National Association of Social Workers by the Tampa Bay Unit and then again by the Florida Chapter, received an honorary Doctorate from the University of South Florida School of Social Work, and in 1993 she was Hispanic Woman of the Year.

Madam Speaker, Delia P. Sanchez is a woman of the highest regard who has dedicated her life to helping others. I am proud to call her my neighbor, and I join many others to applaud her lifetime contribution to the Tampa Bay community.

HONORING ASNETH SYDONNIE COUNCIL

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Asneth Sydonnie Council for outstanding and exemplary contribution to children and families in their pursuit of educational opportunities and advancement.

Asneth Council grew up in St. Ann, Jamaica in a home environment nurtured with love and strong family ties. She is the first of four daughters and one son of Mrs. Hillary Livingston, who is herself an educator. Her family's motto is "Education Is the Key to Success." Naturally, Ms. Council epitomizes this motto in

her professional life as well as her work with children, families, staff and community stakeholders.

Asneth attended and graduated magna cum laude with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Behavioral Science from Mercy College. She continued her studies at Teachers College of Columbia University where she earned a Master of Arts Degree in Social and Organizational Psychology. Her love of learning propelled Ms. Council to return to Long Island University where she completed a second Master's Degree in Public Administration in May 2007. She is presently enrolled in Doctoral Studies with a concentration in Industrial and Organizational Psychology.

Starting at the Joseph DiMarco Head Start program where she worked with children and their families, she continued working in Head Start by setting up a joint Head Start program with Broadway Housing and Center for Urban Community Services.

In December 2005, Asneth Sydonnie Council joined the Police Athletic League where she was quickly promoted from Deputy Director to the Director of Head Start programs and in August of 2007, was promoted to her current position as Director of Childcare and Nutrition. Moreover, Ms. Council is also a member of the Police Athletic League Strategic Planning Committee.

Ms. Council and her husband, Herbert, are celebrating seven years of marriage and are the proud parents of five children who continue to excel in their educational pursuits. Keeping with the tradition of her family's motto, Asneth also believes that ''every individual is important and has something to offer.''

Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to honor Asneth Sydonnie Council for her important role, her unwavering dedication and valuable contributions on behalf of young children. She is selfless and gives all of her heart to the very young who need her compassion the most.

STEPHANIE MORROW

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Stephanie Morrow of Blue Springs, Missouri. Stephanie is a very special young woman who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Girl Scouts of America, and earning the most prestigious award of Girl Scout Gold Award.

Stephanie has been very active with her troop, participating in many scout activities. In order to receive the prestigious Gold Award, Stephanie has completed all seven requirements that promote community service, personal and spiritual growth, positive values and leadership skills.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Stephanie Morrow for her accomplishments with the Girl Scouts of America and for her efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Girl Scout Gold Award.

HONORING NANCY PORTER MORRILL

HON. PATRICK J. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Nancy Porter Morrill—the 2008 recipient the Bucks County Women's History Month Award. Ms. Morrill is being recognized by the Bucks County Women's Fund for her hard work and exceptional achievements in working to improve her community.

Ms. Morrill has a long and distinguished career of service to Bucks County. Committed to improving Bucks County. Ms. Morrill dedicated herself to working for various organizations, such as Community Development Advisory Council, Human Services Advisory Council and the Operations Review and Evaluations Committee.

Ms. Morrill has also worked to improve the scholastic and cultural environment of Bucks County. She was an important member of both School Works! and the Pennsbury School District, working to advance the relationships between businesses, teachers, students, and parents.

She has had an impact on the arts as well. She helped create the Arts and Cultural Council of Bucks County and the Food and Wine Festival in Bucks County which she co-chaired for 5 years. Ms. Morrill was also an active member of the Pennsbury Arts Foundation and the Art Committee of the Phillips Mill Community Association.

Of all Ms. Morrill's outstanding achievements, her most important work has been done fighting for women's rights in Bucks County. Over many years, Ms. Morrill worked tirelessly for the Planned Parenthood organization. She was head of the fundraising committee for the Planned Parenthood clinic in Doylestown and she went on to serve as the president of Bucks County Planned Parenthood organization. Also, Ms. Morrill was named the secretary of the board of the Family Planning Association of S.E.PA, and helped to build the Bucks County Women's Fund.

As her outstanding resume shows, Nancy Morrill has pledged her life to helping those in her community. Through her tireless work, Ms. Morrill has changed Bucks County for the better. Madam Speaker, I am proud to recognize Ms. Morrill for her extraordinary accomplishments and extremely honored to serve as her Congressman.

HONORING OLD FIRST CHURCH IN SPRINGFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I would like to commemorate the First Church of Christ, Congregational, located in Springfield, MA, commonly known as ''Old First Church.'' The congregation first established on the banks of the Connecticut River in 1637, conducted its last service on Sunday, December 31, 2007. Its steeple bells tolled for the last time after the service was concluded and rang out over Court Square and downtown Springfield in its entirety. Its closing should not go unreported.

Old First Church was founded by settlers, including William Pynchon, who came to the banks of the Connecticut River from Roxbury, MA, in 1636. The settlers began worshiping in settlers' homes in 1637 with the Reverend George Moon. The First Meeting House was built in 1637, the second in 1677, the third in 1752 (during the ministry of the Reverend Robert Breck), and the fourth, and current, Meeting House was built in 1819. The dedication of the building took place on August 19, 1819. Three thousand people, essentially the entire population of Springfield and the surrounding area were in attendance.

Old First Church is the ''mother church'' for 15 ongregations throughout the Connecticut River valley and over 30 churches can trace their roots to Old First Church. Several of the churches were established for reasons of theological difference and sometimes because of differences relative to a particular pastor's style and perspective. Among the active ''daughter'' churches are: First Church of Christ, Congregational, Suffield, CT; Enfield Congregational Church, Enfield, CT; First Congregational Church UCC, West Springfield, MA; Wilbraham United Church, Wilbraham, MA; First Congregational Church, Brimfield, MA; First Congregational Church UCC, Chicopee, MA, First Church in Ludlow UCC, Ludlow, MA; The Thirds Congregational Society; South Congregational Church UCC in Springfield, MA; and First Church in Longmeadow, MA. The members of Old First Church hope that their legacy, which includes a commitment to social justice and to serving the people of Greater Springfield in countless ways, will continue through the members of those ''daughter'' congregations.

The current Meeting House was designed and built by Captain Isaac Damon, with a steeple alter the manner of Christopher Wren. Captain Damon originally traveled to Western Massachusetts from Weymouth, MA, to work on the First Church of Christ in Northampton. Subsequently he worked on additional projects in the Northampton area and it was his work in that area that caused the members of Old First Church to seek him out.

From its position atop the steeple of Old First Church, the Rooster weathervane (which was first placed on the third Meeting House in 1768 and on the current Meeting House when fully constructed in 1819) has been a witness to Springfield's rich and important New England history including: George Washington passing by on June 30, 1775, to take charge of the defense in Boston; the travel of Henry Knox and his train of artillery on January 26, 1776; the selection of Springfield as the site for the first United States Arsenal; General Burgoyne's army after its defeat in Saratoga, New York in 1777; and the defense of the Springfield Armory from rebel forces lead by Daniel Shays in 1787. In more current times, it has gone on to witness community celebrations and commemorations, demonstrations and festivals. It has remained steady and devoted to the City of Springfield and its citizens, just as the members of the Congregation of Old First Church have for hundreds of years.

There are many events and activities of note which have taken place at Old First Church over the centuries, which include the

body of President John Quincy Adams laying in state, and the famed Swedish soprano, Jenny Lind, performing at the Church in July 1851. Samuel Chapin, the subject of the St. Gaudans ''the Puritan'' statue, was an early deacon of the Church. Old First Church played a role in the Underground Railroad. In fact, Reverend Osgood brought in leading abolitionists from England to give speeches advocating against slavery. Daniel Webster attended Old First Church on more than one occasion.

The church also organized and annually hosted a series of musical presentations called ''Music at First'' which featured individual artists, chambers music, ensembles and choral groups. The New England Academy of Academic Artists was also annually provided with a venue for its Juried Show.

Old First Church, until its closing, hosted the largest and longest established Alcoholics Anonymous meeting in Western Massachusetts.

Beginning in 1977, Old First Church began to house ''Open Pantry'' the largest food distribution service for the needy in the Greater Springfield area. It also hosted and regularly staffed ''Loaves and Fishes'' providing two meals for the homeless each Saturday and Sunday. In recent years, during the winter months, the Church opened its door to ''The Warming Place'' supplying emergency shelter to the area's homeless.

Public Vigils to raise consciousness surrounding the issues of AIDS, domestic violence and other social issues have regularly been held at Old First Church as well as memorial services for the New England Association of Fire Chiefs.

The members of the congregation embraced and actively participated in ''Walking United'' a program designed to gather and distribute unused prosthetic devices in the United States to a clinic it established to aid the people of Nicaragua who suffered as a result of land mine and other catastrophic injuries.

Despite its conservative New England roots, Old First Church has been among the most socially progressive churches in Massachusetts. It has been a church which has paved the way for other congregations to follow and one that has always provided unconditional resources and support to those in need within and beyond the City of Springfield.

At the ''Celebrations of the Life of Old First Church 1637 to 2007'' those in attendance were invited by the Reverend Dr. J. Thomas Gough, the 23rd settled pastor of Old First Church, to come forward and accept ''packets of seed'' while offering this prayer:

''Gracious God, Creator of earth and sky, author of all living things, spirit of hope and grace and promise, be part of us now as your people here at Old First Church prepare to offer themselves as seeds of your love. Bless these packets of seed as symbols of your intention for us that we might venture forth into the world bearing what is necessary to grow in other soil.

''May it be your breath that blows us to other places. May it be your call that leads us to go forth from this place to be your people scattered in the world. May we follow in the paths you set before us and take root where next you plant us. Help us, above all, to flourish in new places and to bring the fruit of Old First Church to ripeness in other communities of faith. Let what we have learned in this place, what has given us life and meaning and purpose, create new and holy spaces wherever we are taken in your name.''

Madam Speaker, it is my hope that Old First Church will continue to remain a historic landmark and preserved, as it is truly one of the most significant buildings in the city. The parish house has potential valuable uses for the city and it would be a tragedy if we did not do everything in our power to preserve this building. The memories made at the church will continue to live on in the hearts and spirits of the members.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, on March 12, 2008, I was unavoidably detained and was not able to record my votes for Rollcall Nos. 124–134.

Had I been present I would have voted:

Rollcall No. 124—''no''—On Motion to Adjourn.

Rollcall No. 125—''no''—Resolution Raising a Question of the Privileges of the House.

Rollcall No. 126—''no''—On Motion to Adjourn.

Rollcall No. 127—''no''—On Motion to Adjourn.

Rollcall No. 128—''yes''—On Motion to Table the Resolution.

Rollcall No. 129—''yes''—Providing for the consideration of H. Con. Res. 312, Congressional Budget for the U.S. Government for Fiscal Year 2009.

Rollcall No. 130—''yes''—Providing for the consideration of H. Con. Res. 312, Congressional Budget for the U.S. Government for Fiscal Year 2009.

Rollcall No. 131—''yes''—Generations Invigorating Volunteerism and Education Act.

Rollcall No. 132—''yes''—Providing for an adjournment or recess of the two Houses.

Rollcall No. 133—''yes''—Honoring the 200th anniversary of the Gallatin Report on Roads and Canals, celebrating the national unity the Gallatin Report engendered, and recognizing the vast contributions that national planning efforts have provided to the United States.

Rollcall No. 134—''yes''—To temporarily extend the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965.

HONORING FRANKLIN SCHOOL FOR BEING NAMED AN ILLINOIS SCHOOL OF HONOR

HON. JERRY F. COSTELLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. COSTELLO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Franklin School, in Belleville, Illinois, for being named an Illinois School of Honor, one of only two schools in Illinois to receive this award.

The University of Illinois Extension has teamed with the Character Education Partnership (CEP) to conduct an award competition that recognizes schools that have implemented outstanding programs in character education. Franklin School was selected in the state competition as one of only two Illinois Schools of Honor. This is a prestigious honor for Franklin School and brings well-deserved recognition to their very successful character education program.

With the emphasis in recent years on testing and meeting aggressive educational standards, it is refreshing to see that schools also realize that character counts. These schools demonstrate that well-rounded students can be developed by instilling values of respect for others and good moral judgment while also focusing on instruction in academic subjects.

The application process for the State School of Character competition is very rigorous and there are specific, objective criteria that must be met to qualify. In order to be considered, a school must demonstrate that they have implemented a comprehensive, effective and successful program for incorporating character development into their school environment. Winning this award reflects positively on the entire Franklin School community, administration, faculty and staff, students and families. All worked together to achieve this honor.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the administration, faculty, staff, students and families of Franklin School for their recognition as an Illinois School of Honor.

FREEDOM FOR RANDY CABRERA MAYOR

HON. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak about Randy Cabrera Mayor, a prisoner of conscience in totalitarian Cuba.

Mr. Cabrera Mayor was imprisoned by the Cuban totalitarian dictatorship in 1989, a month before his 19th birthday. for his refusal to join the dictatorship's armed forces.

Eight months after his imprisonment, Mr. Cabrera Mayor courageously escaped the atrocious confinement facility known as ''Ganusa'', located in San Jose de las Lajas. He promptly built himself a makeshift boat and attempted to reach freedom in the United States. Unfortunately, Mr. Cabrera Mayor was caught ten miles off the coast of Matanzas by agents of the communist dictatorship. He was convicted by a sham tribunal on charges of ''treason'' and ''illegal departure from the island.'' This would mark the first of many unsuccessful attempts by this brave political prisoner to achieve his god-given right to freedom.

My colleagues, I wish to bring to your attention the inhumane conditions Mr. Cabrera Mayor is currently living in. The food he is being provided is consistently under an advanced stage of decomposition to the point that it is propagating intestinal diseases. He spends long periods of time in solitary confinement without access to a bathroom and shackles have been attached to his ankles to hinder his movements. When not in solitary confinement, Mr. Cabrera Mayor and other political prisoners are held in the same cells as common criminals of the most dangerous kinds.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Randy Cabrera Mayor has engaged in numerous hunger strikes to

protest his conditions and those of other prisoners, and he has been met with threats of beatings and withholding of sustenance, all in accordance with the usual treatments that the brutal regime that currently oppresses Cuba affords its political opponents in the dark and cruel world of Castro's gulags.

Madam Speaker and colleagues, the conditions in which prisoners of conscience in Cuba are held are abominable and condemnable. We must demand the immediate release of Mr. Cabrera Mayor and all unjustly incarcerated prisoners, including all the political prisoners in totalitarian Cuba.

HONORING DR. MONA PERVIL ULYSSE

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Mona Pervil-Ulysse, a native of Cap-Haitien, Haiti who arrived in the United States at the age of eleven where she attended elementary, junior and high schools in Brooklyn, New York.

Subsequently, Dr. Ulysse pursued her premedical requirements in the Sciences as a Biology Major at Brooklyn College and completing the Basic Sciences years of medical school at the Universidad del Noreste in Mexico. The last two years of medical school were pursued at the Albert Einstein College of Medicine, and the Bronx Lebanon Hospital Center in New York. She completed her residency in Internal Medicine at Kings County Hospital and SUNY Downstate Medical Center, where she proceeded to specialized training in Rheumatology.

Dr. Mona Pervil-Ulysse is Chief of Rheumatology at Interfaith Medical Center since 1997. She is a clinical instructor at SUNY Downstate Medical Center and attending physician at the New York Methodist Hospital. She coordinates a well-organized arthritis clinic, (Orris G. Walker Clinic) and is a mentor to medical residents in training who rotate through the Rheumatology Division at the Interfaith Medical Center. She provides Rheumatology consulting services at various nursing homes and is in private practice. Dr. Pervil-Ulysse has been a co-principal investigator of different research projects during her specialized training in Rheumatology. Her clinical presentations and professional activities have received recognitions in medical journals and newspapers. She is a frequent lecturer of the various rheumatologic diseases, notably Systemic Lupus Erythematosus, Rheumatoid Arthritis and Osteoarthritis, among many others.

Dr. Mona Pervil-Ulysse holds various leadership positions. She is the president of the Christian Community Health Team, the New York Chapter of the Baptist Medical Dental Fellowship from the Southern Baptist Convention. Also, she is president of the Aesclepius Medical Society and administrator of L'ASCH, a Brooklyn partner of the Lupus Foundation. Dr. Pervil-Ulysse participates in health fairs, lectures in schools in the tri-state area and conducts an annual health fair in Haiti with the French Speaking Baptist Church.

Madam Speaker, it behooves us to pay tribute to this incredible doctor who has dedicated her entire career in caring for the ill and for her endless support of the struggle against health care disparities. Dr. Mona Pervil-Ulysse is a remarkable person and I am proud to recognize her today.

MISHA MAZURKEWYCZ

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Misha Mazurkewycz of Saint Joseph, Missouri. Misha is a very special young woman who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Girl Scouts of America, and earning the most prestigious award of Girl Scout Gold Award.

Misha has been very active with her troop, participating in many scout activities. In order to receive the prestigious Gold Award, Misha has completed all seven requirements that promote community service, personal and spiritual growth, positive values and leadership skills.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Misha Mazurkewycz for her accomplishments with the Girl Scouts of America and for her efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Girl Scout Gold Award.

HONORING LANCE CORPORAL JERED CAMPBELL

HON. BILL SALI

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. SALI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of my constituents, LCpl Jered Campbell.

Lance Corporal Campbell recently returned from Haditha, Iraq, where he served a 7-month deployment. He was assigned to Company "E" of the Second Battalion, Third Marine Regiment of the United States Marine Corps.

The city of Haditha saw unprecedented improvements where Lance Corporal Campbell's Company E served. Upon arrival, Haditha was considered one of the most dangerous regions in Iraq. By the end of Lance Corporal Campbell's deployment, the police force was rapidly growing, attacks on Iraqi police and Marine patrols were steadily decreasing, and relations with the Iraqi people were improving.

Madam Speaker, please join me in paying tribute to Lance Corporal Campbell, whose selfless actions benefit all Americans. Our Nation owes Lance Corporal Campbell and his fellow Marines a great debt of gratitude for their service.

HONORING LARRY FURROW IN HIS ACCOMPLISHMENTS AT RETIREMENT

HON. STEVAN PEARCE

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. PEARCE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the great achievements of Lt. Larry Furrow. In the 41 years that Larry has served the U.S. military and Government, he continually showed great dedication, knowledge, and skill. I greatly admire his dedication to his work. His many years of education and lifetime of experiences make Mr. Furrow a noteworthy man and an exceptional example to other people.

Mr. Furrow's service to his country did not stop in the military after he gained the rank of lieutenant in 1993. He went on to become the chief of public affairs for White Sands Missile Range in New Mexico. These are all reasons to honor Mr. Furrow, but he is also admired for his great sense of humor that attracted people to him—whether it was in the military, flying people around, or working in public relations for White Sands Missile Range.

Among his many respectable traits, Mr. Furrow is also an enthusiastic outdoorsman who likes to spend time snowshoeing, skiing, and running marathons. He is not only adventurous and dedicated, he is also a loving husband, father, and grandfather.

In all of the years that Mr. Furrow has been in the workplace, he has exemplified hard work, dedication, and commitment to duty and country. It is inspiring to know and a privilege to honor Mr. Furrow in his time of retirement. On behalf of the people of the Second District of New Mexico, I congratulate Mr. Furrow on his outstanding career and know that he will continue to inspire others with the intelligence, leadership, thoughtfulness and humor that he displayed to so many throughout the years.

HONORING ANGEL DIAZ

HON. JOE BACA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. BACA. Madam Speaker, I stand here today to honor a civic leader, innovative visionary, loving father and grandfather—Angel Diaz.

Angel was born in Los Angeles, CA, and eventually moved to Richgrove with his family where he attended Delano High School. After graduating from Porterville College in 1961, he served in the United States Army and received an honorable discharge in 1964.

Upon Angel's return to the Delano area, he began an inspiring life of activism due to his passion and fervor for community betterment.

As a founding member of the Kern County Hispanic Chamber of Commerce. he also founded Adelante, a networking database that connects over 2.5 million registered Latino households in order to relay important community messages with the greatest priority necessary. Having sat on numerous boards in positions of authority, Angel is regarded with the utmost respect by community members and leaders alike. In the past, he has served as

California State president of Adelante, commissioner on the Civil Service Commission of Kern County, president of MAPA of Kern County and State 15th Senate District, State and National vice president for the Mexican American Political Association, and State vice president of the Latino American Political Association, in addition to being a member of many more.

Furthermore, Angel's influence in the Central Valley as a successful advocate for health safety regarding water contamination distinguishes this man as a genuine fighter and champion for Latino children and families everywhere.

Apart from owning Diaz Enterprise. Angel is also the founder and CEO of California Migrant Leadership Pre-school. It is through this school that Angel is able to successfully convey the importance of establishing a solid foundation for the educational development needs of children in order to prepare them for further academic advancement. As a result of his involvement with this school, Angel has met with a wide spectrum of politicians and community' leaders to compel them to recognize the positive ripple effect it creates for our society.

Angel Diaz is not only an empowering leader, but a true friend not only to me and my family and the Latino community. I am grateful for Angel's admirable dedication to instilling positive change and leading an exemplarily life, one of whose footsteps we all hope to follow. God Bless him for love of country and mankind.

SESQUECENTENNIAL OF THE FOUNDING OF FORT FAIRFIELD

HON. MICHAEL H. MICHAUD

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. MICHAUD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the families who 150 years ago came to the banks of the Aroostook River following the Aroostook War and the Webster-Ashburton Treaty which paved their way. Working together in the midst of wilderness, the community supported a school and increasing amounts of small businesses. Finally, in March, 1858, the Secretary of State certified that an act to incorporate the Town of Fort Fairfield had been signed by Governor Lot M. Morrill.

Today, equipped with the same community spirit and sense of common purpose, the people of Fort Fairfield continue to embrace the challenges and opportunities of living and working on the border in northern Maine. Their commitment and the commitment of their ancestors are to be commended. It is these individuals and families along with the many other hardworking people of Maine that I remember every time I cast a vote here on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives.

It is an honor and a privilege to represent the people of Fort Fairfield and I am pleased to have this opportunity to help this community celebrate its 150th Anniversary.

HONORING ELLA RILEY GARDNER

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Ella Riley Gardner who after thirty-four years of service with the New York City Department of Education retired in 2004. Born in Beaufort, South Carolina, she is the only child of Dan and Idelle Riley. She is a wife and mother of Elliot, Michelle, and Deisha, all college graduates and the grandmother of Shantrelle, Jonelle, Terrell, and Michaela.

Ella's motto, ''Love your calling with a passion; it is the meaning of your life'' saw her teaching English for twenty-three years where he enjoyed the richness of literature, poetry, novels, short stories, essays, etc. from all over the world. Her greatest joy was to see the expression of awe and wonder on the faces of her students as he unfolded the themes and life lessons derived from literature. Her greatest satisfaction was to know that they had learned and achieved as a result of her diligent and thorough instruction.

Ella received many accolades during her tenure as teach, including ''Teacher of the Year'' in 1992. From that year until her retirement, were spent in various capacities of administration and supervision: Site Facilitator for District 5 Professional Development Laboratory; Department Chairperson, Literacy Staff Developer, Assessment Coordinator, Assistant Principal at I.S. 195 and administrator of a $350,000 Comprehensive School Reform Technology Grant from 2002 until her retirement.

As an avid community servant, Ella serves children and women in two community-based shelters, adopted schools and other community concerns through two professional organizations; the National Sorority of Phi Delta Kappa and the National Association of Negro Business and Professional Women's Clubs. She is currently in her second term as President of the Brooklyn Club. There, she was instrumental in securing an endowment fund that provides $22,000 yearly for five years to Brooklyn Club scholarship applicants.

Madam Speaker, Ella Riley Gardner's educational preparation includes a B.A. in English, City College New York (1971); MA in Reading CCNY (1973); MS in Educational Administration and Supervision, Pace University (1987); Paralegal Certificate, Long Island University (1989); Professional Diploma in Teacher Leadership, Teacher Leadership Institute at NYU (1993). As a lifelong learner, Ms. Gardner continues to enhance her knowledge and oftentimes attends countless workshops and seminars that expound the latest developments in literacy.

Madam Speaker, it is a privilege to pay tribute to Ella Riley Gardner for her selfless dedication to her passion—her calling as a teacher.

DANIELLE LEEPER

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Danielle Leeper of Kingston, Missouri. Danielle is a very special young woman who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Girl Scouts of America, and earning the most prestigious award of Girl Scout Gold Award.

Danielle has been very active with her troop, participating in many scout activities. In order to receive the prestigious Gold Award, Danielle has completed all seven requirements that promote community service, personal and spiritual growth, positive values and leadership skills.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Danielle Leeper for her accomplishments with the Girl Scouts of America and for her efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Girl Scout Gold Award.

IN RECOGNITION OF PEGGY DODDS

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, I wish to recognize Peggy Dodds, a native South Carolinian for her service, loyalty, and dedication upon her retirement from the South Carolina Research Authority, SCRA.

Before her commitment to SCRA, Mrs. Dodds worked for Columbia College for 13 years. concluding her tenure as the executive assistant to the president.

On its upcoming 25th anniversary, SCRA is looking forward to celebrating its two and a half decades of building and managing multi-organization teams for industry, government, and academia to advance our country's technical competitiveness, During Mrs. Dodds' service to SCRA, she dedicated herself to the premise that SCRA was founded upon—to more quickly deploy our research successes for practical and competitive uses. This is still the bedrock of the organization across many disciplines, which include: manufacturing, shipbuilding, composites, law enforcement, homeland security, health care, and energy.

Mrs. Dodds rose to the position of director of corporate relations and has been an integral contributor, often behind the scenes, to SCRA's many successes. As Bill Maloney, SCRA's CEO and president, has said, ''in a variety of ways and across a variety of programs, Peggy has provided consistently effective interface and execution capabilities on behalf of both the CEO and the entire company, punctuated with a unique signature of polite, pleasant professionalism.''

During Mrs. Dodds' 18 years of service to SCRA, she has skillfully served and admirably performed in her capacity. Mrs. Dodds actively coordinated official business matters with the State's General Assembly and the South Carolina congressional delegation on behalf of SCRA presidents. Other responsibilities included scheduling and interaction with the

SCRA trustees and chairman, recording secretary for the company and the All-Associates' meetings, and program management for the South Carolina Nutrition Research Consortium. Mrs. Dodds also assisted program management for SC Launch!, which is working to expand the knowledge economy of South Carolina. Additionally, she has contributed significantly to not only the day-to-day execution, but also the long-term transformation of SCRA. Her integrity is reflected in the thoughts and comments of her peers. Robert Henderson, past president and CEO of SCRA. has remarked that "she was a great friend and an astounding organizer." Another former president and CEO of SCRA, Larry Druffel, says it best with "Peggy was not only the soul of the organization but she knew the history, the people and most importantly the culture, which she worked to nurture."

I am grateful for Peggy Dodds' service to the South Carolina Research Authority and her service to the many lives she has helped to improve in the State of South Carolina and the Nation. I know Peggy looks forward to focusing on her lamily and her church as well as traveling with her husband, Dave. I wish her good health and Godspeed for her future.

SUPPORTING PSORIASIS RESEARCH AND CARE

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Madam Speaker. I rise today in support of H.R. 1188, the Psoriasis and Psoriatic Arthritis Research, Cure, and Care Act, and encourage my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation.

As many as 7.5 million Americans are affected by psoriasis—a chronic inflammatory, painful, disfiguring and disabling disease for which there are limited treatments and no cure. Between 10 percent and 30 percent of people with psoriasis also develop psoriatic arthritis, which causes pain, stiffness and swelling in and around the joints.

Brian Lehrschall, coleader of the Triangle Psoriasis, Education, Advocacy, and Support group in my congressional district, is just one of my constituents living with psoriasis. Diagnosed with plaque psoriasis at age 13. Brian underwent many courses of treatment to address his severe condition, including several different topical medications and ultraviolet radiation. Through the years, Brian has remained active in his local psoriasis support group and been a staunch advocate for the National Psoriasis Foundation's work to increase psoriasis and psoriatic arthritis research.

H.R. 1188 would direct the National Institutes of Health to expand and intensify research and related activities of the Institutes with respect to psoriasis and psoriatic arthritis. Specifically, the bill would direct the National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases to conduct a number of research activities related to psoriasis. The bill also would establish a national psoriasis and psoriatic arthritis patient registry through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and would direct the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Secretary to convene a national summit on psoriasis and psoriatic arthritis research. Finally, the bill would authorize a study by the Institute of Medicine regarding medications and treatments for psoriasis and psoriatic arthritis.

I appreciate the work Brian and his colleagues have done on behalf of so many individuals living with psoriasis and psoriatic arthritis, and I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 1188, the Psoriasis and Psoriatic Arthritis Research, Cure, and Care Act.

HONORING ST. FRANCIS PARISH AMARILLO, TEXAS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. MAC THORNBERRY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the St. Francis Parish, in Amarillo, Texas, on the occasion of its 100th Anniversary.

The history of the St. Francis Parish can be traced to the early 1900's when Texas sold public lands to encourage development in the region. In 1907, the Reverend Francis J. O'Reilly decided to establish a "Catholic colony" in the Texas Panhandle. After an extensive search, a site was selected to serve a growing number of parishioners settling the area. By 1908, over 13,000 acres on the Potter-Carson County line were purchased to develop a town.

The community boomed with families who were attracted to West Texas to work the land as faithful farmers and ranchers, and the first Catholic church was built there in 1908. The parish continues to flourish with a current congregation of about 65 families.

Over the years, the community and parish experienced both the blessings and challenges of life in West Texas. Dealing with unpredictable weather, crops, and economic conditions served to help parishioners become even more steadfast in their faith. The strong agricultural community set deep roots in the area, and many descendents of those first families still call the Texas Panhandle and St. Francis home.

The St. Francis Parish continues to actively celebrate and embrace its history of faith and community. In 1983, they commemorated their 75th Anniversary, which included the placement of a historical marker and the publication of a hardbound history book entitled "Harvest of Memories—The St. Francis Story."

Faith, family, and fellowship make our communities strong and provide us with hope. As St. Francis Parish celebrates its past and looks ahead to the future, I join with the community to wish them a joyous 100th Anniversary.

HONORING DEPUTY DAVE MILLS

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Deputy Dave Mills of Gallatin County, Illinois. Deputy Mills passed away suddenly on March 11, 2008.

Deputy Dave, as he was affectionately known to the students in Gallatin County, was the Gallatin County School District DARE Officer. I received a letter from a student in Gallatin County, Taylor Jackson, who had this to say about Deputy Dave; "He was really close to me and most of the students of my school." Taylor went on to write, "he was a great man and a huge influence to me and my teachers and my fellow students . . . I'm only 13, but he really meant the world to me and many others."

As we can tell from Taylor's words, Deputy Mills' work certainly had an impact that will be forever etched into the hearts and minds of those whose lives he touched. I extend my sympathy to the family and friends of Deputy Dave Mills. My prayers will be with them and the Gallatin County community as they mourn this great loss.

HONORING VERONICA MONTGOMERY-COSTA

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Veronica Montgomery-Costa, the Harlem-born, third-term President of Local 372 and District Council 37 who assumed leadership of more than 26,000 union members on July 15, 1999. Local 372 represents the school-based Substance Abuse Prevention and Intervention Specialists, part-time School Aides, Family Paraprofessionals, Community Coordinators, School Lunch Workers, School Crossing Guards, and school-based Health Service Aides. Ms. Costa hit the ground running and fulfilled more than her campaign promises. She kept her promise to rebuild Local 372, which had been under the administration of its parent union, AFSCME, by implementing much-needed economic and administrative reforms.

Veronica transformed Local 372 into a fiscally sound, ethically administered organization wiping out an inherited $5 million deficit, restoring an effective grievance procedure, training for Grievance Representatives and Shop Stewards and increasing the number of members involved in standing committees. Local 372's integrity was restored along with its bargaining power and its members won record salary increases, improved health, retirement benefits and job security for full-time and part-time workers. With Ms. Costa's determination, Local 372 worked with parents and community groups to block the NYC Board of Education from turning over the management of five public schools to a private, for-profit corporation. Ever in the forefront of the fight against school vouchers, Veronica and Local 372 used its phone bank to support an effort which resulted in the House Education and Workforce Committee dealing President Bush and conservative Republicans a critical blow by voting to strip a private school voucher provision from the House Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Veronica Montgomery-Costa started a Local 372 Scholarship Fund for Members' children, fought off privatization of the School Lunch Program, successfully lobbied to restore $3.1 million to the School Based Prevention Program in the state budget, and played a role in

fighting for the reauthorization of the Child Nutrition Program without any cuts to the program. In conjunction with the Community Food Resource Center, Veronica spearheaded an innovative pilot project to help 500 Local 372 members take advantage of their eligibility for Earned Income Tax Credit.

Madam Speaker, Veronica Montgomery-Costa was unanimously elected for three consecutive terms as President of the 125,000-member District Council 37 by the Council's delegates and also serving in her second term as a member of the Steering Committee of the Municipal Labor Committee. It is an honor to pay tribute to her exceptional leadership on behalf of working men and women. She is most deserving of our recognition today.

ELSIE LEE

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Elsie Lee of Kansas City, Missouri. Elsie is a very special young woman who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Girl Scouts of America, and earning the most prestigious award of Girl Scout Gold Award.

Elsie has been very active with her troop, participating in many scout activities. In order to receive the prestigious Gold Award, Elsie has completed all seven requirements that promote community service, personal and spiritual growth, positive values and leadership skills.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Elsie Lee for her accomplishments with the Girl Scouts of America and for her efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Girl Scout Gold Award.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF GREECE AND CELEBRATING GREEK AND AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

SPEECH OF

HON. ZACHARY T. SPACE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 2008

Mr. SPACE. Madam Speaker, I wish to acknowledge Tuesday's consideration and passage of H. Res. 1024, a bill recognizing the 187th anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating Greek and American democracy.

I am honored to support a bill whose significance is so extensive and which has such enormous personal meaning to me. I am immensely proud of my Greek heritage, and the profound influence this legacy has had not only on American democracy but on governments around the world.

Early on, America's Founding Fathers looked to the ancient Greeks and their enlightened society for inspiration in forming a new government. As we know, American representative democracy is rooted in the philosophy and ethos of Greek government.

It is this example of freedom and representation that so many governments strive to emulate today. And now, more than ever, it is imperative for that message to he heard.

The Greek American community continues to work admirably to connect Greek culture and heritage with the global society of today. They have grown that symbiotic relationship into an extensive Greek-American legacy.

This legacy is made of the contributions of millions of Greek-Americans, such as my paternal grandfather who emigrated from Greece in the early 20th century and earned his citizenship in his new country by fighting in World War I. My father, Socrates, continued the Space family's patriotic tradition by serving in the Marines during the Korean War. After the war, my father attended Ohio State's law school, thanks to the GI Bill, thereby paving the way for his future family—for me.

The opportunities afforded to my father and my grandfather in America were—in my opinion—a result of the democratic by-products of freedom and liberty that Americans enjoy, thanks to the Greeks.

Today. as we celebrate the anniversary of this wonderful nation's independence, it's important that we continue to recognize the significance of Greek contributions to the global society. Needless to say, as a Greek-American, I very much support H. Res. 1024.

HONORING SAN MARCOS HIGH SCHOOL MADRIGAL SINGERS

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate an exceptional high school choir in my district, the San Marcos High School Madrigal Singers of Santa Barbara, CA, which was chosen to perform at New York City's legendary Carnegie Hall on March 10, 2008.

The San Marcos high School Madrigal Singers were selected out of dozens of high school choirs across the country for this performance. The concert featured 200 students from four states, and is the capstone of Carnegie Hall's yearlong National High School Choral Festival. The concert was conducted by Dr. Craig Jessop, esteemed Music Director of the Mormon Tabernacle Choir, who has been working with the choirs and their conductors throughout the year. Apart from their world-renowned performances, Carnegie Hall brings innovative music education programs to students across the Nation. I am delighted that these young people have been given this opportunity.

Led by Carolyn Teraoka-Brady. The Madrigal Singers, one of 5 choral groups at San Marcos High School, performs a varied repertoire of choral literature, Renaissance to contemporary, for the community and at festivals. In the last 4 years. the group has consistently received superior ratings at State and regional festivals in CA. In 2006, the group received a first place score at the invitational ''National Festival of Gold'' in New York City, featuring some of the country's finest ensembles. In addition to choral activities, these students are also leaders in the school's theatre productions, student government, Mock Trial, school newspaper, and CIF sports. The Madrigal Singers have performed for Donald Brinegar, Lynne Gackle, Anton Armstrong, André Thomas, and Weston Noble.

I am honored to have one of the 4 schools in the Nation chosen for the Carnegie Hall National High School Choral Festival come from my California district. The Madrigal Singers should be proud not only of their musical achievement, but their embodiment of the quality musical education the State of California provides. I commend these students and their leaders for their success.

PAUL WELLSTONE MENTAL HEALTH AND ADDICTION EQUITY ACT OF 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 5, 2008

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, the time has come to enact the Paul Wellstone Mental Health and Addiction Equity Act. We need to end discrimination against those with mental illness and substance use disorders, just as we have worked to end discrimination more broadly. I regret that I could not be here to vote on its passage out of the House.

If you cannot be moved by a sense of compassion to support this important legislation, then maybe you can be moved by the statistics. More than 57.7 million Americans suffer from mental disorders. That's one in five Americans—people in our families, our friends, and coworkers. Mental disorders and addictions affect us all—regardless of race, gender or socioeconomic status. H.R. 1424 ensures that health insurers and group health plans treat mental disorders and addiction no differently than any other disease.

This is not a mandate. The Paul Wellstone Mental Health and Addiction Equity Act simply says that if plans choose to offer mental health coverage, then that coverage must not be subject to different standards than the coverage for treatments of physical disease. Parity will ensure that treatment for mental disorders and addictions will be no more restrictive than treatment limits applied to comparable medical and surgical benefits.

Opponents of true parity claim that H.R. 1424 could result in decreased access to employer provided health insurance. That is merely a scare tactic designed to undermine the broad-based support for the bill. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) has estimated that the impact on premiums is just two-tenths of one percent. Statistics show us that depressed workers lose 5.6 hours a week of productive work time. This translates into tens of billions of dollars annually in lost productivity for employers.

We also know that every dollar spent in treatment saves up to $12 in health care and criminal justice costs alone. Do the math, and you'll see that treating mental health and addiction disorders is a wise investment. No one in this day and age should lose years of their lives in the fog of mental illness and addiction when help is available. We would never think of denying diabetes patients insulin. Yet, it seems to be acceptable to erect financial barriers or take other steps that ultimately deny patients with physical and chemical imbalances treatment for their mental illness. That

is wrong, and this legislation would end these discriminatory practices. I look forward to negotiating a strong compromise with our Senate colleagues.

INTRODUCTION OF THE CHILD PROTECTION IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2008

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. SCHIFF. Madam Speaker, I rise to speak about the introduction of the Child Protection Improvements Act of 2008. I introduced this bill today with my colleague Congressman MIKE RODGERS of Michigan to allow youth-serving organizations to perform Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) fingerprint-based background checks on prospective volunteers. We are joined by Senator JOSEPH BIDEN, Senator ARLEN SPECTER, and Senator ORRIN HATCH, who are introducing identical legislation in the Senate.

A positive, stable influence can make an incredible difference in a child's life, and we are lucky to have millions of Americans eager to serve their community. In 1986, as a young lawyer, I volunteered as a Big Brother and was paired with a wonderful seven year-old named "David." That relationship has been one of the most rewarding and enduring in my life. It also taught me first hand the trust that we place in the adult in a mentoring situation. Groups like Big Brothers and Big Sisters, the Girl Scouts, and thousands of agencies, large and small, are doing amazing work for children across America. This bill is about giving them the tools they need to protect children and to accomplish their mission.

The Child protection Improvements Act will allow organizations that pair volunteers with children, whether as mentors, Little League coaches, or Scout Masters, to perform quick and accurate background checks through the FBI's fingerprint-based system. It will be simple for organizations to request a check, it will cost non-profits a maximum of 525, and they will receive a result in less than a week.

This legislation arose from the lessons we learned from a 2003 pilot program established in the PROTECT Act. The pilot gave certain mentoring and youth agencies the ability to submit fingerprints directly to the FBI to receive a determination if the volunteers criminal record made them unfit for the role. In 2003, and earlier, state law enforcement agencies have been able to access the FBI system, but as of today only one-third of states have the infrastructure in place for a mentoring agency to get an FBI background check in an affordable and timely manner.

The PROTECT ACT pilot demonstrated the need for background checks to protect children from predators. Six percent of checks conducted came back with serious criminal records, in many cases records that would not have turned up through a search of a state database or through a name-based, commercial search. There are cases around the nation in which applicants were sex offenders, repeat felons, and child abusers. The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC) reviewed tiles in which an applicant had a criminal record in four states, including a conviction for murder, which they didn't reveal when they applied to be a volunteer.

The pilot also taught us that youth serving organizations want to watch out for children and they want access to affordable, accurate, and prompt background checks. And that was exactly what the pilot provided, returning a fitness determination in an average of three to five days for less than $20.

The Child Protection Improvements Act also protects the privacy rights of volunteers. No criminal records will he transmitted to anyone other than NCMEC without the consent of the volunteer, so their right to privacy will be protected. If they believe their record contains errors, or if they disagree with the determination of NCMEC, they can challenge the completeness of the record or request its full release.

There is a clear and compelling need for this legislation. By passing the Child Protection Improvements Act, Congress will take an important step forward in protecting children and supporting the service of thousands of community-based youth serving organizations around the country.

20TH ANNIVERSARY OF SADDAM HUSSEIN'S ATTACK ON HALABJA, IRAQ

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call the attention of the House to the 20th anniversary of Saddam Hussein's attack on the city of Halabja with chemical and biological weapons. On March 16, 1988, these weapons killed some 5,000 Kurdish men, women and children, as part of Hussein's Al-Anfal campaign to kill and displace the Kurdish population in northern Iraq.

According to a comprehensive study by Human Rights Watch, the 1988 Al-Anfal campaign consisted of approximately 40 gas attacks and resulted in the deaths of at least 50,000 and perhaps as many as 100,000 Iraqi Kurds. The worst in this series of attacks was on Halabja.

The attack in 1988 has left behind a cruel and persistent legacy on the village of Halabja, where inhabitants experience a high instance of life threatening medical conditions due to the persistence of noxious poisons in the food and water supply. I ask that our colleagues remember this day, which exemplifies the legacy of brutality and human rights abuses that characterized the regime of the late Saddam Hussein.

HONORING LOUVENIA POINTER

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Louvinia G. Pointer who enjoyed a successful career on the Broadway stage. When Noel Coward heard Louvinia's voice, he wrote a part for her to sing in his musical, "Set To Music," starring Beatrice Lillie. After that, she appeared with Alfred Lunt and Lynne Fontaine on Broadway in "The Pirate." Highly esteemed among her peers as a singer, teacher and choral conductor, her fulfilling career includes work with some of the country's outstanding teachers including Rosalie Miller, Samuel Margolis, Sarah Lee, Modena Scoval, and her long-time friend, coach and accompanist, the late Sylvia Olden Lee.

Louvinia's exceptional work as choral director of the National Youth Administration Radio Workshop won praise from notables such as Harry T. Burleigh, Fritz Mahler, Robert Hufstadder, Hall Johnson, Eleanor Roosevelt and Mary McLeod Bethune. Mrs. Pointer took her love of music to the New York City School system, where for many years, she was privileged to share her love of music and teaching gifts with the children of New York City. She taught in Public School 21, Lefferts Junior High School, Girls High and Tilden High Schools. During her 26 years teaching, she received numerous awards for her outstanding work.

Now retired, Mrs. Pointer is committed to the revival and preservation of the "Nego Spiritual." Her dream of establishing an organization to preserve the Negro Spiritual became a reality in 1987 when the Great Day Chorale was formed. Now in its twentieth season, the group, through the positive messages of these songs, has been an inspiration to listeners everywhere.

In 1994, Mrs. Pointer was chosen to take part in the Crown Heights Project, which was a collaboration of the Brooklyn Children's Museum, the Historical Society and the Society for the Preservation of Weeksville and Bedford-Stuyvesant History. Among her many awards, she received citations from the Honorable Howard Golden, former Borough President and the present Borough President, Marty Markowitz. Louvinia has been awarded for her work with Brooklyn-based arts organizations, including Celebrate Brooklyn, BACA, Welcome Back to Brooklyn, the Brooklyn Museum, Brooklyn Botanic Garden, Brooklyn Philharmonic Orchestra, and as a member of the board of the Brooklyn Music School.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to honor Louvinia G. Pointer for her remarkable achievements and luminous career in the musical arts. She has directed two albums and even arranged the song, In the Garden by Bob Dylan on his album "Gotta Serve Somebody."

STEPHANIE HULL

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Stephanie Hull of Liberty, Missouri. Stephanie is a very special young woman who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Girl Scouts of America, and earning the most prestigious award of Girl Scout Gold Award.

Stephanie has been very active with her troop, participating in many scout activities. In order to receive the prestigious Gold Award, Stephanie has completed all seven requirements that promote community service, personal and spiritual growth, positive values and leadership skills.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Stephanie Hull for her accomplishments with the Girl Scouts of America and for her efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Girl Scout Gold Award.

INTRODUCTION OF THE STATE SECRET PROTECTION ACT OF 2008 PROTECTING NATIONAL SECURITY AND THE RULE OF LAW THROUGH SAFE, FAIR, AND RESPONSIBLE PROCEDURES AND STANDARDS

HON. JERROLD NADLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, the state secrets privilege is a common law doctrine that allows the Government to protect sensitive national security information from harmful disclosure in litigation.

This privilege was first recognized by the U.S. Supreme Court in the 1953 case of U.S. v. Reynolds, a case brought by the widows of three civilian engineers against the U.S. Government for negligence in a military airplane crash. The Government refused to produce an accident report of the crash, claiming that disclosure of the report would reveal secret military information harmful to national security. The Court accepted the Government's state secret claim and allowed the Government to withhold the report without ever reviewing it. When the report was discovered through an internet search 50 years later, it did not reveal any secret military information but, instead, showed the Government's negligence in the crash.

Unfortunately, Reynolds is not the only instance where the secrecy claims have been abused. Exaggerated claims of national security were made in an effort to conceal information about U.S. conduct in Vietnam and the bombing of Cambodia in the ''Pentagon Papers'' case and to prevent prosecution for the unlawful sale of arms to Iran and the funneling of proceeds from those sales to the Nicaraguan Contras. In the ''Pentagon Papers'' case, N.Y. Times Co. v. United States, 403 U.S. 713, Solicitor General Griswold warned the Supreme Court that publication of the information would pose a ''grave and immediate danger to the security of the United States.'' Eighteen years later, he acknowledged that he had never seen ''any trace of a threat to the national security'' from publication of the information and that ''there is very rarely any real risk to current national security from the publication of facts relating to transactions in the past, even the fairly recent past.''

What these examples teach is that when a government is allowed to escape accountability by hiding behind unexamined claims of national security, it often will, making judicial oversight of state secrets privilege claim critical to our constitutional system of checks and balances. Unfortunately, in the years following Reynolds, courts have proven reluctant to test Government claims of secrecy, often failing to examine evidence independently and accepting the Government's secrecy claim at face value.

Concerns about the lack of judicial oversight of the state secrets privilege have increased as the current administration has responded to cases challenging the most troubling aspects of its '' war on terror''—including rendition, torture, and warrantless wiretapping—with blanket claims that these cases must be dismissed outright, before any discovery can proceed. As a result, injured plaintiffs have been denied justice and the courts have failed to address fundamental questions of constitutional rights. Take, for example, the case of Khaled el-Masri, a German citizen who was kidnapped, rendered to a CIA black site, and tortured before the administration realized that it had the wrong man. There is extensive public evidence supporting Mr. El-Masri's case, including a Council of Europe report verifying the accuracy of Mr. El-Masri's claims and the administration's public disclosure and defense of the rendition and interrogation of terror suspects as a valuable tool in its ''war on terror.'' Yet the administration successfully argued that Mr. El-Masri's case should be dismissed before any discovery could occur based on the state secret privilege.

The transformation of a governmental privilege to withhold specific items of evidence into a claim of absolute immunity, and the overall lack of consistency in how courts handle state secret claims, requires Congressional reform. In 1980, Congress enacted the Classified Information Procedures Act—known as CIPA—to provide courts with clear statutory guidance on handling secret evidence in criminal cases. Congress also authorized courts to review and rule upon sensitive materials under the Freedom of Information Act and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. For the past several decades, courts have effectively and safely applied these laws—under the procedures and standards articulated by Congress—to protect sensitive information while also respecting the rule of law and providing fairness and justice to litigants.

It is time to enact procedures and standards for civil cases similar to those that we already have provided for criminal cases. Many have called for this reform, including the American Bar Association, which recently issued a report calling upon Congress to enact procedures and standards that promote meaningful, independent judicial review and ''bring uniformity to a significant issue on which courts have adopted divergent approaches.'' The bipartisan Constitution Project has similarly urged us to ''craft statutory language to clarify that judges, not the executive branch, have the final say about whether disputed evidence is subject to the state secret privilege,'' reminding us that ''reforms are critical to ensure the independence of our judiciary and to provide a necessary check on executive power.''

In a recent hearing held by the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties, which I chair, experts like retired Federal judges Patricia Wald and William Webster supported legislative efforts to require independent judicial review. According to Judge Webster:

''As a former Director of the FBI and Director of the CIA, I fully understand and support our government's need to protect sensitive national security information. However, as a former federal judge, I can also confirm that judges can and should be trusted with sensitive information and that they are fully competent to perform an independent review of executive branch assertions of the state secrets privilege. Judges are well-qualified to review evidence purportedly subject to the privilege and make appropriate decisions as to whether disclosure of such information is likely to harm our national security.''

The State Secret Protection Act of 2008 provides much-needed reform by establishing rules and standards for determining state secret privilege claims. The act will strengthen national security by ensuring that legitimate secrets are protected from harmful disclosure, and it will strengthen the rule of law by preventing abuse of the privilege and maximizing the ability of litigants to achieve justice in court.

Modeled on CIPA, but adjusted for civil litigation, the State Secret Protection Act provides for secure judicial proceedings and other safeguards to protect valid state secrets. Under the act, a judge may not blindly rely upon assertions of secrecy and harm contained in an official's affidavit. Judges must review the information that the Government seeks to protect, along with any other evidence or argument relevant to the claim, to determine whether the harm identified by the Government is reasonably likely to occur. Where this standard is met, a judge may not order disclosure of the information. The judge must, however, consider whether a non-privileged substitute can be created that would allow the litigation to continue.

If a substitute is possible—for example, a redacted version of a document or a summary of the information—the government has the choice of producing the substitute or having the court resolve the issue to which the evidence is relevant against it, as happens in CIPA. Where there is no possible substitute, the judge may issue appropriate orders, including dismissing a claim or finding for or against a party on a factual or legal issue. The act allows the Government to raise a claim of privilege to avoid answering allegations in a complaint but prevents premature dismissal of claims before all issues of privilege are resolved and the parties have the opportunity to conduct non-privileged discovery.

Through these procedures and standards, the act allows parties the opportunity to make a preliminary case and provides courts with the flexibility to craft solutions that protect valid state secrets from harmful and serve the interests of justice. Congress has clear constitutional authority to establish rules of procedure and evidence for the courts, and reform of the state secrets privilege in civil litigation is long overdue. I urge all of you, my colleagues in the House, to join us in this important effort.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE CENTRAL VALLEY HEALTH NETWORK

HON. DENNIS A. CARDOZA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. CARDOZA. Madam Speaker, it is with the greatest pleasure that I rise today in recognition of the Central Valley Health Network as they celebrate their tenth anniversary. Comprised of 13 private, non-profit community health center systems, the Central Valley Health Network currently operates 116 clinic sites throughout 20 counties in California, providing high quality health care to those most in need.

In the 10 years since its inception, the Central Valley Health Network has provided families throughout the region with health care that is cost-effective, accessible, comprehensive, coordinated, compassionate, and culturally competent. Serving more than 530,000 patients, the Central Valley Health Network facilitates 2.1 million patient visits annually, providing care for low-income individuals, of which 75 percent are at or below the Federal poverty level, 50 percent of whom are enrolled in Medi-Cal, and 35 percent who are uninsured. Combined, it is the chief health care system for low-income families throughout the Central Valley, and in many communities the Central Valley Health Network's clinics are the only primary health care option available.

The Central Valley of California consistently experiences far greater physician shortages and dramatically increased rates of chronic diseases than other regions in the State. To address these imbalances, the Central Valley Health Network's mission is to support their member community health center systems in the effective delivery of high quality accessible health care with a special focus on advocacy for attaining optimal health for the medically underserved. Furthermore, the Central Valley Health Network's presence in the region has made a significant impact in local economies, generating over $200 million in Federal funds and creating over 2,000 jobs.

The Central Valley Health Network contributes greatly to the improvement of the overall quality of life for families throughout the Central Valley of California. Madame Speaker, I respectfully ask my colleagues to rise and join me in thanking everyone involved with the Central Valley Health Network for the work they do each and every day to provide the people and families of our communities with essential health care services. There is no more important or rewarding work than helping a fellow citizen in need, and through their dedicated and compassionate efforts, thousands of lives have been touched. We all owe them a great debt of gratitude, and I am proud to represent their efforts in Congress.

HONORING KAREN BASS

HON. LAURA RICHARDSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Ms. RICHARDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the newly elected speaker of the California State Assembly, the Honorable Karen Bass. It is with great pride and pleasure that I applaud her accomplishments and wish her much future success.

At the end of this legislative year, Karen Bass will break glass ceilings in California and across the Nation by becoming the first African-American woman speaker of a State legislative body. Speaker-elect Karen Bass, who is respected on both sides of the aisle, received unanimous vote of the members to become the first Democratic woman elected to this position in California's history.

Throughout her career, public service and social justice have been the common threads around which her life revolved. Understanding the importance of education, Speaker-elect Bass taught as an adjunct instructor at her alma mater, California State University, Dominguez Hills. She also served as the clinical instructor at the Southern California School of Medicine and as the project director for the health careers opportunity program. A graduate of the University of Southern California's, USC, School of Medicine-Physician Assistant Program, Speaker-elect Bass worked in our country's largest trauma center, Los Angeles/USC Medical Center. It was here that she witnessed firsthand the havoc wreaked upon the community by the crack cocaine epidemic.

In 1990, Speaker-elect Bass took action by leaving the medical profession and founding the Community Coalition for Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment. She served as its executive director for 14 years. After the 1992 civil unrest in Los Angeles, the coalition united and succeeded in transforming the social and economic conditions in south Los Angeles.

Speaker-elect Bass turned to politics when she concluded that the best way to implement change was to become an elected official herself. At the time of her election, there were no other African-American women in the California legislature, but her leadership potential was recognized immediately. During her first term, she was appointed majority whip during the 2005–2006 legislative session. During her second term, she became the first woman and first African-American appointed to the position of majority leader.

As vice chair of California's Legislative Black Caucus, Speaker-elect Bass pressed for the creation of the State of Black California Report, which measured economic and social conditions of California's African-American population. The Speaker-elect also created the People's Council to engage citizens in the debate on public policy and the political process. The Council was composed of four commissions, which examined education, environment, small business, and health issues in the State.

Always reaching for the highest goals, I am certain that Speaker-elect Bass will lead the California State Assembly with the same commitment and dedication that she has demonstrated throughout her entire career. In closing, Madam Speaker, please join me in honoring the achievements of Speaker-elect Karen Bass and wishing her continuing success.

HONORING ERMA ROLLE

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. TOWNS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Erma Jean Rolle, a passionate effective advocate for the needs of minorities, women and children. Moreover, we note her strong commitment to God, her family, her church and her community.

Erma Jean Rolle was born in Little Rock, Arkansas moving to Milwaukee Wisconsin where she graduated from North Division High School. After graduation, she moved to New York with big dreams and goals to be accomplished. Erma joined the New Lots Community Church where she served as: an Elder; Clerk of the Consistory; President of the Women's Ministry; Youth Ministry Leader; member of the Women of Faith choir; Confirmation teacher; Vice-President of the Women's Brooklyn Classical Union; Music and Worship Committee; and a member of the Racial Justice Task Force.

As a community activist, Erma has served on Community Board #5, Vice-President of the Meadow Wood at Gateway Condominiums and Treasurer for the Jamaica Armory Gun Club. Moreover, she helped to organize and start the East New York Drum & Bugle Corps for sixty boys and girls. In addition, she was part of a committee that marched to stop domestic violence against women in the sixties and seventies.

In 2001, Erma retired from the New York City Board of Education as a bus driver. In that same year, she celebrated another milestone—graduating from the College of New Rochelle with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Psychology.

Erma Jean Rolle is a role model for African-American families, especially hers. She has four children; Marshall, Cheryl, Fernanda, and Cassandra. She is also the proud grandmother of James, Kadrian, Brandon, and Kyran. In her leisure time, Erma enjoys going to the rifle range, shopping, bowling and traveling.

Ms. Rolle lives a full and productive life gathering comfort from one of her favorite Biblical passages (Isaiah 40:31): ''But those who wait for the Lord shall renew their strength, they shall mount up with wings like eagles, they shall run and not be weary, they shall walk and not faint.''

Madam Speaker, I am proud to cite Erma Jean Rolle for her invaluable contributions to the New Lots Community Church, her service to the community and her open-heartedness. Even today, she volunteers especially for causes that involve children, at the Johnny Ray Youngblood Academy.

CARRIE HOTTEL

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Carrie Hottel of Liberty, Missouri. Carrie is a very special young woman who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Girl Scouts of America, and earning the most prestigious award of Girl Scout Gold Award.

Carrie has been very active with her troop, participating in many scout activities. In order to receive the prestigious Gold Award, Carrie has completed all seven requirements that promote community service, personal and spiritual growth, positive values and leadership skills.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Carrie Hottel for her accomplishments with the Girl Scouts of America and for her efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Girl Scout Gold Award.

TRIBUTE TO DR. ETHEL M. HENDERSON TAYLOR

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. Ethel M. Henderson Taylor, on the occasion of her retirement after 58 years in broadcasting. Ethel Taylor's 58 years in broadcasting, 51 years in public education and a lifetime of community service is a testament to her commitment to excellence and her personal belief that service to others is the key to happiness in life.

Dr. Ethel Taylor is the first female African-American radio announcer in South Carolina. Her voice was the first one heard on Columbia's heritage radio station WOIC—where she served in multiple capacities for 44 years. Mrs. Taylor then joined the staff of Glory Communications' WFMV/95.3 where she has hosted Golden Gospel Memories for the past 14 years.

Ethel Taylor used her barrier breaking achievement with WOIC in the 1950s, to connect WOIC with its African-American listeners and the community at large. She quickly made headway in the African American community with her weekly Saturday morning show A Date with Ethel. The program drew hundreds of listeners through its skillful mix of soulful music, highlights of community events, and its warm down-home feel that listeners could connect to throughout the midlands. Throughout her career, Dr. Taylor received numerous awards for her broadcast and community accomplishments.

A native of Laurens, SC, Ethel Taylor brings great pride to my home state. She is a 1946 Magna Cum Laude graduate of Benedict College, taught english in the Richland County Public School system for 30 years, earned her masters of education degree in english from the University of South Carolina, and now serves as assistant professor of english at Benedict College. Throughout these years, she served on numerous faculty and community boards in many roles of leadership.

Along the way, Mrs. Taylor and her deceased husband, John B. Taylor, raised nine children. She is a grandmother of 15 and great-grandmother to 4. Mrs. Taylor celebrates her 85th birthday on March 27, 2008.

Madam Speaker, I ask you and my colleagues to join me in honoring the great lifetime achievements of Mrs. Taylor. Today. her retirement from broadcasting only means that Dr. Ethel M. Henderson Taylor is poised to write another chapter in her phenomenal story of service to God, her family and community. I wish her continued success and Godspeed.

HONORING THE DUBUQUE WAHLERT GOLDEN EAGLES BASKETBALL TEAM

HON. BRUCE L. BRALEY

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. BRALEY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding results achieved by the Dubuque Wahlert Golden Eagles basketball team at the Iowa State Boys Basketball Tournament in Des Moines this past weekend.

With 2 seconds left in the championship game, No. 2 ranked Wahlert and No. 4 ranked Harlan were tied at 67. Wahlert called a time out and Billy Scherr threw a full-court inbound pass to teammate Eric May; Eric squared up to the basket and nailed a 35 foot 3-point-jumper at the buzzer. It was a magic moment!

I congratulate the Golden Eagles for winning the Iowa Class 3A state championship. This thrilling 70–67 victory by Wahlert gives Dubuque its first state champion since 1931. The Golden Eagles now have a third basketball state championship trophy to add to the case.

Madam Speaker, I am extremely proud of the accomplishments of the Wahlert basketball team, both on and off the court. Perhaps Paul "Bear" Bryant, the late, great coach of the Alabama Crimson Tide football team says it best: "Show class, have pride. and display character. If you do, winning takes care of itself." This past weekend, Wahlert proved just that.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIERREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from this chamber yesterday afternoon, March 12, 2008, due to an urgent family matter. I would like the record to show that, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, and 134.

HONORING KILEY SLATER

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Kiley Slater of Trenton, Missouri. Kiley is a very special young woman who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Girl Scouts of America, and earning the most prestigious award of Girl Scout Gold Award.

Kiley has been very active with her troop, participating in many scout activities. In order to receive the prestigious Gold Award, Kiley has completed all seven requirements that promote community service, personal and spiritual growth, positive values and leadership skills.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Kiley Slater her accomplishments with the Girl Scouts of America and for her efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Girl Scout Gold Award.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL WOMEN'S HISTORY MONTH

HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, throughout the month of March we observe National Women's History Month, which pays tribute to the contributions of women in this Nation. I rise today to recognize the women of our country, who have played an important role in shaping America's history.

During the month of March we have the opportunity to take pause and celebrate the important contributions of all women, past and present. Not only have women been leaders in securing their rights of suffrage and equal opportunity, but they have played a crucial role in the abolitionist movement, labor movements and the Civil Right's movement.

Leading women in history from Abigail Adams, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Sojourner Truth, and Eleanor Roosevelt have paved the way for contemporary figures such as Nancy PELOSI, the first female Speaker of the House of Representatives. Connecticut has been the proud home of significant women such as Americas first female governor to he elected in her own right—Governor Ella Grasso, and the long-serving champion of the First District and my predecessor, Congresswoman BARBARA KENNELLY—the first woman in American history to serve as a Deputy Majority Whip and to serve on the House Intelligence Committee.

I would be remiss if I did not mention the contributions of Elizabeth Colt, often referred to as the "First Lady" of Connecticut. Elizabeth Colt lived in a pre-women's suffrage era, but she refused to surrender to the pervasive gender inequalities of her day. The wife of American inventor and industrialist Samuel Colt, she carried on her husband's dream and life's work after his death and successfully ran their industrial empire. She was an entrepreneur, patron of the arts, philanthropist, and staunch advocate for women's rights—she will long be remembered for her contributions to the Hartford area.

There are many women, named and unnamed throughout American history that have broken glass ceilings and gender barriers for the next generation. As the father of two daughters, I honor the historical women of our country and take great pride in the fact my daughters can grow up in a country where anything is possible for them.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the trailblazers who have paved the way for women's equality and recognizing the many contributions that women have made to our Nation and to the entire world by promoting the ideals celebrated in National Women's History Month.

RECOGNITION OF TIM HOFFMAN, SUPERINTENDENT FOR THE ADEL-DESOTO-MINBURN SCHOOL DISTRICT

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the retirement of Tim Hoffman, Superintendent for the Adel-Desoto-Minburn School District, and to express my appreciation for his dedication and commitment to the youth of Iowa.

For the past 25 years, Tim has contributed his time and his talents to the betterment of young Iowans. During his time as superintendent there have been many district-wide

improvements, and a new high school was built. Over the years, the school curriculum has also been significantly modified to create greater consistency and to focus on essential learning material, which has in turn helped raise student achievement scores. He credits much of his success to having quality school board members, great administrators, and dedicated employees in the school district. Nearly all the current school district employees were hired by Tim.

During his service, Tim has made a significant impact on the students and the entire surrounding community. His leadership will certainly be missed. I consider it an honor to represent Tim Hoffman in Congress, and I wish him continued success in his future endeavors.

HONORING MURFREESBORO, TENNESSEE AS A NATIONAL AMERICAN MUSIC CENTER

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize Murfreesboro, Tennessee as a national center for traditional American music.

The objective for the national center is to educate, market and preserve traditional American music, including old-time music. A learning center will offer concert and performance venues for individual artists.

The Uncle Dave Macon Day Festival has 30 years of experience promoting and developing the traditional music and cultural heritage of Middle Tennessee. Traditional American music includes folk music, blues, gospel, dance music and any kind of acoustic that is learned primarily from oral tradition.

With the aid of Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro can offer the community highly qualified graduates to manage and staff the national center for traditional American music.

MTSU College of mass Communication offers young people the chance to become major players in recording industry, journalism, photography, television and radio-all media on which Uncle Dave Macon Day depends.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO GLADYS MUHAMMAD-WARD OF SOUTH BEND, INDIANA

HON. JOE DONNELLY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam Speaker, today I pay tribute to an outstanding citizen of South Bend, Gladys Muhammad-Ward, who devoted her life to the service of her community. Her impact on the city is immeasurable, the result of her unflagging efforts to improve the quality of life for all its citizens. She has been a blessing to her large and loving family as well as to the extended family of those whose lives she has changed.

Whether on the grassroots or executive level, Mrs. Muhammad-Ward's vision, talent and energy have benefited young and old alike. In 1978 she helped establish and became the first director of the YWCA's Battered Women's Shelter, a post she held for six years. Subsequently, as the Deputy Director of South Bend's Code Enforcement, she was instrumental in helping to develop what had been a drug infested and dangerous neighborhood into sixty-five units of affordable housing and cultivating the Charles Martin Youth Center.

Mrs. Muhammad-Ward's influence extends to the national level. She was in the first class of the Washington D.C.-based Center for Community Change's ''Change Agent Project.'' She was also invited to participate in President Clinton's roundtable on neighborhoods held in Little Rock, Arkansas.

Locally, Mrs. Muhammad-Ward has lent her talents to many organizations and served on numerous boards, including The Martin Luther King Jr. Foundation, the Saint Joseph County Democratic Party, the African American Community Fund, the Indiana University South Bend Civil Rights Heritage Center, Bridges Out of Poverty Committee and the Memorial Health Foundation Board of Directors.

Gladys Mohammad-Ward was awarded the key to the City of South Bend in 2007 and the Sagamore of the Wabash in 1998, and in 1994 she was inducted into the South Bend Hall of Fame and named YWCA Woman of the Year. In addition, she was named Citizen of the Year by the National Social Worker Association in 1999 and received the Distinguished Alumni Award from Indiana University South Bend. She has been honored by WNDU–TV, The Indiana Black Expo, Essence Magazine, Kiwanis Club and the YMCA.

So, today, on behalf of the citizens of Indiana's Second District, I thank Gladys Mohammad-Ward for her years of selfless dedication. As she continues her work on behalf of all of our citizens, regardless of race, gender or socio-economic class, let us pay special tribute to this outstanding woman who serves as a role model to us all.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT IS VITAL TO HOMELAND SECURITY EFFORTS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, Homeland Security shouldn't be left strictly to the Federal Government but requires the vigilant assistance of State, county and city police departments. When local law enforcement agencies choose not to detain criminal aliens for immigration enforcement officials, it is like a city police officer ignoring a bank robbery because it is a Federal crime. That kind of head in the sand mentality is ridiculous and will not make our Nation safer.

In Houston, Texas, Harris County Sheriff Tommy Thomas is blazing a path with a common sense approach to dealing with illegal aliens arrested for committing crimes. Sheriff Thomas recently announced that employees at the Harris County's Inmate Processing Center will receive Section 287(g) training from U.S. Customs and Immigration Enforcement officials.

This program will train deputies to identify, process and detain illegal aliens arrested for criminal activity in Harris County. Instead of catch and release, this new training will allow deputies to catch and begin the deportation process for criminal aliens.

This program will help take more illegals off the streets and make the county safer for Texas families. For example, illegal aliens will no longer have the opportunity to continuously endanger lives by getting arrested multiple times for DWI. The deportation process will start in the county jail the first time they are arrested.

Besides trespassing into our Nation, illegal aliens commit many other crimes such as driving without car insurance, drug trafficking, human smuggling, theft, burglary and murder. As a result, American citizens and legal immigrants end up carrying the financial burden created by illegal aliens such as increased medical and prison expenses.

Empowering local law enforcement officials to start the deportation process immediately after an illegal alien is arrested, sends a clear message that international trespassing will not be tolerated. Protecting citizens and legal immigrants from criminal acts by illegal aliens is the essence of Homeland Security.

By not passing off responsibility for dealing with criminal aliens to the Federal Government, like in some cities, Sheriff Tommy Thomas is finding solutions to reducing crime in Harris County instead of making excuses. He is setting an example that other agencies should follow.

He is a great sheriff who's recent actions demonstrate that he is committing to protect our communities from both foreign and domestic criminals. It will take the leadership of other sheriffs like Thomas and police chiefs with the backbone to enforce all of our Nation's laws, instead of just the ones they prefer, for effective Homeland Security.

Today, I salute Sheriff Tommy Thomas for his local efforts and leadership in moving Harris County, and the rest of our Nation, in the right direction to protect citizens and legal immigrants from criminal aliens.

And that's just the way it is.

IN MEMORY OF THOMAS G. BOLERJACK

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Thomas Bolerjack's memory and his lifelong contributions to his community, family, and country.

Tom's passion for life was apparent to everyone who met him. A man with a tremendous love for flying, it should come as no surprise that, at 16 years old, Tom was sitting in the cockpit of a plane testing for his pilot's license. He later enlisted in the Air Force, where he worked his way through the ranks and retired as a Colonel.

Tom's enthusiasm, both for flying and serving others, did not diminish upon his retirement from the Air Force. Aviation was an interest that brought Tom obvious joy for the remainder of his life, and his penchant for service became focused on local endeavors.

Working with the Boy Scouts of America was a joy Tom shared with his entire family. The Bolerjacks' two sons have been scouts for several years, and Tom was an active part of their experience. He served as an assistant den leader for Pack 170 and was the driving force behind Troop 589, starting the troop a few years ago with a handful of boys. Under Tom's leadership, both troops expanded their memberships to approximately thirty scouts.

In addition to serving as Cubmaster, Webelos leader, and Den leader, Tom was also very involved in Boy Scout training for youth and adults. Tom was the Cub Scout Leader Training Chair, the Boy Scout Leader Training Chair, Troop Committee Chair, and the Mustang District Training Chair. Tom also served on the Baloo, Arrowhead & Twin Arrows staff, and was a trainer for the youth protection and new leader programs. He assisted in the Trainer Development Conference. Tom earned his Wood Badge Beads and went on to staff Wood Badge as a Troop Guide. He also served on the organization's Twin Arrows/National Youth Leadership Training and was very active in the Order of the Arrow. Over the years he was honored with multiple awards, including the Cubmaster Award and the Den Leader Award.

Tom has been described as a giver, an outstanding example to others, and an inspiration to everyone who knew him. His friend Graham Crudgington described Tom best when he said, "His energy, his spirit, his dedication are all things that I admire, and are things that have pushed and inspired me to do things I wouldn't normally have done." Tom's ceaseless devotion to the community motivated others to get involved; his passion encouraged the passion of others.

I extend my sincerest condolences to Tom's wife Becky and his two sons, Tommy and B.J. My thoughts and prayers are with Tom's many friends and family members as they endure this difficult time. The North Texas community has lost a devoted citizen and a great man. He leaves behind a legacy of generosity and kindness. The compassion, commitment, and selflessness shown by Mr. Thomas Bolerjack are truly remarkable, and he should serve as an example to all. He will be deeply missed, but his service and dedication will always be greatly appreciated.

BLACK HISTORY EXHIBIT OPENS ON WEST COAST

HON. NORMAN D. DICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. DICKS. Madam Speaker, the United States Capitol Historical Society has prepared a fascinating exhibit of artifacts and interpretative materials entitled "From Freedom's Shadow: African Americans and the United States Capitol" which is being displayed across America this year. It is a depiction of what is truly one of the better kept secrets in our Nation's history: that the construction of the United States Capitol, and even the casting of the Statue of Freedom that sits atop the dome, was accomplished with the help of slave labor.

Earlier this month the exhibit opened on the West Coast, at Olympic High School in my congressional district, and it has given everyone in my home community an interesting, yet disturbing, insight into one of the most troubling contradictions of American society in the 18th and 19th centuries. We were a society founded on the principle of freedom and yet even in the construction of the iconic seat of this Government we tolerated and benefited from the labor of people who were deprived of the essential freedoms that were celebrated beneath the Capitol Dome.

This is an important and instructive exhibit, Mr. Speaker, and I am honored to submit for the RECORD an article from the Central Kitsap Reporter that was published on March 1st, entitled "Black History exhibit at Oly exposes 'cruel irony'."

[From the Central Kitsap Reporter, Mar. 1, 2008]

BLACK HISTORY EXHIBIT AT OLY EXPOSES "CRUEL IRONY"

(By Paul Balcerak)

Central Kitsap School District board members, employees and educators had the tables turned on them Wednesday night.

It was their turn to learn as they got one of the first looks at the U.S. Capitol Historical Society's traveling exhibit, "From Freedom's Shadow: African Americans and the United States Capitol."

The exhibit, a production of the U.S. Capitol Historical Society, offers insight into one of the better kept dirty little secrets in American history: that the U.S. Capitol was built with help from black slave labor.

The exhibit put front-and-center a jarring truth which the historical society's Web site called a "cruel irony."

"It's a real tangible experience of the history that most people don't know," Olympic Principal Bob Barnes said.

Barnes admitted unawareness of the history before being introduced to the project during the plan to bring it to CKSD last year.

"In mainstream history, you get little snippets of things, but you don't really get a feel (for what things were actually like)," he said. "There are lots of little facts out there that our history, as it's written, doesn't necessarily reflect."

Documents showcased at the exhibit cover a period from 1794–1800 and shed light on some of the people history has forgotten, People like Philip Reid, a slave who, ironically, helped cast the five sections of "Freedom," the statue that sits atop the Capitol, in bronze.

The title of the exhibit is in reference to the statue itself.

It wasn't easy unearthing stories such as Reid's, as evidenced by the work exhibit curator Felicia Bell and her colleagues did to bring the exhibit to life.

"It was a lot of primary source research, but also secondary source research (to understand the context of the primary sources)," Bell said.

Also director of education and outreach for the historical society, Bell has spent countless hours at the National Archives, Library of Congress and various historical societies searching for any remnants of information that could contribute to the exhibit. Some of it is scant, but striking; Bell showed off an old timecard used to track all workers' hours that used an "N" next to slaves" names to denote them as "negroes."

The small document offered a blunt lesson: even timecards were segregated.

"It's chilling, but I think it's important to understand so we don't make those mistakes again," CKSD Curriculum Specialist Jeni Zapatka said.

Zapatka was responsible for discovering the exhibit and pushing to have it brought to CKSD. Thanks to donations from UPS, the exhibit is shipped across the country for free and the only cost to the district was to bring Bell to the area to showcase the exhibit.

"It's fun to see how students from various locations and various backgrounds react to the exhibit," Bell said. "I think that it was kind of an eye-opener for students and adults."

She has traveled with the exhibit to various locations around the United States. Its arrival at Olympic, however, marks the first time either have ever been to the West Coast.

The exhibit is now in the hands of students at Olympic, who spent Thursday being trained as docents by Bell. They'll be the ones to pass information along to the public, which has a few opportunities to see the exhibit between now and March 19 (see gray box).

Students were equally outspoken and struck by the exhibit during their training day.

"I never knew anything about the Freedom statue and all the things the enslaved people had to go through to build the Capitol," junior Amanda

Vincent said. "As it stands now, this exhibit being here is top rate for me."

"I like that it's at our school because our school, in the district, is kind of known as the most diverse," junior Kylee McWilliams added.

The exhibit got high marks from those who saw it Wednesday and several involved expressed excitement for the project's value to students and the public.

"I'm just sorry we don't have it in a place that will be open more hours," school board member Christy Cathcart said. "There was . . . quite a lot of introspection going on (at Wednesday's showing).

"Everyone went away with some knowledge that they didn't have before."

'From Freedom's Shadow' public viewing times

March 3, 5–7 p.m.

March 11, 6–9 p.m.

March 19, 6–9 p.m.

The exhibit is located in the Olympic High School library.

The exhibit also can be previewed online at http:uschsonline-exhibits.uschs.org/freedom (no "www.").

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL REAUTHORIZING THE NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM ACT

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, today I introduced a bill to reauthorize the National Sea Grant College Program Act.

The National Sea Grant College Program originally was established in 1966 upon the enactment of the National Sea Grant College Act, 33 U.S.C. 1121–1131, to improve marine resource conservation, management, and utilization. The act was last reauthorized by an act of the 107th Congress in 2002, and current authorizations of appropriations expire at the end of fiscal year 2008.

The National Sea Grant College Program is patterned after the Land Grant College System, which was created in 1862. Although originally assigned to the National Science Foundation, NSF, the National Sea Grant College Program was transferred in 1970 to the

newly created National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, NOAA, within the Department of Commerce. Currently, there are over 30 Sea Grant College programs that represent a network of researchers, educators, and marine extension agents at some of the Nation's top academic institutions. Sea Grant Colleges sponsor a wide range of applied and basic marine science research, education, and training and technical assistance programs promoting the understanding, assessment, development, utilization and conservation of ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources. Sea Grant Colleges also provide yearlong fellowships to graduate students in marine-related disciplines for placement in congressional offices and Federal agencies.

The bill introduced today would refine the act to modestly expand and clarify the scope and purposes of the National Sea Grant College Program. The hill would provide the national program with the ability to promote, encourage, plan, and implement collaboration among groups of Sea Grant programs, strategic partners, and stakeholders. The bill includes amendments to the act that would describe in more detail the role of Sea Grant in addressing important issues of regional and national concern as identified in the National Ocean Research Priorities Plan and Implementation Strategy.

The bill would invigorate oversight and accountability by expanding the responsibilities of the National Sea Grant Review Panel, established by an earlier reauthorization of the National Sea Grant College Act. The bill renames this panel as the ''National Sea Grant Advisory Board'' to more appropriately and accurately describe its purpose and function. The bill would further authorize the Board to extend participation to non-panel members, principally through the establishment of subcommittees for the purpose of receiving advice and guidance. The revised title and afforded level of new participation reflects a broader and ongoing responsibility on behalf of the National Sea Grant College Program. The Board would be also charged with providing advice to the Secretary of Commerce as to how the National Sea Grant College Program can he best strengthened to ensure the activities of Sea Grant Colleges are consistent with and supportive of national objectives.

The bill would amend Sea Grant program performance review standards. Adopted as part of the 2002 amendments, the review requirements have had the unintended consequence of creating a disincentive for programs to work cooperatively or form partnerships. Implementation of new measures for program review combined with policies aimed at advancing ''continuous program improvement'' should ensure effective program assessments.

In addition, the bill would increase the percentage of funds exempt from the non-Federal match requirement from the current 1 percent to 5 percent. Many Sea Grant programs address issues of local as well as national concern. In the case of local Sea Grant projects within States, the general match requirement is appropriate. However, the match requirement makes it difficult for Sea Grant to participate in joint competitive programs with other NOAA offices or other Federal agencies because incoming proposals for Sea Grant funding require a match, while proposals from the other agencies often do not.

The bill would also exempt the Dean John A. Knauss Marine Policy Fellowship Program from having to match grant awards in order to achieve parity between fellows placed in congressional offices with those fellows placed in Federal agencies.

Finally, the bill also supports reasonable and justifiable increases in authorized appropriations for Sea Grant. Authorized funding levels would increase from $66 million to $100 million for the period between Fiscal Year 2009 through Fiscal Year 2014.

The National Sea Grant College Program has established an impressive record over the course of its 38-year history. The reauthorization bill introduced today builds on the sensible recommendations of the Sea Grant Association, the Sea Grant Review Panel, other stakeholders, and consultations with personnel assigned to NOAA's Sea Grant Program Office. Sea Grant provides countless benefits to the American public, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reauthorize and strengthen this important extramural marine conservation program.

HONORING MR. PEDRO JOHNSON FOR HIS YEARS OF SERVICE IN CONNECTICUT

HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to pay tribute to my dear friend, Pedro Johnson, who has recently decided to retire from his service for his tribe, the Mashantucket Pequot Tribal Nation.

I have known Pedro Johnson for many years and have seen firsthand how he has dedicated himself to improving the lives of others and this Nation. Pedro honorably served in the United States Air Force prior to joining the University of Connecticut Police Department in 1966. He dedicated over 20 years of service to the UCONN police, holding the positions of department liaison, martial arts instructor, and police photographer, before retiring in 1992 at the rank of sergeant.

Retirement would be short-lived for Pedro, and it would not be long before he continued his life passion of public service. As a member of the Mashantucket Pequot Tribe, Pedro was elected to three terms on the Tribal Council including one term in the prestigious position of treasurer. During his time on Tribal Council, Pedro worked with his fellow council members on an incredible transformation that has made the Mashtantucket Pequot Tribe into one of the most respected Tribes in the Nation.

Under Pedro's leadership, the Tribe has become a major economic and cultural focal point in the region. They have become one of the largest employers in the State of Connecticut and opened the Mashantucket Pequot Museum and Research Center, which contains one of the largest collections of indigenous artifacts in North America. The dedication and commitment of Pedro Johnson has been instrumental in shaping the Tribe's vision for the future.

Pedro has always been involved in public service. Over the years he has sat on the board of directors of the Foxwoods Development Company. Natchaug Hospital, Eastern Connecticut State University, Bushnell Theater, Old State House, and the Savings Institute Bank. He was also a member of the Masons Fraternal Order and held the position as worshipful master of his lodge for several years.

We could not pay proper respects to Pedro without mentioning his lifelong partner, his wife Linda. Pedro and Linda recently celebrated their 44th wedding anniversary, and I know they have been a source of strength and love for each other for nearly five decades. They have two children, Michael and David, who have brought them great joy over the years.

Madam Speaker, it is a great honor to pay tribute to a man who has done so much to improve the quality of life for his Tribe and indeed, the people of Connecticut. I know that Pedro is retiring from his position at the Tribe. but I know he will continue to be an active member of our community and I look forward to working with him in the future.

RECOGNIZING THE 2007 NATIONAL PRINCESS OF THE AMERICAN MINIATURE HORSE REGISTRY, ALYSSA PALAS OF STORY CITY, IOWA

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the 2007 National Princess of the American Miniature Horse Registry, Alyssa Palas of Story City, Iowa.

In September 2007, Alyssa was crowned at the National Miniature Horse show in Tulsa, Oklahoma. As princess, Alyssa presented all the awards during the show, including presenting her mother with Reserve National Champion honors for their two-year-old gelding. She will reign until the 2008 national show.

Alyssa and her family have been involved in the miniature horse business for six years. The Palas family competes across the country under the farm name Royal Palas Miniatures. They received 31 National Top Ten placings at the 2007 national show.

I know that my colleagues in the United States Congress join me in commending and congratulating Alyssa Palas. I consider it an honor to represent Alyssa and her family in Congress and I wish them the best in their future endeavors.

HONORING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ROAD RUNNERS CLUB OF AMERICA

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, today I rise to recognize the 50th Anniversary of the Road Runners Club of America. The initial organizational meeting took place on February 22, 1958, in a small hotel room in New York City. Five running clubs emerged from that meeting. Today, the RRCA has more than 700 member clubs, representing 180,000 distance runners nationwide. Included among these are 18 clubs from

Tennessee with a total of 5,600 members. The Murfreesboro Pacers and the Murfreesboro Half Marathon are among them.

In the late 1950s, jogging for heath and fitness was practically unheard of and there were very few distance racing events in the United States. The Long Distance Log, publication with a circulation of 126 readers, was the chief means of communication with distance runners. In the August 1957 issue of the Long Distance Log an editorial by Olympian Browning Ross proposed developing an organization for American distance runners. The concept was modeled after the Road Runners Club of the UK, which was founded in 1952. He suggested that membership include not only runners, but also officials, race sponsors, coaches and more. Ross envisioned the group would encourage running, meet regularly, raise funds, coordinate schedules, recruit sponsors and promote competition in long-distance races.

Response to the concept was positive; meetings were held in December 1957 and shortly thereafter, the Middle Atlantic Road Runners Club was established. And on February 22, 1958, the Road Runners Club of America was born.

Meeting at the Paramount Hotel in New York City, Ross and nine others discussed the general direction for the organization and developed the basic operating structure. Ross was named acting provisional president. The first RRCA National Championship races were awarded, and events were held in Chicago, New Jersey and Philadelphia.

Interest in the RRCA increased and by April 1958, the New York Road Runners Club, now the New York Road Runners, was established with 29 members. In February 1959, the Michigan Road Runners Club was established in Detroit by Hugh Jascourt and Frank McBride. Several months later, the RRCA held an annual meeting at the Paramount Hotel in New York City. The group elected president Dick Donohue, treasurer Steve Thomas, and co-secretaries Tom Osler and Browning Ross. They served as the first officially elected officers of the RRCA.

At the 1960 annual meeting Ted Corbitt was elected president. ''Those were tough days, days of survival [for the RRCA]'', Corbitt wrote. ''Instead of recognizing the good work the RRCA was doing to promote distance running, the Amateur Athletic Union (AAU) refused to admit the RRCA as a member club and took the position that the RRCA was illegal.'' In those days, the AAU was the ruling body of sport; they advised the RRCA to function solely as a social or fraternal group and not conduct races.

The early 1960s saw the development of new running clubs around the country. By the end of the RRCA's third year, its members had hosted over 600 races around the country compared to the previous handful of races.

Over the years, the RRCA has been credited with developing course certification programs, establishing the first events for recreational joggers, removing age requirements for racing, encouraging competitive opportunities for women, creating a Hall of Fame for distance runners, and obtaining insurance and IRS tax-exempt status for member clubs.

Many important publications have been developed by the RRCA including fact sheets on cold and hot weather running, safety for runners, guidelines for buying a pair of running shoes, tips for helping children start running and many more.

By the 1980s, RRCA membership included 400 clubs and elected its first woman president, Henley ''Gibble'' Gabeau. The first edition of the RRCA Children's Running Booklet and the Parent & Teacher's Curriculum authored by Don Kardong, an Olympic marathoner and future RRCA president, and Jim Ferstle were circulated to thousands for clubs, teachers, schools and more.

More recently the RRCA has developed a coaching certification program, as well as the Roads Scholar Program to support aspiring international caliber American distance runners. In 1997, the RRCA gave a grant through the new Roads Scholar Program to Deena Drossin (Kastor), a young distance runner who went on to win the bronze medal in the 2004 Athens Olympic marathon.

Over the last 50 years, the RRCA has stayed true to its mission. The future of long-distance running and the RRCA's impact on the sport will continue to be written for years to come.

CONGRATULATING THE YMCA OF MICHIANA ON ITS 125TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOE DONNELLY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam Speaker, today I wish to congratulate the YMCA of Michiana. On March 19, 2008 the Michiana YMCA will celebrate 125 of years of steadfast dedication to building strong individuals, families and communities.

The YMCA was launched in 1882 back when Clement Studebaker was president of the Studebaker Company and local resident Schuyler Colfax was the Vice-President of the United States. In order to celebrate Studebaker's 50 years of success in the community and in business, the Studebaker Company established the YMCA, beginning a proud tradition of service. Sports programs flourished over the coming decades. Famed Notre Dame coach Knute Rockne even taught football during the summer at the Michiana YMCA affiliate Camp Eberhart.

Michiana was blessed with an especially successful YMCA. During the 1950s it developed the nation's largest Indian Guide program and started the Indian Maiden program. An impressive tennis program was also developed that rivaled the nation's best. During the 1960s, two newer facilities were built, a more family oriented approach was pursued to encourage both girls and boys to participate and the Urban Youth Services Program was started. Today the YMCA offers physical fitness activities, aquatics, youth and adult sports leagues and many other programs that improve the lives of people of all ages.

These are exciting times for the YMCA as a new three-year Strategic Plan is being implemented. The Michiana community has benefited from the positive influence of the YMCA on the community for over a century. Today I salute the Michiana YMCA and wish them continued success.

DR. VIDA DAVOUDI—CHANGING THE WORLD ONE STUDENT AT A TIME

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, today I have the privilege to recognize Dr. Vida Davoudi of Kingwood, TX. Her life as an Iranian immigrant turned proud American citizen is an inspirational tale of not only living the American Dream but of someone who diligently works daily to improve it for others.

Her journey to success in America began early. With encouragement from her parents, they told her to dream big and that the key to great achievement was to obtain an education. While in high school, Davoudi became a foreign exchange student to the United States through the American Field Service Program as well as a sponsorship from a Rotary Club. For one year, she lived with an American family and fell in love with the democratic political system of the United States.

After returning to Iran to graduate from high school, Dr. Davoudi participated in a competitive exam conducted by American International Development and was awarded a four-year, full scholarship to attend American University of Beirut. Continuing her journey of academic excellence, she returned to the United States to attend graduate school at Southern Illinois University.

After Dr. Davoudi earned her masters and doctorate degrees in political science, she returned to her country and ran for a seat in the Iranian Parliament. Davoudi won and become the youngest member ever elected. She served for three years in the national assembly representing the city of Tehran and championed issues such as the abolition of polygamy and divorce law reform. She left Iran for the United States shortly before the Shah of Iran was overthrown in 1979.

When Dr. Davoudi arrived in the United States, the only things she brought with her were a suitcase, her nine-year-old son and her education. Davoudi credits her education as the key ingredient to her success.

''Education was the only thing that enabled us to survive,'' she said. ''I have no doubt that education is the key to opening doors and improving lives financially and intellectually.''

She was hired as a government professor at Kingwood College in 1989 and has used the opportunity to impact the lives of numerous young people.

For example, a recently divorced student approached Davoudi one day in tears. The young woman told her that she was having great difficulty coping with her divorce and wanted to drop her class. Davoudi told the woman that she would not let her withdraw, but instead would provide her with flexibility and whatever she needed in order to complete the course. The young lady successfully finished Davoudi's class and eventually became a practicing nurse. Years later, she was very thankful to Davoudi for not letting her quit during a difficult time in her life.

Davoudi is also the faculty sponsor for the college's Student Government Association. She fosters leadership development in her students by actively encouraging them every year to seek state-level positions in the organization. Through her diligent efforts and advice,

one of her former students was even elected to the highest level of State leadership as president of the Texas Junior College Student Government Association. She teaches her students not to simply attend college but to become leaders.

In addition to pursuing state office positions within the organization, Davoudi has led the students of SGA at Kingwood College in multiple community service projects such as food, clothing and toy drives for non-profit organizations and local area shelters for abused women and children. In the words of one of her colleagues, Dr. Davoudi is "changing the world one student at a time."

I salute Dr. Vida Davoudi for being a shining example of a distinguished scholar and advocate for lifelong learning. Her life and eternal gratitude for living in a country so richly blessed with opportunity and freedom is an inspiration to us all.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF DR. WILLIAM "DOC" WILKERSON

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of Dr. William "Doc" Wilkerson. Dr. Wilkerson, who passed away on February 29, 2008, was one of the founders of Flower Mound, Texas and also the town's second mayor.

Doc Wilkerson was born in Madill, Oklahoma on December 21, 1917, and began working for a locksmith at age ten. This prompted his mother to enroll him in the Boy Scouts of America, where he later achieved the rank of Eagle Scout in 1935.

In 1954, Doc bought 150 acres of unincorporated rural land north of the newly-created Grapevine Lake. It was here that his fight for Flower Mound began. During the early 1960s, Wilkerson worked tirelessly to halt Irving's attempt to annex what is now the town of Flower Mound. Doc was ultimately successful in stopping the annexation. After this success, he worked to incorporate present-day Flower Mound.

Dr. Wilkerson was elected mayor of Flower Mound in 1968. He was only the second individual to hold the position of mayor for the young town, and he held this office until 1973. In honor of his passing, the town of Flower Mound will fly its flags at half-staff.

The first mayor of Flower Mound, Bob Rheudasil, once said about Doc, "No words are big enough to talk about him." This is certainly true; Doc's tireless dedication to Flower Mound greatly contributed to turning the small town into the thriving community it is today.

My thoughts and prayers go out to Doc's two sons, his brother and three sisters, as well as a long list of family members and friends. North Texas has lost a long-time friend and advocate. While Doc Wilkerson will be greatly missed by the community he helped found, he will forever be remembered for his dedication to the city of Flower Mound.

TRIBUTE TO THIRD DISTRICT CONGRESSIONAL YOUTH ADVISORY COUNCIL

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, last fall I invited high school students living in the Third Congressional District to join the Congressional Youth Advisory Council. The goal of the CYAC is to foster civic involvement and to encourage students to unleash their passions for America. Each meeting, they exceed my expectations and make me hopeful for the future.

The students who serve on the CYAC represent the best and the brightest in north Texas. Students are leaders, athletes, musicians, volunteers, and activists. They are the voice of their generation to Congress. They make a difference at each meeting, and I'm proud of them.

For this year's community project, students interviewed a veteran and wrote essays. A summary of some of the submitted essays follows.

It is my hope that some day the Congressional Youth Advisory Council will be associated with excellence and one of our highest standards of civic pride for young people in north Texas. I commend the students for volunteering their time on the Congressional Youth Advisory Council. Without a doubt, every student will continue to play an important role in our community for decades to come, and America and north Texas will continue to benefit from their dedication, smarts, and service.

To the members of the 2007–2008 Congressional Youth Advisory Council. Thank you. I salute you; God bless you and God bless America.

I interviewed Mr. Keith Fannon. He served in the United States Air Force. His beginning rank was just a basic airman, but he was able to rise all the way up being a Staff Sergeant when he finished his time of service. He served in the Korean War. Mr. Fannon may not have seen too much on the battlefield in itself, but he performed search and rescue missions for airmen who had been shot down through the Civil Air Patrol (CAP), helped civilians in need in Korea, and had been through six major offensives during his service time. Mr. Keith Fannon has been a family friend for about four years now, and I've solely gotten to know him for the person he is today. To be able to learn of Mr. Fannon's past in the Air Force, though, was a fascinating experience. It gave me more insight to Mr. Fannon as a whole, and I enjoyed every bit of it. Having the ability to learn even more about a friend, a veteran, and America's history from a first-person point of view all at the same time was mind-blowing. I would like to thank Mr. Keith Fannon and the Congressional Youth Advisory Council for giving me such a great opportunity.—Patrick Foster

For the Veteran's History project, I interviewed retired Lieutenant Colonel James Megellas, the most decorated Army officer of the 82nd Airborne, 504th Parachute Infantry Regiment. Lt. Col. Megellas and his regiment fought through Europe in World War II from January 1943 to the end of the war in 1945, and were welcomed home to a victory parade in New York on January 12, 1946. He led his men as a Platoon Leader in many famous battles, including the Battle of the Bulge, Operation Market Garden, and the battle for Anzio, and he eventually participated in the American occupation of Berlin. Interviewing such an influential and heroic veteran truly affected my life in an undeniable and poignant way. Though Lt. Col. Megellas said that he does not agree with those who call him part of the "greatest generation," getting the chance to interview him reminded me that unbelievable heroism, valor, and selflessness can still exist in the face of a world where people's worth is often judged by their money and power in society. Whether he agrees with me or not. I believe that soldiers like Lt. Col. Megellas, including the brave men and women fighting in the military for America today, are the greatest of any generation in American history. As Lt. Col. Megellas put it, "We're blessed in many ways, but not more so than the quality of the young men and women who will step forward whenever we're been in trouble. They are the best of this generation."—Stephen Hayes

Howard Montfort, known to all his friends as Dusty, was born in Carrolton, Texas and has lived in Texas all his life, except for his time of service. He was originally drafted in 1966, but was unable to comply with his draft notice due to an infection of viral encephalitis. After recovering, he was given pardon and transferred from Texas A&M, where he had been going to school, to NTSU. There he was drafted a second time, but decided instead to visit the school's recruiter to join a program which allowed him to finish school while training for the Air Force. Dusty entered the Air Force in 1969, flying the infamous B–52. After joining the Vietnam Conflict, he quickly rose from Second Lieutenant to Aircraft Commander, and flew numerous Tours for a total of 141 combat missions. Dusty received the Air Medal and seven Oak Leaf clusters during his service. In addition, he was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross in December 1972 for "Heroism or extraordinary achievement while participating in an aerial flight."

In March of 1974, Dusty left the service after flying for five years. He is now married to Gila Montfort, his wife of thirty-eight years. Together, they have a son, Steven Montfort, who lives in Los Angeles and works as an actor. By conducting this interview, I have heard first-hand the experiences of an American veteran. These people have served our country. They have died to pay for our freedom, and I had the opportunity to speak to one of them. In addition, I learned more about the Vietnam Conflict than I previously knew, I am extremely thankful for the experience.—Weston Barker

Mr. Billie Bob Norris proudly served as a Corporal in the United States Marine Corps for 19 months during the Korean War. He was a member of the First Marine Air Wing, Fleet Marine Force, Marine Air Group 12, Service Squadron 1. During that time, he was stationed in the frigid area of Wonsan, North Korea, shortly after its liberation by the South Korean forces. He then joined with the K27 Yonpo Airdrome as they went to Hamhung-Hungnam as part of the "Frozen Chosin" or "Chosin Few." He was also stationed in Pusan, South Korea, and later worked as a radio-radar technician in Japan for the duration of his service. Mr. Norris currently holds a bachelor's degree in industrial art, a master's degree in secondary school administration, and a specialist degree in vocational education. He is also a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) and lives in Frisco, Texas with his wife, Armetha.

Throughout the process of writing this essay I have earned both a greater respect

for this Nation's veterans and a greater understanding of one war in our country's history that is, sadly, looked over by many people. The United States' veterans have gone through experiences that neither I nor anyone in my generation can truly begin to imagine. And for that, we can never thank our troops, both past and current, enough.—Ashley Newton

Lloyd was born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania on July 10, 1923. At age 11, his family moved to Peacedale, Rhode Island. Some seven or so years later Lloyd voted for his first presidential candidate, Harry S. Truman, for his second term. Then in the November of his nineteenth year, he enlisted in the Navy. He was a payroll officer, and a soldier. When it was necessary, as it was for the Japanese invasion, the payroll was to be set down, and they would fight with the rest of the outfit. When the war was ended, Lloyd decided to stay in the army, and was assigned to Okinawa. Soon thereafter, he sent for Dorothy and their fourteen month-old daughter, Carol. When they arrived, it was the first time Lloyd had ever seen Carol. In January of 1951, he was called to active duty and was stationed at the Air Force base in Miami. Although he was still a payroll officer, his outfit supported the troops in Japan facing Korea. Lloyd retired from military service on a Sunday in 1965 as a senior master sergeant, and began work at the PANTEX Ordnance Plano the very next morning in Amarillo, Texas. He retired from his job in 1986. Lloyd died on February 24th, 2008, in the center of a circle of family members. This project came at the perfect time. I may have missed my chance to learn about him had I not conducted this interview. There was an opportunity for closure, and I'm beginning to see how quickly we are losing the WWII generation.—Bethany Johnston

For the Preserving History project I interviewed Sergeant Quentin Higgins. Higgins served as a tank commander in World War II throughout England, North Africa, and Italy and earning several medals. In addition, he has written a memoir, reached the age of ninety years old, and blessed the lives of many people. Through this experience I have learned more about the dedication of our military to preserve our liberty in the United States that can often be taken for granted. I was initially stunned and amazed that the man I was speaking to went through intense front line combat in World War II and lived to tell about it at ninety years old. While I had read and heard second hand about World War II stories, the reality of the events and experiences of the soldiers came alive in my mind when I spoke with Mr. Higgins. I have acquired a greater appreciation for our troops who sacrifice their lives daily for their country and a deeper comprehension of the traumas of war. Most importantly I gained a fuller gratefulness as Higgins stated ''appreciate life and count your blessings.''—Stephanie Tison

I had the pleasure of interviewing Lieutenant Colonel Bernard Aikens, formerly of the United States Army, on 29 February 2008, at his office in Plano Fast Senior High School. He provided me with his personal history, from his many academic achievements in high school, his introduction to the military during college, and some of his more memorable experiences as an officer in the United States Army. I have also had the opportunity to work with Lieutenant Colonel Aikens for the past four years, and I have found him to be a great example for the students he leads, and very helpful in my own pursuit of goals for the future, as well as instrumental in the roads to success for several other students, my peers, and those who have gone before. His life has been and continues to be one of dedicated and energized service to those around him, to his community. and to his country.—David Paxman

For my Preserving History: Veteran's Interview. I am honored to have received the opportunity to interview Wesley C. Browning. This remarkable individual served in the Iraq War for a nine month period. He was titled as a civilian and worked with the Hazardous Material Management in Baghdad, Iraq. Mr. Browning conquered many challenging obstacles and accomplished well respected goals. He faced the boot camp, bombings, and hardships like the hero he truly represents. During the time he spent in Iraq, his primary task was to assist the soldiers so they could concentrate on defending their country. Mr. Browning dealt with the contamination of foods after battle and vermin localized around the camp. He handled weapons, bomb materials, and fought adjacent to the soldiers while participating in the war. Mr. Browning has gained a wide breadth of experience from joining the Iraq War. He not only has made lifelong friendships, but has learned about the various cultures and traditions in other parts of the world.

I have the utmost respect for anyone that risks their life to defend their country. Conversing with Mr. Browning has allowed me to gain an innovative view of the world and our society. Hearing him discuss passionately his values and morals was very impressive and refreshing. I have learned from this war hero that the materialistic side of life is submissive to the people and relationships present and nothing is worth being taken for granted.—Ally Crutcher

Non-commissioned Officer Josh Bomar joined the United States Marine Corps to find discipline and focus. Bomar served two terms of seven months each in Iraq. The Marines protected, patrolled, and regulated the areas. Bomar's assignments were gunner, who lies on top of the humvee and shoots a machine gun, and vehicle commander, who is in charge of an entire humvee. Bomar's family was very encouraging, both extending and immediate family supported his decision to join the service. Bomar is now attending the University of Texas at Dallas where he is studying criminology. Bomar's military experiences has made him more confident. Becoming a Marine has given Bomar the tools to do better in his life. He now has the discipline to accomplish everything he wants to in the future. Bomar feels fortunate to have been part of the United States Marine Corps and is thankful for all the opportunities he has been given.

By interviewing Josh Bomar, I have gained a better understanding of how joining the service can change your life. This opportunity allowed me to learn about the daily life of soldiers and the realities of combat during the war. I admire the courageous men and women who sacrifice their lives to protect our country.—Emily Buss

Command Sergeant Major Robert F. Donahue epitomizes everything it means to be a proud American. Even after two tours of duty in Vietnam and another in Iraq, he loves to share his experiences and wisdom gained from his time in the military. People are always trying to find someone who can be a great role model for today's young people, CSM Donahue is exactly that. Born into a military family with a career soldier for a father and a World War II nurse for a mother. CSM Donohue was born in North Carolina. He moved many times during his early life and spent most of his high school life in Lawton, Oklahoma. Growing up in Lawton. CSM Donahue didn't know a life other than the one he was living, of military orientation, very regimented and discipline oriented. Prior to his last year of high school, the Tet Offensive happened in Vietnam. Once he graduated from high school, he enlisted in the Marine Corps, heading off to Vietnam for ten months on separate tours of duty. After Vietnam, he stayed in the army reserve up until his time in Iraq. I gained many things from my experience interviewing CSM Donahue.—Michael Buss

I chose to do my biography on Matthew Edward Rice, my dad. In August 1981, at nineteen years old he went to Basic Training at Ft. Gordon. He then went to AIT where he learned to be a Telephone Switchboard Technician, and then he was stationed in Darmstadt, Germany in May of 1982 with the C Co. 44th Signal Battalion. He then received orders to go back to Ft. Gordon for new advanced digital telephone switch training. He was then assigned to Ft. Bragg with orders to the 327th Signal BN. However, he was transferred to B Co. 50th Signal BN, for the liberation of Grenada. He was reassigned to A Co. 327th Signal BN. My dad went to Germany in 1984 and attended Primary Leadership Development Course. He then was transferred to the 17th Signal BN. He then returned to Ft. Gordon as an Instructor. His last assignment was with Headquarters Co. 304th Signal BN South Korea from May of 1991 to June 1992. I have learned a lot about dedication, hard work and responsibility from my father and his stories of his time in the Army. My dad has instilled in me the values that the military has instilled in him.—Allyson Rice

Larry Lucido joined the Marine Corps. He began as a private in the Marine Corps and ended his service as a Sergeant. During his nine month tour of duty in the Korean War he saw a lot of action and fought in several battles including the battle of Chosin Reservoir where the Chinese entered the war and surrounded the Marines until the Marines managed to break out. He was awarded two Purple Hearts during his tour. The first Purple Heart was awarded to him after he was shot in the back. His second Purple Heart was awarded to him after he went to go help one of his injured friends and he stepped on a land mine that took off his leg. He also captured a North Korean soldier than gave them information about the other North Korean Troops in the area.

From this experience I have gained a greater respect for those who serve in our country's armed forces and fight to keep this and other countries free. His service in the Marine Corps is a great inspiration. How he was shot in the back and lost his leg in the service of our country shows how high the price of freedom can be and how we must respect those who fight to protect it.—Brian Bruck

My name is James Garrett Follette and I interviewed Captain Ralph Peter ''Pete'' Langenfield on January 26, 2008. Pete enlisted with the Air Force in the summer of 1942 and saw active duty in January 1943 as a 2nd lieutenant. Pete was assigned to the 785th Bombardment Squadron of the 466th Bombardment Group of the 8th Air Division stationed in England as a bombardier for a B–24 Liberator. His last day of service was on December 19, 1945. For two years, Pete also flew B–29 Bombers during the Korean War. He held the rank of Captain when he was discharged on April 14, 1951.

On August 24, 2006 he received the Distinguished Flying Cross with valor for his heroism on January 2, 1945. On his 31st combat mission over Remagen, Germany, one of the live 2,000-pound bombs on his B–24 Liberator did not release. Pete removed his parachute and oxygen mask so he could move to the open bomb bay and manually release the weapon. Interviewing Captain Langenfeld has been an incredible experience. To listen to the thrill and patriotism in his voice is

contagious. It makes one realize how important history is and we do not want to lose these experiences.—Garrett Tollelle

The tributes, memories, and lives of those who serve or have served in the armed forces must be exalted and above all else never forgotten. Thanks to this interview of United States Marine Corps Major John Lauder, I have first hand insight on the life of a true patriot. Major John Lauder went from only a Cadet, to Captain, 1st Lieutenant, 2nd Lieutenant all the way to where he is now at Major. As I listened to the memories and experience of Major Lauder, it occurred to me the massive amount of courage, dedication, and perseverance it takes to serve. As a marine he has served four tours of duty thus far and is still an honorable member of the Marines. It is to him I owe my understanding of the true hardships that one must take on as a Marine. I hold people like Major John Lauder responsible for my feelings of security and pride in such a beloved country.

The memories of our men in service and veterans are important ones. They are memories that should not be lost. These people have put their lives on the line and triumphed over all odds. I proudly say that Major John Lauder is one of these people. While serving, Major Lauder has truly excelled as a Marine. earning awards such as Iraqi and Afghan campaign medals as well as being decorated for valor. Not only those, but he has also received the Global War on Terrorism Service medal, expeditionary medals, along with a combat action ribbon. Major John Lauder is a truly exemplary person and I give thanks to God for people like him.—Amanda Dees

Colonel James E. Gilliland grew up in a changing time throughout the tides of war and peace. He entered the Air Force as the Korean War had ended, but answered the call to defend his country during the Vietnam War, flying 100 vital reconnaissance missions over North and South Vietnam war zones in a very short amount of time. The dangerous missions which he completed helped to contribute to the key strategies during the war, saving countless American lives. Throughout his tour in enemy skies, he was a highly decorated RF–4C pilot in the United States Air Force, which includes the Silver Star, Distinguished Flying Cross, Legion of Merit, Bronze Star and Air Medals. Even after his combat tours in Vietnam, Colonel Gilliland continued to hold senior command and staff positions in Saigon, Hawaii, Colorado, Texas, England, and eventually Belgium. Not only was this man a hero throughout his career with the Air Force, but he is also my grandfather, a man I hold in the highest regard. Hearing his story, which even now is hard for him to tell, has helped me to better understand just how much he has sacrificed for his country.—Trevor Ede

What Corbett Reagan accomplished was a 6 month tour (1990–1991) of duty in Iraq during Operation Desert Storm where he specialized in anti-tank gunning. He was the recipient of the Meritorious Unit Award, the Valorous Unit Citation, and the Kuwait Liberation Medal. What I gained from this interview experience was how committed Corporal Reagan was to his country. It was part of his heart and soul to be a Marine and serve our nation, particularly growing up in a military family. I also was struck by the influence the Marines and his overall service in Kuwait/Iraq during Operation Desert Storm had in molding him into a man of character. Being in the Marines shaped his life in many ways, particularly in helping him understand the issues of life and death, obtaining his education, the importance of family and friends, as well as gaining an appreciation for what it means to live in this great nation of ours.—Lauren Hill

Lieutenant Colonel Richard Castle was born in 1946 in Rochester, New York. His decision to join the Army was voluntary but also influenced by his family. His grandfather had served in the Navy during WWI while his own father had been a captain in the air corp. Even his brother had served in the United States Army during the Vietnam War. Richard served in the Vietnam War as a logistics officer. During his entire military career. Richard reached the position of 5th corp commander under a three star general. At the end of his military career, he reached the position of lieutenant colonel for his incredible service. The things I learned from Lieutenant Colonel Richard Castle were so astounding and intriguing. He seemed like a man who genuinely cared about his country and had loved serving in the Army. It made me gain a much greater appreciation for the men and women in the service right now. Talking on the phone with him. I realized how much of an ordinary person Mr. Castle was. Yet for him to have done so much for the Army is absolutely amazing. His story truly shows that anyone can serve the country and be an inspiration.—Lisa Hu

Colonel Vernon David Gores was born on December 27, 1929 in Bisbee, North Dakota. He grew up exposed to the agricultural environment of North Dakota, in addition to the small city life of Fargo, North Dakota. Vern Gores graduated from North Dakota State University with a degree in civil engineering in 1951. While there he attended ROTC, then entered the United States Air Force as a second lieutenant and attended flight school. Vern served in several capacities for the Air Force. For most of his Air Force career, Vern served as a pilot for transport (C–46) and reconnaissance aircraft (EC–121). He also advised an ROTC unit. He held positions of operations officer, commander advisor to the National Guard, and inspector general. Vern lived across the nation and internationally during his career. After North Dakota he lived in Alabama, Oklahoma, Illinois, Vermont, California, Massachusetts, Florida, and Ohio. He also served in several foreign countries: Japan, South Korea, Libya, Vietnam, and Thailand. Vern served in the Korean conflict and Vietnam. He remembers the Cuban Missile Crisis and the ''ongoing'' Cold War.

Vern retired from the Air Force at the rank of Full Colonel in 1979 at Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio after 28 years of service. He has been awarded the Legion of Merit, Air Medal, and Bronze Star recognitions. Today Colonel Gore lives in the Villages of Lady Lake, Florida with his wife Colleen. They have been married for more than fifty years. They have one son, two daughters, and five grandchildren. His family is very proud of his accomplishments. He served with untiring effort, superior intellect, and uncompromising values of honesty, integrity, and loyalty. The nation and our family are fortunate to be associated with him.—Garrett McDaniel

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. HILDA L. SOLIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Ms. SOLIS. Madam Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 120, on motion to adjourn, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

INTRODUCTION OF THE PATHWAY FOR BIOSIMILARS ACT

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Ms. ESHOO. Madam Speaker, the field of biotechnology is the future of medicine. Scientists and doctors are just beginning to scratch the surface of the potential to harness the extraordinary power of biology and the astounding natural processes which occur in the human body, in animals, and in other living organisms to advance breakthrough medical discoveries and treatments. While ordinary pharmaceuticals primarily treat the symptoms of a disease or illness, biotechnology products—''biologics''—can be manipulated to target the underlying mechanisms and pathways of a disease.

Through the study of biotechnology, we will develop effective treatments for cancer and AIDS, many of which are already saving lives. We will cure diabetes. We will prevent the onset of deadly and debilitating diseases such as Alzheimer's, heart disease, Parkinson's, multiple sclerosis and arthritis. We will save millions of lives and improve countless more.

The development of biologics is expensive and extremely risky. Bringing a biologic to market can require hundreds of millions of dollars in research and development costs and can take several years. For every successful biologic, there are another 10 or 20 that do not pan out, making the incentives for investment in this field extremely sensitive to any changes in the regulatory structure for biologics.

In the relatively young industry of biotechnology, many of the original patents on biologics are beginning to expire and it's appropriate for Congress to consider how ''follow-on'' biologics or ''biosimilars'' are considered and approved by the FDA, and the impact these products will have on patient health and safety, health care costs, and incentives for innovation.

As a primary matter, it's important to recognize that traditional ''small-molecule'' pharmaceuticals and biologics are fundamentally different in their development, their manufacture and their chemical makeup. A traditional small-molecule drug is manufactured through synthesis of chemical ingredients in an ordered process, and the resulting product can be easily identified through laboratory analysis. A biologic is a large, complex molecule, which is ''grown'' in living systems such as a microorganism, a plant or animal cell. The resulting protein is unique to the cell lines and specific process used to produce it, and even slight differences in the manufacturing of a biologic can alter its nature. As a result, biologics are difficult, sometimes impossible to characterize, and laboratory analysis of the finished product is insufficient to ensure its safety and efficacy.

The pharmaceutical drug production process is easily replicated and a ''generic'' drug product is virtually identical to the original innovative product, so generic drug manufacturers are permitted to reference the original testing data submitted by the innovator companies when the original drug is submitted to the FDA for approval. With biologics, the manufacturing process is unique to each biologic and is not

generally disclosed as part of the published patent. A biosimilar manufacturer would have to have intimate knowledge of these proprietary processes in order to ''duplicate'' the biologic product, and even then it is extremely difficult—no two living cell lines are identical, so no two biologics manufacturing processes have identical starting materials or proceed in the same way.

It's also important to note that because biologics are produced with cells from living organisms, many of them can cause an immune reaction which is normally benign and does not affect safety. However, some of these reactions can negate the effectiveness of the biologic or even cause side effects that are more dangerous. Most of these reactions can only be observed through clinical trials with real patients.

Any expedited regulatory pathway for biosimilars must account for all these factors and I'm proud to join with the Ranking Member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Rep. JOE BARTON, to introduce the Pathway for Biologics Act. Our bill builds on the significant progress the Senate, led by Senators KENNEDY and ENZI, has already made, as well as the significant level of consensus we have heard on our Committee about this issue. The Pathway for Biologics Act will establish a new statutory pathway for biosimilars guided by three principles:

1. Legislation to facilitate the development of biosimilars should promote competition and lower prices, but patient safety, efficacy and sound science must be paramount.

2. We must preserve incentives for innovation and ensure that patients will continue to benefit from the groundbreaking treatments biotechnology alone can bring.

3. We must strive to protect the rights of all parties and resolve disputes over patents in a timely and efficient manner that does not delay market entry and provides certainty to all parties.

The regulatory pathway set forth in the Pathway for Biologics Act embodies each of these principles and sets forth a sensible, scientifically sound process for approval of biosimilars. The legislation allows for input from all interested parties and provides FDA appropriate flexibility to protect patient health by requesting analytical, animal and clinical studies to demonstrate the safety, purity and potency of a biosimilar. The FDA will be empowered to require the tests and data it deems necessary, but the results of clinical testing for immunogenicity will always be required as part of this data unless the FDA has published final guidance documents advising that such a determination is feasible in the current state of science absent clinical data and explaining the data that will be required to support such a determination. Since biologics are derived from human and animal products, immune reactions are a major concern for any new biologic product and are now impossible to detect without actual human testing.

Our legislation also addresses the important issue of interchangeability of biosimilars for the reference product. Some legislative proposals would allow the FDA to permit pharmacists and insurers to substitute a biosimilar for a physician's prescription for an innovator biologic product even when they cannot be demonstrated to be identical in their composition or effectiveness. Interchangeability of generic pharmaceuticals for brand name drugs is entirely appropriate since traditional generic drugs are chemically identical to the reference product. However, if the state of science is such that a complex molecule cannot be fully characterized and a precursor biologic cannot be adequately compared to a proposed biosimilar, then the biosimilar should not be fully substitutable for the precursor product without a physician's direction. The Pathway for Biologics Act makes it clear that the FDA cannot make a determination that a biosimilar is interchangeable with a reference product until it has published final guidance documents advising that it is feasible in the current state of scientific knowledge to make such determinations with respect to the relevant product class and explaining the data that will be required to support such a determination. This requirement is consistent with the recommendations of the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

An essential element of any new regulatory scheme for the biotech industry is a careful balancing of incentives for innovation and opportunities for new entry by competitors. To preserve incentives for innovation, the Pathway for Biologics Act provides 12 years of data exclusivity for new biologic products, which ensures that biosimilar applications that rely on the safety and efficacy record of existing biologic products will not be permitted to enter the market for 12 years following the approval of the innovator product. The 12-year exclusivity period is meant to preserve existing protections biotech companies receive from patents. The Congressional Budget Office has found that the effective patent life for pharmaceuticals is about 11.5 years, so a data exclusivity period of 12 years is consistent with that finding. Data exclusivity is necessary to provide additional protections and incentives for biologics because biosimilars—unlike generic drugs—will not be chemically identical to the reference product and will be less likely to infringe the patents of the innovator.

The legislation also includes incentives for additional indications and pediatric testing. New indications are critical for biologics and are often more significant than the indications for which approval was granted. Incentives for continued testing on new indications must be included to promote access to new treatments and cures, and this bill provides an additional 2 years exclusivity for new indications. I also believe it's important to provide incentives similar to those given traditional pharmaceuticals under the Best Pharmaceuticals for Children Act to biologics, so the legislation provides an additional 6 months of data exclusivity for testing for use in pediatric groups.

In order to protect the rights of all parties and ensure that all patent disputes involving a biosimilar are resolved before the expiration of the data exclusivity period, the Pathway for Biosimilars Act establishes a simple, streamlined patent resolution process. This process would take place within a short window of time—roughly 6–8 months after the biosimilar application has been filed with the FDA. It will help ensure that litigation surrounding relevant patents will be resolved expeditiously and prior to the launch of the biosimilar product, providing certainty to the applicant, the reference product manufacturer, and the public at large. The legislation also preserves the ability of third-party patent holders such as universities and medical centers to defend their patents.

Once a biosimilar application is accepted by the FDA, the agency will publish a notice identifying the reference product and a designated agent for the biosimilar applicant. After an exchange of information to identify the relevant patents at issue, the applicant can decide to challenge any patent's validity or applicability. All information exchanged as part of this procedure must be maintained in strict confidence and used solely for the purpose of identifying patents relevant to the biosimilar product. The patent owner will then have two months to decide whether to enforce the patent. If the patent owner's case is successful in court, the final approval of the application will be deferred until the patent expires.

Madam Speaker. I believe the Pathway for Biosimilars Act sets forth a straightforward, scientifically based process for expedited approval of new biologics based on innovative products already on the market. This new biosimilars approval pathway will promote competition and lower prices, but also ensure that patients are given safe and effective treatments that have been subjected to thorough scrutiny and testing by the FDA. The Pathways for Biosimilars Act will also protect the rights of patent holders and preserve incentives for innovation in the biotechnology sector to develop the next generation of life-saving, life-changing therapies.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Pathway for Biosimilars Act.

RECOGNIZING MARCELLA POTTHOFF OF INDIANOLA, IOWA, AS THE GOOD SAMARITAN SOCIETY'S 2007 VOLUNTEER OF THE YEAR

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Marcella Potthoff of Indianola, Iowa, as the Good Samaritan Society's 2007 Volunteer of the Year.

Marcella volunteers three days every week at the Indianola Good Samaritan Center. She performs a variety of tasks for residents, which includes making food, pushing wheelchairs and playing games. She especially enjoys bingo. According to Trudie Wood, the activity director and volunteer coordinator at the Good Samaritan Center, Marcella's eagerness to serve, and her patience and availability at short notice is what makes Marcella deserving of this award.

Marcella has dedicated her life to improving her community. Her past volunteer work includes teaching Sunday school, hosting a Bible study, helping with youth activities, leading a Girl Scout troop, and being an active member in a quilt club and a singles club. She is a great example for her community, and I commend her on her enduring commitment.

I consider it an honor to represent Marcella Potthoff in Congress. I commend Marcella's willingness to volunteer and I wish her all the best in her future endeavors.

NEW DOGS IN OUR BACKYARD

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, our own backyard is in jeopardy. Recently Colombia, our ally in the war on drugs and in combating Marxist rebels bent on undermining democracy in the Americas, was threatened with military action by its neighbors Venezuela and Ecuador. Colombia had taken the military initiative to eliminate a FARC commander across the border in Ecuador in order to maintain its own security. Yet the leftist and anti-U.S. leaders from Venezuela and Ecuador took grave offense to the killing of one of their comrades in arms, and rolled up tank battalions to the border to try to intimidate Colombia. Thankfully, cooler heads prevailed in this round, yet the United States should be concerned from some emerging big dogs in our own backyard.

With our attention turned elsewhere around, other nations and interests have been undermining US influence in the Americas. As seen already, Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez has been trying to gather support of other Latin American leaders to oppose the U.S. This latest incident in threatening our ally is a prime example.

Yet there is an even bigger dog, and it is hungry. China is growing in influence in Latin America. Seeking trading, political, and military ties with Latin America nations, China's hunger for expansion is part of its goal to be a chief player in world politics. As China seeks greater ties and influence in South America, it will naturally rely on its Communist ties with Marxist and leftist leaning groups.

What is the result of these two big dogs in our backyard? US influence is lessening in Latin America. For decades we stood by and militarily backed our Monroe Doctrine. In essence, we claim that the Western Hemisphere and the Americas is our sphere of influence. While we were able to keep Europe out, we are failing to keep the Far East and Communism out. Theodore Roosevelt added his corollary to the Doctrine, stating that the US reserves the right to intervene in Latin America. American foreign policy should take notice of this situation. While we have our chickens outside grazing, the coop is empty and under threat. We should hold fast to our Monroe Doctrine, and include all emerging threats, whether from Europe, the Far East, or ideas such as Communism and radical Islam. Strangers in one's backyard do not make for a secure household.

And that's just the way it is.

CONGRATULATING JACK AND DONNA CLARK FOR THEIR SERVICE TO FLOWER MOUND HIGH SCHOOL

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Jack and Donna Clark, long time administrators of Flower Mound High School. The Lewisville Independent School District is honoring their service by naming Flower Mound High School's auditorium the Jack and Donna Clark Auditorium.

Naming the Flower Mound High School auditorium after Mr. and Mrs. Clark is especially fitting because they both enjoy and have an interest in the performing arts. Donna was a member of the world-famous Rangerettes at Kilgore College in Kilgore, Texas. The couple met when both were teaching at Lake Highlands High School in Dallas, Texas. Donna was an English teacher and director of the Highlandettes Drill Team and Jack was the head basketball coach.

The Clark family moved to Flower Mound in 1999 to help open Flower Mound High School. Four years later, Mr. Clark was named principal, the same year the couple's son, Cody, graduated from Flower Mound High School. Additionally, Mr. Clark was named Principal of the Year by Lewisville ISD.

The final paragraph of the nominating letter, which was signed by every assistant principal and member of the counseling staff, states: ''The dedication that Jack and Donna Clark have shown through their years of education and to Flower Mound High School should not go unnoticed.'' This dedication is a great way to honor this couple for their devotion to the community of Flower Mound.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to rise today and pay tribute to Jack and Donna Clark and their legacy of service to the arts. I am proud to represent this couple in the 26th District of Texas and I am glad to know that their legacy will continue to live on.

REGARDING MARCH AS NATIONAL PEANUT MONTH AND THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF TEXAS PEANUT PRODUCERS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, today I rise in appreciation of the Texas peanut industry.

March is National Peanut Month, and it is timely to thank peanut farmers all over the great State of Texas for the work of their hands. Texas ranks second in the Nation in peanut production. The annual value of peanuts to our State is more than $96 million.

As baseball is America's favorite pastime sport, what would a day at the ballpark be without a bag of peanuts? How would a child's favorite sandwich taste without the creamy goodness of peanut butter?

Few can deny the deliciousness of peanut brittle, peanut butter cups, plain roasted or boiled peanuts. The legumes are used in a great variety of ways and are an important industry to our State and Nation.

Texas peanut farmers produced nearly 370,000 tons of peanuts last year. The primary uses of peanuts, nationwide, are for popular confections. Peanuts are roasted and packaged in plastic bags or sealed cans. They are also used in significant quantities for peanut butter.

Texas is a state of grand scale. There were 190,000 acres of peanuts grown in Texas in 2007; the varieties include Runner, Spanish, Virginia and Valencia. Agriculture and cattle ranching are major Texas industries, and it is fitting to recognize those who work the fields so that people everywhere can enjoy the products of their labor.

Madam Speaker, the Texas Peanut Producers Board and the Western Peanut Growers Association are valuable assets to Texas as leading producers in their industry. It is my privilege to recognize their contributions to our State's economy.

CHABAD LUBAVITCH OF RIVERDALE TOYS CAMPAIGN

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, for the past 8 years children in Babies and Children's Hospital of Columbia Presbyterian, Bronx Lebanon, Jacobi Medical Center, North Central Bronx Hospital, Lincoln Medical Center, Montefiore Medical Center, St. Barnabas Hospital, and Our Lady of Mercy Hospital have had their holidays brightened with gifts from the Chabad Lubavitch of Riverdale Toys Campaign.

Heartfelt gestures such as these have raised some from the despair of illness in a hospital during the holiday season to bring them hope and laughter. Toys are also given to children of more than 180 families living in homeless shelters in the Bronx.

This mitzvah, this kindness for those who are in need at that most special time of the year for joy and happiness, has earned the Chabad Lubavitch of Riverdale Toys Campaign the Community Organizational Award from the Riverdale Jewish Community Council.

HONORING PASTOR W. JAMES THOMAS II OF SHILOH CHURCH IN MEMPHIS, TN

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, our pastor today was Pastor W. James Thomas II.

Pastor Thomas is God's visionary for Shiloh Church of Memphis, located in Memphis, Tennessee. Serving as Senior Pastor since 1994, his consistent obedience to God has taken the Shiloh congregation from glory to glory. The membership has grown from 75 to 600 and counting. During these years, Pastor Thomas has been preaching and teaching God's uncompromising Word with a boldness that has changed the lives of the people at Shiloh and throughout the country.

To accommodate the vision and growth of the church membership, Pastor Thomas led the congregation in the acquisition of a 19,000 square foot worship and educational facility in 1998. In 2003, the sanctuary was completely renovated and office complex expanded to accommodate staff and daily operational needs.

Spiritually, Pastor Thomas was saved and received much of his spiritual development in the Church of God in Christ. He was called to the ministry at the age of 14 and began pastoring at the age of 18 in Knoxville, TN.

Educationally, Pastor Thomas graduated cum laude from Crichton College in Memphis, Tennessee with a bachelor of science degree in biblical studies and is currently a candidate for the masters of divinity degree. He has also been awarded a doctor of divinity degree from St. Thomas Christian College in Jacksonville, FL. Pastor Thomas was selected from among 300 clergy nationally to participate in, and has completed the first Graduate School of Theological Studies Special intensive at Harvard Divinity School in Cambridge, MA in September, 2005 and Yale School of Divinity in September, 2006.

Pastor Thomas has accomplished many tasks on the local and national level. He is the founder and CEO of Grace Community Development Corporation and Grace for Living Ministries International and currently serves as Vice-Chairman of the Board of Directors for the Marchell Foundation, a regional scholarship granting foundation. In July of 1998, he was appointed and installed as the District Overseer for the West Tennessee Full Gospel Baptist Church Fellowship. Apostolically, he serves as the overseer of True Praise & Worship International Church in Raleigh, NC and Fresh Annointing Christian Fellowship Church in Clarksville, MS. He is a member and chapter officer of Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc. He's very active in our community in Memphis, Tennessee. He is married to Minister Antonia R. Thomas, who serves alongside him in the ministry. And even possibly more important than his congregation, Pastor Thomas has two children. One is Private First Class Reginald Cleveland, who has been serving this Chamber for the past 4 years as an officer with the Capitol Police. His daughter Joshlyn Thomas is a student at Craigmont Middle School in Memphis.

Generations are changed because of his passion for mentoring youth, empowering the saints and serving as a spiritual father for Pastors. Through the ministry of Pastor Thomas, people are discovering their destinies. His favorite Scripture is Psalms 37:4—"Delight thyself also in the Lord and he will give you the desires of your heart."

I appreciate Pastor Thomas serving the United States House of Representatives as our pastor this morning.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO DAYNA LYNN AHERN

HON. JON C. PORTER

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. PORTER. Madam Speaker, I rise to honor the life and memory of my friend Dayna Lynn Ahern, whose passion for life was an inspiration.

Dayna was a native of Las Vegas who was a student of fashion merchandising at the Fashion Institute in Las Vegas, Nevada. Prior to enrolling in the Fashion Institute, Dayna had earned an Associates Degree from the prestigious Le Cordon Blue College of Culinary Arts in Las Vegas.

Among Dayna's many passions was traveling and music. These dual talents provided her with a number of unique opportunities, such as performing for the Pope at the Vatican and traveling with her high school choir to perform at various locals in Europe. Dayna was also an active member of her Church, and had a strong sense of spirituality.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to honor the life and legacy of my friend Dayna. On March 30, 2006, Dayna passed away but her enthusiasm and passion for life will serve as an inspiration for all who knew her. She will be greatly missed, but her legacy as a caring and motivated individual will live on.

RECOGNIZING CHARLES CITY, IOWA POLICE DEPARTMENT INVESTIGATOR TODD SMITH AND MASON CITY POLICE OFFICER STEVE KLEMAS

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Charles City, Iowa Police Department Investigator Todd Smith and Mason City Police Officer Steve Klemas as recipients of The Sullivan Brothers' Award of Valor for saving another's life by risking their own.

The Sullivan Brothers' Award of Valor Program was established in 1977 to recognize peace officers and firefighters, who while serving in an official capacity, distinguished themselves by performing a heroic act while fully aware of a threat to his/her personal safety. The strict nomination process includes background investigations, and the final determination is made by the Governor of Iowa.

On June 18, 2007, Officer Klemas and Investigator Smith responded to a request by the Wright County sheriff to assist in an armed stand-off that occurred after the office attempted to serve a committal order on an individual. After failed negotiations, two rounds of tear gas, and a five-hour stand-off, Officer Klemas and Investigator Smith led a team of eight into the house. Investigator Smith served as the shield person, and was shot at three times as Officer Klemas fired on the individual to subdue him and take him into custody.

Investigator Smith and Officer Klemas' bravery goes above and beyond what we are asked of as citizens of this country. Their courage illustrates the compassion of Iowans; willing to risk their own lives for the safety of our fellow citizens. For this I offer them my utmost congratulations and thanks.

I commend Officer Steve Klemas and Investigator Todd Smith for their bravery. I am honored to represent them in Congress and I wish them the best in their future endeavors.

CONNOR KONZ ENDURES FIJI

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, I would like to recognize a young constituent of the Second Congressional District, Mr. Connor Konz, for his participation in the Discovery Kids Channel competition Endurance Fiji.

Connor is a 15-year-old sophomore at Atascocita High School in Humble, Texas. He was selected in June of this year as a participant after submitting a five-minute video describing himself and how he spends his free time.

The game consists of teams collecting 13 pyramid pieces which are essential inner qualities to complete the Pyramid of Endurance. They are Strength, Heart, Courage, Perseverance, Luck, Trust, Leadership, Discipline, Knowledge, Commitment, Teamwork, Ingenuity and Friendship. The first team to collect all 13 pieces wins the game. The teams earn pieces by winning physical and mental competitions.

Connor and his mother, Debbie Konz, were flown to Fiji on Aug. 12. After arriving, he was taken by boat from the airport to an island hotel and from there to another island for the competition.

By no means was this tropical island competition a Sunday picnic or vacation for Connor. He was without all of the daily teenage essentials such as no cell phone, MP3 player or digital camera the entire time he was on the island. He slept in a sleeping bag, in a bamboo hut with a thatched roof and no air conditioning. Connor said that the worst part of the experience was no electricity or indoor plumbing.

The teens also faced isolation by sleeping on a separate island away from their parents and didn't get to see them again until they were kicked off the show for losing a competition.

Connor had to use his physical and mental abilities to overcome the obstacles and challenges in the competition. It was an experience that pushed him farther than he thought he could go and resulted in lifelong friendships with the contestants.

Connor not only represented his family in the competition but Humble, Texas as well. I salute Connor Konz for enduring Fiji.

And that's just the way it is.

CONGRATULATING THE DENTON COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Denton County Transportation Authority (DCTA) of Lewisville, Texas. The DCTA was recently awarded a Federal Transit Administration Ridership Award.

The Federal Transit Administration Ridership Awards honor and acknowledge the industry's commitment to excellence. The recipients of the Ridership Award are transit systems that have substantially increased their ridership since 2003 through a variety of techniques and innovations. The DCTA is one of four agencies being recognized that service an area with a population between 200,000 and 1 million people.

The Denton County Transportation Authority is a synchronized county transit agency that provides a wide variety of local services to Denton and surrounding communities, as well as a commuter service to downtown Dallas. The DCTA has strong relationship with the community. In 2005, the DCTA took over the daily operational and management responsibility of the campus shuttle service for the University of North Texas. The DCTA and the

University worked together to provide free fares for students, and ridership on the shuttles increased by 15 percent between fall 2005 and fall 2006. The program was expanded in 2006 to allow free access onto the DCTA Commuter Express service and to expand the service on campus by two stops. The number of students, faculty, and staff that rode transit increased substantially in 2006 and, by the end of the year, 35–40% of passengers on the Commuter Express were associated with the University.

I extend my sincerest congratulations to the Denton County Transportation Authority. Their commitment to improving the public transportation system is to be commended and I hope other transit agencies will follow in their successful, innovative footsteps.

SUPPORTING OUR NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY WITH THE TOOLS THEY NEED

HON. CHARLES W. BOUSTANY, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, I rise to support the bipartisan Senate-passed update to the Foreign Intelligence and Surveillance Act, a chief component of national intelligence.

Three weeks have passed since our national security community lost the ability to track valuable intelligence without going through slow and burdensome bureaucratic hurdles. That's more than 3 weeks of terrorist communications that cannot be recovered. Yet, the Democratic House leadership under Speaker NANCY PELOSI refuses to debate a bipartisan Senate bill, which would give intelligence officials expanded authority to track terrorists outside of the United States. Since August last year, a temporary set of new laws authorized this program, but it expired on February 15, 2008.

Violent extremists operating around the world have one aim—kill Americans. I am committed to providing responsible and appropriate tools to our intelligence community to protect and defend Americans at home and abroad. It is not a coincidence that the U.S. has not been attacked at home since September 11, 2001. American intelligence officers protected us, and Congress must provide the tools and techniques they need to meet the long-term challenges that remain. Those standing on the frontlines battling these terrorists must have the ability to quickly intercept foreign communications to stop terrorists.

The Democratic leadership in the House has said, "there is no urgency" on updating our Nation's intelligence laws. I vehemently disagree, allowing this law to expire is completely irresponsible. I will continue to stand up for our men and women who defend us against future terrorist attacks.

I urge my colleagues to adopt the Senate-passed bill to expedite this necessary and timely update to the FISA law. Another day should not pass without our passing this bill.

HONORING THE MIAMI MEDICAL TEAM FOUNDATION

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize a wonderful organization in my home State and district in Florida, the Miami Medical Team Foundation, M.M.T.F. The M.M.T.F. is celebrating their 25th year as a local organization with worldwide significance and deserves more than a moment of recognition for their service.

The Miami Medical Team Foundation is a group of wonderful people that have formed a nonprofit, humanitarian, self-supported organization whose goals are the improvement of the sanitary and medical conditions in Third World countries.

The M.M.T.F. is composed at its core by medical doctors of all specialties, but as well, nurses, physical therapists, medical technicians, and Pharmacists. Founded in the early 1980s when refugees began piling in the borders between Nicaragua and Honduras, the group has since been involved in many different scenarios of tragedy in five continents of our planet, providing assistance to a total of 19 countries and makes available medical and surgical teams and the shipping of donated medicine and medical equipment. Members of the M.M.T.F. have always covered the costs of each and every humanitarian operation they embark on.

With the strong leadership of their president, Dr. Manuel A. Alzugaray, they have seen their efforts put to amazing use. Manuel is a dedicated individual with a professionalism that can not be easily matched. I know that it will he with his guidance that the M.M.T.F. will continue to play a vital role in making sure the world's most disadvantaged populations receive the timely care that they so desperately deserve.

Again, I praise the Miami Medical Team Foundation for all their successful initiatives across the globe and moreover, I commend them for their willingness to operate as a financially independent organization that could not exist without its members' dedication to the noble principles that they hold so dear. For all that the Miami Medical Team Foundation has done in support of their global humanitarian mission, and will certainly continue to do, I thank them so very much.

EXCERPT FROM THE WORLD OF WATCHERS

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, the attached article is submitted at the request of the American Center of Polish Culture.

[Excerpts from The World of the Watchers by Edward Pinkowski]

INTRODUCTION

Almost a century after it was created, the equestrian statue of General Casimir Pulaski in Washington, D.C., has overshadowed discussion of many subjects, For example, very few are familiar with the Polish roots of Frank C. Watcher, who was elected in Baltimore, Maryland, as a Republican to the 56th Congress in 1898 and was reelected three successive times. None of the other congressmen then had a drop of Polish blood.

When Abraham L. Brick, who came from South Bend, Indiana, to Washington at the same time as Watcher, introduced a bill for the erection of the monument to Pulaski, Watcher saw that it had little support. He realized that if he didn't speak out, none of his colleagues would pay attention to the bill to honor the Polish hero of the American Revolution. He was known as an efficacious man, with a cheerful smile, who easily won others to his side. "On the last day of the session the Speaker of the House brought it up for consideration," he told a reporter of the Baltimore Sun in 1902. "The bill passed."

It took years after that for the federal government to set up a commission, find a site for the Pulaski monument in the nation's capital, and work out the rest of the details. The sculptor was Kazimierz Chodzinski, who had studied under the famous Matejko in Krakow, Poland, and was the one who carved the Kosciuszko statue before in Chicago. When his equestrian statue of Pulaski was unveiled in 1910, critics said it was the best they ever saw.

CITY OF BALTIMORE

Frank Charles Watcher was born September 16, 1861, in South Baltimore, where the Baltimore and Ohio company built the largest railroad station in the world in 1852 and the stockyards butchered more hogs than any other city on the Atlantic coast. Built on the Patapsco River not far from the Watcher home, Fort McHenry, which Francis Scott Key immortalized in the Star Spangled Banner, was used in the 1860s to hold thousands of Confederate prisoners of war.

When he was growing up, Frank Watcher dreamed of being a tailor like his father. Upon graduation from St. Paul's German English School, however, he got a job as a clerk for $1.50 a week in a clothing store. In time, because of his energy, determination, and brains, he managed a business.

POLITICAL CAREER

The first important campaign of his life came in 1898 when he received the Republican nomination for Congress. Nobody expected him to win. One of the issues in his favor was immigration. The Democratic Party, largely in Irish hands, was against new immigration because the immigrants who came mostly from Poland and Italy were taking the places of Irish workers in mines and factories and working for less money. In the coming election, the Polish citizens of Baltimore, most of whom previously supported Democrats, voted in large part for Watcher. He was elected to the Fifty-sixth Congress by a majority of 122 votes.

Watcher ran again two years later and won by more than 2,071 votes. After three terms in Washington, he ran for mayor of Baltimore. He won in the primaries and lost in the general election by less than 500 votes.

His family was at his bedside when he died on July 1, 1910. His body was followed to Loudon Park Cemetery by a long cortege of political and business associates. The honorary pall bearers included Speaker of the House Joseph G. Cannon.

RECOGNIZING CHARLES CITY, IOWA, CITIZENS POLICE ACADEMY

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the Charles City Police Department and the graduates of the first ever Charles City, Iowa, Citizens Police Academy.

On November 13, 2007, seventeen residents of Charles City graduated from the first Charles City Citizens Police Academy, a ten week program facilitated by the Charles City Police Department and North Iowa Area Community College. The Charles City police officers took time to study specific aspects of police work and polished their presentation skills before instructing the classes. The Academy participants learned about the rigorous education and training police officers go through to do their jobs effectively. They also gained knowledge in various topics including; handling stressful situations, law enforcement operations, jurisdiction, the use of force and liability, terrorism training, and self-defense techniques.

This inaugural program has helped citizens better understand all that police do to protect and serve communities and has brought the police and citizens of Charles City closer together. The Academy is a characteristic of what Iowa is all about—regular citizens motivated to protect and cooperate with one another for the betterment of their communities.

I know that my colleagues in the United States Congress join me in commending and congratulating the Charles City Citizens Police Academy and Charles City Police Chief, Mike Wendel. I consider it an honor to represent each member of the Academy and the Charles City Police Department in the U.S. Congress, and I wish them all the best as they work together to make Charles City a safer place.

RECOGNIZING BUD SCHRIER, THE 2008 CARLISLE, IOWA, CITIZEN OF THE YEAR.

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Bud Schrier for his longtime service to the community of Carlisle, Iowa, and being named 2008 Carlisle Citizen of the Year.

Bud was born in 1930 and grew up on a farm west of Carlisle. After graduating high school, he entered the army and fought in the Korean War. He then came back to Carlisle to marry his wife, Betty, and began a 35 year career as an automotive parts salesman for NAPA. Since 1954, Bud has been an active member of the American Legion, promoting patriotism in his community. He also has dedicated a significant amount of time to volunteering for the needy. Since 1977, Bud has also been involved with the Boy Scouts of America in Carlisle as a Scoutmaster.

Around town, Bud is known for having a deep respect for the American flag. He ensures the respectful and proper display of each flag in town and kindly reminds townspeople when their flags need to be replaced. Bud's profound reverence for our country certainly sets a wonderful example for all of us.

Bud's dedication to his community and his commitment to volunteer service should be commended. I consider it an honor to represent Bud Schrier in the U.S. Congress, and I wish him the very best in his future endeavors.

CONGRATULATING THE FORT WORTH TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Fort Worth Transportation Authority of Fort Worth, Texas on being recognized by the Federal Transit Administration with the 2008 Ridership Award.

The Federal Transit Administration Ridership Awards honor transit systems that have substantially increased their ridership over the past five years through a variety of methods and improvements. The awards acknowledge the industry's commitment to excellence. The Fort Worth Transportation Authority is one of four agencies recognized that service an area with a population between 200,000 and 1 million people.

The Fort Worth Transportation Authority's bus system, known as ''The T,'' has experienced a significant increase in ridership since the agency executed an advertising campaign aimed at automobile commuters. The effective campaign's goal used fuel prices to show commuters the cost of driving to work by car compared to the cost of using The T system. Additionally, the Fort Worth Transportation Authority partnered with the Fort Worth Independent School District (FWISD) and Texas Christian University (TCU) to promote public transportation use among students of all ages. Fort Worth school teachers were provided with free day passes for field trips, and all TCU faculty, staff and students, as well as FWISD ninth graders, were given a free annual transit pass. The actions taken by the Fort Worth Transportation Authority improved student ridership and established the convenience of public transportation with the future labor force.

Madam Speaker, it is with great honor that I stand here today to recognize the Fort Worth Transportation Authority for receiving this honor. Their diligence and commitment to promoting public transit benefits both the community and the environment, and I sincerely hope other agencies follow their example.

A COALITION TO BUY STARRETT CITY

HON. YVETTE D. CLARKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Ms. CLARK. Madam Speaker, I am deeply honored to rise today to support the efforts of a coalition of labor, faith-based, and other community groups to buy Brooklyn's Starrett City. This coalition, consisting of the Christian Cultural Center, the Central Labor Council, and the Metropolitan Council on Jewish Poverty intends to keep the community's interest in mind by making certain that the diverse apartment complex remains affordable for renters.

Since 1974, Starrett City has provided affordable housing to more than 90 percent of the tenants through Government assistance including Federal subsidies. In fact, Starrett City is currently the largest federally subsidized rental complex in the United States.

However, in November 2006, Starrett City residents began to fear the worst as talks began about the possible sale of the 153 acre property. Many believed that the new owners would increase their rent so much that they would no longer be able to live there, and as a result, forcing them to move and possibly making them become homeless. This has been a great concern to many of my New York colleagues such as Congressman ED TOWNS and Congressman ANTHONY WEINER and last year, Representative MAXINE WATERS held a field hearing in Starrett City to examine how Congress can preserve this great treasure for many low and middle income families.

That is why Madam Speaker, it brings me great pleasure to hear that a partnership, spearheaded by the Christian Cultural Center's founder, A.R. Bernard, plans to make a bid to ensure that Starrett City would remain affordable for tenants who cannot pay the skyrocketing rental rates throughout New York City. As he stated, ''the coalition's goal is protecting affordability and raising the quality of life for Starrett as a community.''

In conclusion, I want to extend my sincerest gratitude and support to this coalition as well as commend them for their efforts to save one of ''Brooklyn's last affordable housing frontiers.''

NATIONAL LINK AWARENESS MONTH

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to bring awareness to the link between animal cruelty and other forms of societal violence by designating the month of September 2008 as National Link Awareness Month.

This resolution would highlight the need for more attention and resources to be focused on how violence toward animals is indicative of other violent tendencies. By investigating the link further, information could be gathered that will help mitigate societal violence.

Psychological, sociological, and criminological studies have shown that violent offenders frequently had a history of abusing animals during their childhood and adolescence. The FBI has recognized the connection since the 1970s, when its analysis of the lives of serial killers suggested that most had killed or tortured animals as children. Research has also shown patterns of animal cruelty among perpetrators of child abuse, spousal abuse, and elder abuse. In fact, the American Psychiatric Association considers animal cruelty

one of the diagnostic criteria of conduct disorder.

The link between animal abuse and domestic violence is a recognized fact. Each year, defenseless pets face the sad and disturbing reality that they will be victims of cruelty and abuse. Domestic abusers commonly torture or kill family pets as a method of exerting control and ensuring submission. This causes victims, children and adults alike, to remain in violent households in order to ensure their beloved pets are not harmed further.

Research indicates that children who are exposed to domestic violence are nearly three times more likely to mistreat animals than children who are not exposed to such violence. Tragically, this behavior is often symptomatic of future abuse toward other animals or human beings. Significant research documents a relationship between childhood histories of animal cruelty and patterns of chronic interpersonal aggression.

Due to the correlation between animal abuse and other forms of family and community violence, animal abuse must be taken very seriously. Human services, animal services, and law enforcement agencies must share resources and expertise to address animal and human related violence in communities. By effectively and comprehensively addressing the link between violence towards animals and other forms of societal violence, we can learn information that will help stop violence in the home as well as the community at large.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the designation of September 2008 as National Link Awareness Month so that more awareness will be brought to the link between animal cruelty and other forms of violence in society.

RECOGNIZING LINCOLN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL IN CLEAR LAKE, IOWA

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the 115 second grade students at Lincoln Elementary School in Clear Lake, Iowa, for their efforts in making the holidays brighter for our U.S. troops overseas.

The second grade class participated in a project called ''Operation Stockings for Soldiers.'' The children donated their own time and money to fill stockings with video games, DVD's, razors, stationary and a variety of other items. Each student also wrote inspiring letters, thanking the soldiers for protecting America and wishing them happy holidays. Some of the students' families donated money for the postage on the stockings.

This collective effort at Lincoln Elementary School is a characteristic of what Iowa is all about—citizens motivated and dedicated to improving the lives of others. I commend all the students, their families and especially their teacher, Kim Williamson, who organized this heartwarming effort to help our Iowa soldiers overseas. The effort of Kim and her students has reinforced the importance and joy of giving to others. I consider it an honor to represent each of the second graders, teachers and parents of the Lincoln Elementary School community involved in the ''Operations Stockings for Soldiers'' project in the U.S. Congress, and commend them for their great act of compassion. And I know my colleagues join me in thanking them for their wonderful work.

GENERATIONS INVIGORATING VOLUNTEERISM AND EDUCATION ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 11, 2008

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the GIVE Act and congratulate Speaker PELOSI and Chairman MILLER in bringing this important reauthorization to the floor.

National service builds character and communities. Volunteers in our communities help children succeed in schools, assist in providing social services, green our communities and rebuild after disasters. And the volunteers gain valuable experience and the satisfaction of having made a real difference.

H.R. 5563 strengthens national service opportunities by recruiting 25,000 more volunteers through a new Office of Outreach and Recruitment. This office will promote the recruitment of babyboomers and veterans. The bill also provides a new focus on youth opportunities. Too many youth in our communities are without positive activities during the summer. H.R. 5563 offers summer service opportunities, including a $500 educational award for college expenses.

Volunteerism is also an important part of emergency preparedness efforts. This bill encourages more collaboration with national, state, and local units of government and creates a ''Reserve Corps'' of Americorps alumni for times of national need.

With the many challenges facing the United States—both at home and abroad—it is more important than ever that we provide incentives and opportunities for Americans to give back. We saw the best of ourselves in the outpouring of volunteers after 9/11, Hurricane Katrina, and the bridge collapse in Minneapolis. Reauthorization of the Corporation of National Service will provide that kind of help for families and communities on an ongoing basis in a very cost-effective way.

This is a bipartisan, widely supported bill. I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

ALTERNATIVE PUBLIC SPENDING: EFFECTS ON JOB CREATION

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, last week's report of the February jobs figures—a net loss of 63,000 jobs—is yet another sign that we need to act to spur employment. We need to stimulate the economy and to create the good jobs that will help working families across the country achieve the American dream.

I would like to bring my colleagues' attention to a recent study that gives us new information on how to achieve that goal. The study, completed by economists at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst, evaluates the economic relationship between public spending and job creation. The study, ''The U.S. Employment Effect of Military and Domestic Spending Priorities,'' concludes that public dollars invested in health care, education, mass transit or construction for home weatherization and infrastructure create more jobs than investing an equivalent amount in either military or personal consumption through tax cuts.

The study evaluates the relative effects on job creation of investing an equivalent amount of federal dollars in three scenarios: (1) private consumption through tax cuts, (2) the military, and (3) domestic investments. This important study finds each billion dollars of federal funding would create: 10,799 jobs if spent on tax cuts designed to spur personal consumption; 8,555 jobs if allocated for military spending; 12,883 jobs if invested in health care; 17,687 jobs if invested in education; 19,795 jobs if invested in mass transit; 12,804 jobs if invested in home weatherization and infrastructure.

The bottom line is that public dollars invested in health care, education, mass transit, or construction for home weatherization and infrastructure create more jobs than investing an equivalent amount in either the military or personal consumption.

I hope that my colleagues will review this study, and I would like to thank the Women's Action for New Directions (WAND), the Institute for Policy Studies, and the Political Economy Research Institute at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst for their work in this area.

INTRODUCTION OF TRANSITIONAL HEALTH CARE FOR THE SELECTED RESERVES

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today, along with Representatives STEVE BUYER, GENE TAYLOR, JEFF MILLER and 41 additional members, to introduce legislation to provide transitional health care for the Selected Reserves.

When an active duty soldier is involuntarily separated from the Army, he or she is afforded 180 days of transitional health care at no cost. Unfortunately, those soldiers who have served honorably and simply leave active duty at the end of their contractual agreement with one of the military services are not afforded transitional health care.

The brave men and women who join the ranks of our proud military deserve every consideration upon their release from active duty. This legislation provides an important measure to the servicemembers and their families as they move to civilian life. It seeks to keep the skilled military members in the Guard and Reserves.

Without our dedicated Guard and Reserves forces, it is impossible to keep the threat of terrorism at bay and sustain the Global War on Terrorism. Retaining these highly skilled men and women is paramount in maintaining

our Nation's security. Skills learned while serving on active duty and carried to the Guard and Reserves will provide for future national and world threats. This small incentive allows departing service members a period of adjustment without worrying about a sudden illness or a health emergency.

It is interesting to note that since September 11, 2001, we have had over 600,000 members of the Guard and Reserves called to active duty. Without the Selected Ready Reserves, our ability to defend against enemies foreign and domestic would be greatly reduced. The strength of our Guard and Reserves has always been those former active duty servicemembers who join their ranks.

Those servicemembers also represent a trained pool of military talent available to serve our Guard and Reserves in a different capacity . . . a citizen patriot. Congress should act quickly to help support our Guard and Reserves by passing this bill. I am proud to sponsor this bill along with the many co-sponsors and encourage you to support this important measure.

RECOGNIZING AMES, IOWA POLICE OFFICER CLINT HERTZ AND LT. JEFF BRINKLEY

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ames, Iowa Police Officer Clint Hertz and Lt. Jeff Brinkley as recipients of The Sullivan Brothers' Award of Valor for saving another's life by risking their own.

The Sullivan Brothers' Award of Valor Program was established in 1977 to recognize peace officers and firefighters, who while serving in an official capacity, distinguished themselves by performing a heroic act while fully aware of a threat to his/her personal safety. The strict nomination process includes background investigations, and the final determination is made by the Governor of Iowa.

On December 27, 2007, Lt. Brinkley and Officer Hertz responded to a 911 call of a car on fire in the North Grand Mall parking lot. When Lt. Brinkley arrived, he realized the inside of the car was full of black smoke and the back half of the car was in flames. He quickly ran to the car and broke the passenger window, but because of the thickness of the smoke, he was unable to see if there were any passengers inside the car. Officer Hertz then arrived and also ran to the car to check for passengers and found a man trapped inside the car. Officer Hertz then opened the passenger-side door and Lt. Brinkley helped him pull the man to safety. Moments later the car was completely engulfed in flames.

Lt. Brinkley's and Officer Hertz's bravery goes above and beyond what we are asked of as citizens of this country. Their courage illustrates the compassion of Iowans; willing to risk their own lives for the safety of their fellow citizens. For this I offer them my utmost congratulations and thanks.

I commend Lt. Jeff Brinkley and Officer Clint Hertz for their heroism. I am honored to represent them in Congress and I wish them the best in their future service with the Ames Police Department.

INTRODUCTION OF THE PHYSICAL ACTIVITY GUIDELINES FOR AMERICANS ACT OF 2008

HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker, today, along with my colleague and co-chair of the Congressional Fitness Caucus, Representative ZACH WAMP, I am introducing the "Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans Act of 2008." If enacted, this bill will make important improvements in the way that we measure and promote health and fitness in our communities.

Health care has become one of the most prominent issues of our time, and coming up with solutions to curb rising costs and address the growing numbers of uninsured Americans will take a great deal of hard work and debate. Whatever our disagreements about the best ways to fix these problems, there are simple principles upon which we can all agree. This bill focuses on one of those simple principles: that exercise makes Americans healthier.

Many of us are familiar with Dietary Guidelines for Americans, a report released every five years by the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Agriculture. These are recommendations that help guide the way that physicians and nutritionists talk to their patients and clients about their diets and how to think of healthy food as a way of life. Similarly, HHS also releases a report entitled Physical Activity Guidelines, which summarizes current knowledge about the relationship between exercise and fitness.

I would argue that these publications are of equal importance, as diet and exercise are the pillars of a healthy lifestyle. There is one difference, though, that I believe by fixing we can further promote healthy living for Americans. The difference is this: where Dietary Guidelines is mandated to be updated every five years. Physical Activity Guidelines has no such requirement. Fixing this difference will ensure that Americans have the most up- to-date information about the role and importance of exercise in their lives, just as they do now for their diets.

This bill seeks to accomplish that fix. It would equalize the way that the federal government dispenses information about diet and exercise, and it would benefit ordinary people by giving them relevant information about how to become healthier. As I said. curing all of our health care ills will require a great deal of work. thought. and debate, but I believe that we can get off to a good start simply by helping Americans exercise more and, by staying healthy, go to the doctor a little less. Madam Speaker. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this simple measure to help achieve that simple goal.

RECOGNIZING DEBBIE BRACKIN SMITH AS FLORIDA'S SCHOOL-RELATED EMPLOYEE OF THE YEAR

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, it is an honor for me to rise today in recognition of Debbie Smith, Florida's School-Related Employee of the Year.

As the Physical Education Assistant at Shalimar Elementary School, Ms. Smith works with hundreds of children everyday. Expanding upon the opportunities provided by her position, she has constructed several new physical education programs that heighten student exercise. The "Miler Club," a new program in which students earn "toe tokens" for every five miles that they run, promotes athleticism and encourages students towards physical activity. Ms. Smith is also instrumental in the school's Field Day, a day devoted to outdoor activity.

In addition to teaching physical education, Ms. Smith also assists in the classroom. Utilizing small group instruction, she works with students requiring extra attention in reading and math.

Ms. Smith's instruction has unbounded influence. Her dedication and devotion have led countless students to a greater understanding of physical education and fitness. Ms. Smith's outstanding accomplishments have distinguished her as one of the great educators in Northwest Florida, and the Okaloosa County School District is honored to have her as one of their own.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am proud to recognize Debbie Smith on her exemplary service in Northwest Florida.

MARCH: CRIMINAL JUSTICE MONTH

HON. DAVID G. REICHERT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. REICHERT. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 945, a resolution that establishes March 2008 as "National Criminal Justice Month."

Prior to joining this body, I worked for 33 years as a member of the King County Sheriff's Office, eventually becoming the elected Sheriff of King County in 1997. I could not agree more with the sentiments of this Resolution and want to personally thank each one of the approximately three million Americans working within our nation's criminal justice system today.

I know a job in the criminal justice system, no matter what it is, can often be thankless and tiring. The pressures of family, life and service can be overwhelming. I also know the physical and mental toughness that is required to perform these duties. However, the excitement of a job well done and the respect given to these heroic men and women outweigh the sometimes unpleasant challenges they face.

Those who serve in our criminal justice system today are tasked not only with protecting our communities and neighborhoods but also with protecting our homeland and serving on the front lines of our war against terrorism. Within this framework, the job these brave public servants are doing is truly remarkable. Although sometimes it is hard to feel and see, the gratitude of the American people and this body for our dedicated public servants will not waver.

I ask—as the Resolution does—that we all look seriously at how we as individuals can prevent and respond to crime to help the public servants we too often take for granted.

RECOGNIZING PIERCE BROS. REPAIR OF INDIANOLA, IOWA

HON. TOM LATHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 13, 2008

Mr. LATHAM. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the repair and welding shop, Pierce Bros. Repair of Indianola, Iowa, on celebrating their 50th Anniversary and to express my appreciation for their commitment to providing important services to Iowans in the area.

In 1958, brothers Lee and Gene Pierce opened an old-style blacksmith shop, primarily repairing farm equipment. Current owner Kurt Wells now has a five-man crew doing various jobs in the area, including repairing lawn mowers, grills, trailer hitches, and other projects. Kurt joined the company in 1960 at age ten and bought the shop in 1972.

Pierce Bros. Repair's success has come by sticking to their original niche and only upgrading the necessary modern modifications. Although the shop has expanded twice since 1958, there are no computer-run tools, and the shop is still heated today by a wood burning stove. Kurt's managing secret is to work with his employees, not boss them. It is a secret that has generated 130 years of experience at the shop between the five current employees.

For 50 years, Pierce Bros. Repair of Indianola has benefited Iowans by providing important, reliable, customer-oriented service, and for this I offer them my utmost congratulations and thanks. It is an honor to represent Kurt Wells and all members of the Pierce Bros. crew in Congress, and I wish them continued success in serving the Indianola community.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 70, Budget Resolution.

Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 316, Adjournment Resolution.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2033–S2197

Measures Introduced: Thirty-three bills and eleven resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2754–2786, S.J. Res. 30, S. Res. 481–489, and S. Con. Res. 71. **Pages S2132–34**

Measures Reported:

S. 694, to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue regulations to reduce the incidence of child injury and death occurring inside or outside of light motor vehicles, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 110–275)

S. 1580, to reauthorize the Coral Reef Conservation Act of 2000, with amendments. (S. Rept. No. 110–276)

S. 352, to provide for media coverage of Federal court proceedings, with amendments. **Page S2130**

Measures Passed:

Budget Resolution: By 51 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. 85), Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 70, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2008 and 2010 through 2013, after taking action on the following amendments proposed there to:

Pages S2036–67, S2069–S2119

Adopted:

By 99 yeas to 1 nay (Vote No. 42), Baucus Amendment No. 4160, to provide tax relief to middle-class families and small businesses, property tax relief to homeowners, relief to those whose homes were damaged or destroyed by Hurricanes Katrina and Rita, and tax relief to America's troops and veterans. **Pages S2036, S2040–41**

Bingaman Amendment No. 4173, to provide additional funding resources in fiscal year 2009 for investments in innovation and education in order to improve the competitiveness of the United States.

Pages S2037 S2042

By 53 yeas to 46 nays (Vote No. 44), Conrad Amendment No. 4190, to add a deficit-neutral reserve fund for repealing the 1993 rate increase for the alternative minimum tax for individuals.

Pages S2037, S2042

By 51 yeas to 50 nays, Vice President voting yea (Vote No. 47), Senate agreed to the motion to reconsider Gregg (for Specter/Craig) Amendment No. 4189 (listed above). **Pages S2037, S2043**

By 53 yeas to 46 nays (Vote No. 51), Conrad Amendment No. 4204, to add a deficit-neutral reserve fund for repealing the 1993 increase in the income tax on Social Security benefits.

Pages S2037, S2045–46

By 95 yeas to 4 nays (Vote No. 53), Gregg (for Specter) Amendment No. 4203, to increase funding for the National Institutes of Health and the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

Pages S2037, S2046–47

By 69 yeas to 30 nays (Vote No. 54), Dorgan Amendment No. 4198, to increase the Indian Health Service by $1,000,000,000 in fiscal year 2009. **Pages S2037, S2047**

By 56 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. 55), Nelson (FL) Amendment No. 4329, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve energy efficiency and production. **Pages S2047–48**

Kennedy Amendment No. 4151, to add a deficit-neutral reserve fund for increasing federal student loan limits to protect students against disruptions in the private credit markets. **Pages S2037, S2049**

Murray (for Lincoln) Amendment No. 4194, to provide the Veterans Benefits Administration with additional resources to more effectively meet their increasing workload and to better address the unacceptably large claims backlog. **Pages S2037, S2049–50**

Sununu Amendment No. 4221, to save lives, promote overall health care efficiency, and lower the cost for the delivery of health care services by facilitating the deployment and use of electronic prescribing technologies by physicians.

Pages S2037, S2050

Kerry Amendment No. 4332, to promote the modernization of the health care system through the adoption of electronic prescribing technology.

Page S2050

By 95 yeas to 2 nays (Vote No. 57), Kennedy Amendment No. 4350, to increase funding for the Department of Education's English Literacy-Civics Education State Grant program, with an offset.

Pages S2050–51

By 54 yeas to 44 nays (Vote No. 58), Alexander Amendment No. 4222, to take $670,000 used by the EEOC in bringing actions against employers that require their employees to speak English, and instead use the money to teach English to adults through the Department of Education's English Literacy/Civics Education State Grant program.

Pages S2037, S2051

By 53 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. 59), Menendez Amendment No. 4259, to establish a reserve fund for immigration reform and enforcement.

Pages S2037, S2052

By 61 yeas to 37 nays (Vote No. 60), Sessions Amendment No. 4231, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund for border security, immigration enforcement, and criminal alien removal programs.

Pages S2037, S2052–53

Conrad (for Pryor) Amendment No. 4181, to add a deficit-neutral reserve fund for Science Parks.

Pages S2037, S2054

Nelson Modified Amendment No. 4212, to create additional jobs and make a lasting investment in our national infrastructure by increasing fiscal year 2008 infrastructure stimulus funding by designating $3.5 billion in existing stimulus funding in the resolution as discretionary funding. **Pages S2054–55**

Reed Modified Amendment No. 4154, to reduce the energy burden of low-income families, seniors, and individuals with disabilities by increasing funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP) by $1.6 billion in fiscal year 2009 **Page S2057**

Biden Modified Amendment No. 4164, to increase 2009 funding for the COPS program to $1.15 billion, with an offset. **Pages S2058**

Dole Amendment No. 4208, to increase amounts budgeted for States and local governments for expenses related to immigration enforcement training and support under section 287 (g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, with an offset.

Pages S2058–59

Dodd Amendment No. 4254, to increase funding for the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Health Resources and Services Administration for autism research, education, and early detection with an offset.

Page S2059

Brown/Stabenow Amendment No. 4155, to improve the training of manufacturing workers.

Page S2060

By 49 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. 67), Brownback Amendment No. 4284, to provide funds for a Commission on Budgetary Accountability and Review of Federal Agencies. **Pages S2060–61**

By 89 yeas to 7 nays (Vote No. 68), Kohl Amendment No. 4197, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund for a 3-year extension of the pilot program for national and State background checks on direct patient access employees of long-term care facilities or providers. **Pages S2061–62**

Reid Amendment No. 4373, to establish a reserve fund for studying the effect of cooperation with local law enforcement. **Page S2063**

Conrad (for Enzi) Amendment No. 4214, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to terminate certain deductions from mineral revenue payments made to States. **Page S2064**

Conrad (for Roberts) Amendment No. 4244, to ensure the viability of small businesses by helping them provide to their employees access to quality child care. **Page S2064**

Conrad (for Martinez) Amendment No. 4229, to provide a deficit-neutral reserve fund to provide for State disclosure, through a publicly accessible Internet site, of information relating to payments made under the State Medicaid program to hospitals, nursing facilities, outpatient surgery centers, intermediate care facilities for the mentally retarded, institutions for mental disease, or other institutional providers and the number of patients treated by such providers. **Pages S2064, S2064–65**

Conrad (for Thune) Amendment No. 4269, to provide for a total of $99,000,000 in COPS Hot Spots funding, as authorized in the Combat Meth Act. **Pages S2064, S2065**

Conrad (for Hatch) Amendment No. 4297, to provide for a reserve fund for legislation that funds the traumatic brain injury program.

Pages S2064, S2065

Conrad (for Coleman) Amendment No. 4264, to deny funding for the United Nations Durban II Anti-Racism Conference, which has been used as a platform to advance anti-Semitism and for this reason opposed by the United States and 45 other members of the United Nations General Assembly during a vote on December 22, 2007 and direct the savings to veterans. **Pages S2064, S2065**

Conrad (for Dole) Amendment No. 4349, to provide the Secretary of Agricultural with the necessary funding to effectively address the critical community facility infrastructure needs of our rural areas across the United States. **Pages S2064, S2065**

Conrad (for Barrasso) Amendment No. 4248, to provide for a deficit-neutral reserve fund that preserves and promotes Medicare payment polices that support rural health care providers.

Pages S2064, S2065

Conrad (for Grassley/McCaskill) Amendment No. 4261, to reduce waste in Department of Defense contracting. **Pages S2064, S2065**

Conrad (for Vitter) Amendment No. 4243, to fully fund authorized amounts to implement the Adam Walsh Act that will increase enforcement to catch and detain child predators, combat child pornography, and make the Internet safer for our children. **Pages S2064, S2065**

Conrad (for Burr) Amendment No. 4153, to develop biodefense medical countermeasures by fully funding the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority (BARDA) in a fiscally responsible manner. **Pages S2064, S2065**

Conrad (for Enzi/Barrasso) Amendment No. 4215, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve the animal health and disease program.

Pages S2064, S2065

Conrad (for Klobuchar) Amendment No. 4287, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund for implementation of the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program for members of the National Guard and Reserve.

Pages S2064, S2066

Conrad (for Kennedy) Amendment No. 4148, to increase by $71 million the resources available to the Food and Drug Administration in fiscal year 2009 for food and drug safety. **Pages S2064, S2066**

Conrad (for Biden) Amendment No. 4166, to increase fiscal year 2009 funding for Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) by $100 million, with an offset. **Pages S2064, S2066**

Conrad (for Feinstein) Amendment No. 4225, to provide for a total of $950,000,000 in outlays for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program in fiscal year 2009. **Pages S2064, S2066**

Conrad (for Dodd) Amendment No. 4253, to increase spending for the Maternal and Child Health Block Grant by $184,000,000 in fiscal year 2009, with offset. **Pages S2064, S2066**

Conrad (for Klobuchar) Amendment No. 4286, to provide in the deficit-neutral reserve fund for America's veterans and wounded servicemembers and for a post 9/11 GI bill for access of rural veterans to health care and other services. **Pages S2064, S2066**

Conrad (for Pryor/Kennedy) Amendment No. 4183, to add a deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve student achievement during secondary education, including middle school completion, high school graduation and preparing students for higher education and the workforce. **Pages S2064, S2066**

Conrad (for Lautenberg/Kerry) Amendment No. 4210, to include rail (including high-speed passenger rail), airport, and seaport projects in the eligibility requirements of the Deficit Neutral Reserve Fund for Investments in America's Infrastructure.

Pages S2064, S2066

Conrad (for Dorgan) Amendment No. 4199, to provide for the use of the deficit-neutral reserve fund for tax relief to reinstate and expand the charitable IRA rollover. **Pages S2064, S2066**

Conrad (for Dorgan) Amendment No. 4249, to increase the number of organ donations by funding the programs authorized by the Organ Donation and Recovery Improvement Act of 2004.

Pages S2064, S2066

Conrad (for Nelson (FL)) Amendment No. 4285, to make funds available to ensure that Survivor Benefit Plan annuities are not reduced by the amount of veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation received by military families. **Pages S2064, S2066**

Conrad (for Reid) Amendment No. 4162, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to provide for the acceleration of the phased-in eligibility of members of the Armed Forces for concurrent receipt of retired pay and veterans' disability compensation.

Pages S2064, S2067

Conrad (for Lieberman/Collins) Amendment No. 4211, to increase funding for operations and management of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, with an offset. **Pages S2064, S2066–67**

Conrad (for Carper/Coburn) Amendment No. 4176, to provide for a deficit-neutral reserve fund for the increased use of recovery audits.

Pages S2064, S2067

Conrad (for Casey) Amendment No. 4172, to include in the deficit-neutral reserve funds for America's veterans and wounded servicemembers and for a post 9/11 GI bill provision for the continuing payment to members of the Armed Forces who are retired or separated from the Armed Forces due to a combat-related injury after September 11, 2001, of bonuses that such members were entitled to before the retirement or separation and would continue to be entitled to were such members not retired or separated. **Pages S2064, S2067**

Conrad (for Stabenow/Voinovich) Amendment No. 4219, to provide for the use of the deficit-neutral reserve fund for tax relief to encourage struggling companies to invest in new equipment and stimulate the United States economy by allowing the use of accumulated alternative minimum tax and research and development credits in lieu of bonus depreciation. **Pages S2064, S2067**

Conrad (for Clinton/Warner) Amendment No. 4227, to increase funding for the Administration on Aging by the authorized level of $53,000,000 in fiscal year 2009 for the Lifespan Respite Care Act, which provides much-needed respite care to our Nation's dedicated family caregivers for the elderly and disabled. **Pages S2064, S2067**

Conrad (for Casey) Amendment No. 4352, to add a deficit-neutral reserve fund for the protection and safety of the Nation's food supply. **Pages S2064, S2067**

Conrad (for Smith/Clinton) Amendment No. 4364, to provide a deficit-neutral reserve fund to provide for a demonstration project regarding Medicaid coverage of low-income HIV-infected individuals. **Pages S2064, S2069**

Conrad (for Lincoln/Snowe) Amendment No. 4195, to provide for a deficit-neutral reserve fund for reducing the income threshold for the refundable child tax credit to $10,000 for taxable years 2009 and 2010 with no inflation adjustment to ensure that low-income working families receive the benefit of such credit. **Pages S2064, S2069**

By 90 yeas to 5 nays (Vote No. 70), Boxer Modified Amendment No. 4368, to increase funding for the Department of Justice for the vigorous enforcement of laws protecting children. **Pages S2069–70**

Conrad (for Brown) Amendment No. 4252, to increase Federal assistance to food banks. **Page S2078**

Conrad (for Chambliss) Amendment No. 4230, to increase fiscal year 2009 funding for the Byrne/Justice Assistance Grant program to $906,000,000, with an offset. **Page S2078**

Conrad (for Obama) Amendment No. 4330, to provide an additional $5 million to the military department's respective Boards for Correction of Military Records to expedite review of cases in which servicemembers with combat-related psychological injuries (such as PTSD) or closed head injuries (such as TBIs) were administered discharges for personality disorders or other discharges resulting in a loss of benefits or care and seek a correction of records or upgraded discharge. **Page S2078**

Conrad (for Thune) Modified Amendment No. 4268, to provide $20,000,000 in fiscal year 2009 to improve safety by increasing funds for tribal justice and law enforcement, with an offset. **Page S2078**

Conrad (for Bunning/Enzi) Amendment No. 4186, to provide a point of order against any budget resolution that fails to achieve an on-budget balance within 5 years. **Pages S2078, S2078–79**

Conrad (for Alexander) Amendment No. 4311, to improve education in the United States by providing $300,000,000 for the Teacher Incentive Fund to support State and local school district efforts to reward outstanding teaching and school leadership by improving compensation programs for teachers who have a demonstrated record of improving student academic achievement, teachers who teach in high need subjects such as mathematics and science, and teachers who teach in high need, low income schools. **Pages S2078, S2079**

Conrad (for Gregg) Amendment No. 4357, to create a point of order against using reconciliation to create new mandatory programs and to place a 20% limit on new direct spending in reconciliation legislation. **Pages S2078, S2079**

Conrad (for Clinton) Amendment No. 4361, to increase funding for the Department of Agriculture by $1,000,000 in fiscal year 2009 to provide public access to information about the sources of foods distributed through the school lunch program and other nutrition programs under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture. **Pages S2078, S2079**

Conrad (for Bingaman) Amendment No. 4370, to provide for a deficit-neutral reserve fund to make improvements to ensure access to the Medicare program for low-income senior citizens and other low-income Medicare beneficiaries. **Pages S2078, S2079**

Conrad (for Dorgan) Amendment No. 4200, to provide for the use of the deficit-neutral reserve fund to invest in clean energy and preserve the environment for the 5-year extension of energy tax incentives. **Pages S2078, S2079**

Conrad (for Smith/Lincoln) Amendment No. 4334, to increase the funding levels for programs carried out under the Older Americans Act of 1965

by $184,000,000 to keep pace with inflation and increasing numbers of older Americans, and comply with minimum wage requirements for the programs. **Pages S2078, S2079**

Conrad (for Snowe) Modified Amendment No. 4376, to provide the use of the deficit-neutral reserve fund for tax relief for cafeteria plans. **Pages S2078, S2079**

Conrad (for Allard) Amendment No. 4159, to ensure that the Secretary of Health and Human Services has continued authority to prevent fraud and protect the integrity of the Medicaid program and SCHIP and to reduce inappropriate spending under those programs. **Pages S2078, S2079**

Conrad (for Baucus) Amendment No. 4333, to express the sense of the Senate that Medicaid administrative regulations should not undermine Medicaid's role in our Nation's health care system, cap Federal Medicaid spending, or otherwise shift Medicaid cost burdens to State or local governments and their taxpayers and health providers, or undermine the Federal guarantee of health insurance coverage Medicaid provides. **Pages S2078, S2079–80**

Conrad (for Kohl) Amendment No. 4255, to increase fiscal year 2009 funding for Juvenile Justice Programs to $560 million, with an offset. **Pages S2078, S2080**

Conrad (for Hatch) Amendment No. 4283, to express the sense of the Senate that none of the funds recommended by this resolution, or appropriated or otherwise made available under any other Act, to the USPTO shall be diverted, redirected, transferred, or used for any other purpose than for which such funds were intended. **Pages S2078, S2080**

Conrad (for DeMint) Amendment No. 4345, to provide for a deficit-neutral reserve fund for education reform. **Pages S2079, S2080**

Conrad (for Cardin) Amendment No. 4220, to increase funding for water quality research programs at the United States Geological Survey, with an offset. **Pages S2078, S2080**

By 70 yeas to 27 nays (Vote No. 80), Boxer Amendment No. 4379, to facilitate coverage of pregnant women in SCHIP. **Pages S2082–83**

Conrad (for Leahy) Modified Amendment No. 4270, to add a deficit-neutral reserve fund for legislation that improves the participation of naturalized citizens in the United States political process, strengthens national security by improving and expediting FBI security name checks, and reduces the backlog of naturalization applications for individuals seeking to become naturalized citizens. **Page S2083**

Conrad (for Gregg) Amendment No. 4302, to provide for a reserve fund for legislation to provide access, coverage, and choice for every American to quality and affordable care. **Page S2083**

Conrad (for Clinton) Amendment No. 4300, to provide for a reserve fund for legislation to establish a program, including medical monitoring and treatment, addressing the adverse health impacts linked to the September 11, 2001 attacks. **Page S2083**

Conrad (for Baucus) Amendment No. 4331, to add a deficit-neutral reserve fund to ban abusive and inappropriate sales and marketing tactics used by private insurers offering Medicare Advantage and prescription drug plans. **Pages S2083, S2083–84**

Conrad (for Collins) Modified Amendment No. 4209, to provide for renewable energy and energy efficiency tax credits with offsets. **Pages S2083, S2084**

Conrad (for Specter/Casey) Amendment No. 4375, to express the sense of the Senate regarding Philadelphia Housing Authority's "Moving to Work Agreement" with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. **Pages S2083, S2084**

Conrad (for Bunning) Amendment No. 4307, to permanently extend the adoption tax credit and the exclusion for adoption assistance programs included in the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001. **Pages S2083, S2084**

Conrad (for Graham/DeMint) Amendment No. 4371, to express the sense of the Senate regarding a Balanced Budget Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. **Pages S2083, S2084**

By 73 yeas to 23 nays (Vote No. 83), Biden Amendment No. 4245, to restore full funding for the international affairs budget, in support of the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan, nuclear proliferation, foreign assistance, fighting global AIDS, promoting sustainable development, and other efforts, with an offset. **Page S2086**

By 73 yeas to 23 nays (Vote No. 84), Vitter Amendment No. 4299, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the need for comprehensive legislation to legalize the importation of prescription drugs from highly industrialized countries with safe pharmaceutical infrastructures. **Pages S2086–87**

Conrad (for Barrasso) Amendment No. 4206, to provide funding to enable certain individuals and entities to comply with the Endangered Species Act of 1973. **Page S2087**

Rejected:

By 47 yeas to 52 nays (Vote No. 43), Graham Modified Amendment No. 4170, to protect families, family farms and small businesses by extending the income tax rate structure, raising the death tax exemption to $5,000,000 and reducing the maximum death tax rate to no more than 35 percent; to keep education affordable by extending the college tuition deduction; and to protect senior citizens from higher

taxes on their retirement income, maintain U.S. financial market competitiveness, and promote economic growth by extending the lower tax rates on dividends and capital gains. **Pages S2036–37, S2041–42**

By 49 yeas to 50 nays (Vote No. 45), Gregg (for Specter/Craig) Amendment No. 4189, to repeal section 13203 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 by restoring the Alternative Minimum Tax rates that had been in effect prior thereto. **Pages S2037, S2042–43**

By 49 yeas to 51 nays (Vote No. 46), Senate failed to table the motion to reconsider the vote by which Gregg (for Specter/Craig) Amendment No. 4189 (listed above) was rejected by 49 yeas to 50 nays. **Page S2043**

By 49 yeas to 51 nays (Vote No. 48), Gregg (for Specter/Craig) Amendment No. 4189, to repeal section 13203 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 by restoring the Alternative Minimum Tax rates that had been in effect prior thereto, upon reconsideration. **Pages S2037, S2043**

By 38 yeas to 62 nays (Vote No. 49), Conrad (for Salazar) Modified Amendment No. 4196, to reform the estate tax to avoid subjecting thousands of families, family businesses, and family farms and ranches to the estate tax. **Pages S2037, S2044**

By 50 yeas to 50 nays (Vote No. 50), Kyl Amendment No. 4191, to protect small businesses, family ranches and farms from the Death Tax by providing a $5 million exemption, a low rate for smaller estates and a maximum rate no higher than 35 percent. **Pages S2037, S2044**

By 47 yeas to 53 nays (Vote No. 52), Bunning Modified Amendment No. 4192, to repeal the tax increase on Social Security benefits imposed by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993. **Pages S2037, S2046**

By 47 yeas to 51 nays (Vote No. 56), Alexander Modified Amendment No. 4207, to establish a deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve energy efficiency and production. **Pages S2037, S2048–49**

By a unanimous vote of 97 nays (Vote No. 62), Allard Amendment No. 4246, to raise taxes by an unprecedented $1.4 trillion for the purpose of fully funding 111 new or expanded federal spending programs. **Pages S2037, S2054**

By 42 yeas to 56 nays (Vote No. 63), Ensign Amendment No. 4240, to require wealthy Medicare beneficiaries to pay a greater share of their Medicare Part D premiums. **Page S2055**

By 43 yeas to 55 nays (Vote No 64), Sanders Amendment No. 4218, to put children ahead of millionaires and billionaires by restoring the pre-2001 top income tax rate for people earning over $1 million, and use this revenue to invest in LIHEAP, IDEA, Head Start, Child Care, nutrition, school construction, and deficit reduction. **Pages S2055–56**

By 40 yeas to 58 nays (Vote No. 65), DeMint Amendment No. 4328, to provide for a deficit-neutral reserve fund for Social Security reform. **Pages S2057–58**

By 29 yeas to 68 nays (Vote No. 66), DeMint (for Allard) Amendment No. 4232, to pay down the Federal debt and eliminate government waste by reducing spending 5 percent on programs rated (as mandated under the Government Performance and Results Act (Public Law 103–62)) ineffective by the Office of Management and Budget Program Assessment Rating Tool. **Pages S2059–60**

Vitter/Inhofe Amendment No. 4309, to create a reserve fund to ensure that Federal assistance does not go to sanctuary cities that ignore the immigration laws of the United States and create safe havens for illegal aliens and potential terrorists. (By 58 yeas to 40 nays (Vote No. 69), Senate tabled the amendment.) **Pages S2063–64**

By 49 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. 71), Ensign Amendment No. 4335, to increase funding for the Department of Justice for the vigorous enforcement of a prohibition against taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions consistent with the Child Custody Protection Act, which passed the Senate by a bipartisan vote of 65–34, with an offset. **Pages S2070–71**

By 49 yeas to 50 nays (Vote No. 74), Kyl Amendment No. 4348, to provide certainty to taxpayers by extending expiring tax provisions such as the R&D Tax Credit that helps U.S. companies innovate, the combat pay exclusion for our soldiers in the field, the education deduction to make colleges more affordable and the alternative energy incentives to make the environment cleaner through the end of 2009. **Pages S2072–73**

By 23 yeas to 77 nays (Vote No. 76), Landrieu Amendment No. 4378, to protect family businesses and farmers without increasing our nation's debt by providing for an estate tax that sets the exemption at $5 million and the rate at 35 percent, with the benefits of the exemption recaptured for estates over $100 million, paid for by closing tax loopholes that allow offshore deferral of compensation and transactions entered into solely for the purpose of avoiding taxation. **Pages S2075–76**

By 48 yeas to 50 nays (Vote No. 77), Kyl Amendment No. 4372, to protect small businesses, family ranches and farms from the Death Tax by providing a $5 million exemption, a low rate for smaller estates and a maximum rate no higher than 35%. **Pages S2076–77**

By 47 yeas to 51 nays (Vote No. 78), Grassley Modified Amendment No. 4276, to exempt from pay-as-you-go enforcement modifications to the individual alternative minimum tax (AMT) that prevent millions of additional taxpayers from having to pay the AMT. **Pages S2077–78**

By 41 yeas to 57 nays (Vote No. 79), DeMint Amendment No. 4380, to provide for a deficit-neutral reserve fund for transferring funding for Berkeley, CA earmarks to the Marine Corps. **Pages S2081–82**

By 46 yeas to 52 nays (Vote No. 81), Allard Amendment No. 4233, to require that legislation to reauthorize SCHIP include provisions codifying the unborn child regulation. **Pages S2083, S2084–85**

By 45 yeas to 51 nays (Vote No. 82), DeMint Amendment No. 4339, to provide for a deficit-neutral reserve fund for providing an above the line Federal income tax deduction for individuals purchasing health insurance outside the workplace. **Pages S2080–81, S2085**

Withdrawn:

Inhofe Amendment No. 4239, to express the sense of the Senate on funding for national defense in future fiscal years. **Page S2062**

During consideration of this measure today, the Senate also took the following action:

By 58 yeas to 40 nays (Vote No. 61), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to waive pursuant to section 904(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, with respect to Cornyn Amendment No. 4242, to protect the family budget by providing for a budget point of order against legislation that increases income taxes on taxpayers, including hard-working middle-income families, entrepreneurs, and college students. Subsequently, the point of order that the amendment was in violation of section 305 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, was sustained, and the amendment thus fell. **Pages S2037, S2053**

By 39 yeas to 59 nays (Vote No. 72), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to waive pursuant to section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, with respect to DeMint Amendment No. 4340, to create a point of order against bills that would raise gasoline prices. Subsequently, the Chair sustained the point of order that DeMint Amendment No. 4340 was not germane, and the amendment thus fell. **Page S2071**

By 27 yeas to 71 nays (Vote No. 73), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to waive pursuant to section 904(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, with respect to Cornyn Amendment No. 4313, to protect the family budget from runaway Government spending by increasing the number of Senators necessary to waive the PAYGO Point of Order from 60 to 100. Subsequently, the point of order that the amendment was in violation of section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, was sustained, and the amendment thus fell. **Pages S2071–72**

By 29 yeas to 71 nays (Vote No. 75), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to waive pursuant to section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, with respect to DeMint Amendment No. 4347, to establish an earmark moratorium for fiscal year 2009. Subsequently, the Chair sustained the point of order that DeMint Amendment No. 4347 was not germane, and the amendment thus fell. **Pages S2074–75**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that the enrolling clerk be authorized to make technical and conforming changes to the levels in Title 1 of S. Con. Res. 70 at the direction of the Committee on Budget majority staff, to reflect the effects of amendments agreed to by the Senate. **Page S2118**

Adjournment Resolution: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 316, providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate. **Page S2187**

Authorizing Use of the Rotunda: Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 71, authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for the presentation of the Congressional Gold Medal to Michael Ellis DeBakey, M.D. **Pages S2187–88**

Congratulating X PRIZE Foundation: Senate agreed to S. Res. 486, to congratulate the X PRIZE Foundation for their efforts to inspire a new generation of viable, super-efficient vehicles that could help break the addiction of the United States to oil and stem the effects of climate change through the Automotive X PRIZE competition. **Page S2188**

National Rehabilitation Counselors Appreciation Day: Senate agreed to S. Res. 487, designating March 22, 2008, as National Rehabilitation Counselors Appreciation Day. **Page S2188**

National Safe Place Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 488, designating the week beginning March 16, 2008, as "National Safe Place Week". **Pages S2188–89**

Public Radio Recognition Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 489, designating April 2008 as Public Radio Recognition Month. **Page S2189**

Death of former Senator Howard Metzenbaum: Senate agreed to S. Res. 485, relative to the death of Howard Metzenbaum, former United States Senator for the State of Ohio. **Pages S2189–90**

Measures Considered:

New Direction for Energy Independence, National Security, and Consumer Protection Act and the Renewable Energy and Energy Conservation Tax Act: Senate resumed consideration of the motion to proceed to consideration of H.R. 3221, moving the United States toward greater energy independence and security, developing innovative new technologies, reducing carbon emissions, creating green jobs, protecting consumers, increasing clean renewable energy production, and modernizing our energy infrastructure, and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the production of renewable energy and energy conservation. **Page S2119**

Authorizing Leadership to Make Appointments—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that, notwithstanding the upcoming recess or adjournment of the Senate, the President of the Senate, the President Pro Tempore, and the Majority and Minority Leaders be authorized to make appointments to commissions, committees, boards, conferences, or interparliamentary conferences authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate. **Page S2190**

Authority for Committees–Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that, notwithstanding the recess of the Senate, committees be authorized to file legislative and executive matters on Thursday, March 27, 2008, from 10:00 a.m. until 12:00 noon. **Page S2194**

Removal of Injunction of Secrecy: The injunction of secrecy was removed from the following treaty:

Protocol Amending 1980 Tax Convention with Canada (Treaty Doc. No. 110–15).

The treaty was transmitted to the Senate today, considered as having been read for the first time, and referred, with accompanying papers, to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed. **Page S2187**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

Michael F. Duffy, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term of six years expiring August 30, 2012.

Kristine L. Svinicki, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the term of five years expiring June 30, 2012.

John E. Osborn, of Delaware, to be a Member of the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy for a term expiring July 1, 2009.

Ondray T. Harris, of Virginia, to be Director, Community Relations Service, for a term of four years.

David W. Hagy, of Texas, to be Director of the National Institute of Justice.

John S. Bresland, of New Jersey, to be a Member of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board for a term of five years.

John S. Bresland, of New Jersey, to be Chairperson of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board for a term of five years.

Thomas C. Gilliland, of Georgia, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the remainder of the term expiring May 18, 2011.

James Francis Moriarty, of Massachusetts, to be Ambassador to the People's Republic of Bangladesh.

Javaid Anwar, of Nevada, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Harry S Truman Scholarship Foundation for a term expiring December 10, 2007.

Javaid Anwar, of Nevada, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Harry S Truman Scholarship Foundation for a term expiring December 10, 2013.

William J. Hybl, of Colorado, to be a Member of the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy for a term expiring July 1, 2009.

Elizabeth F. Bagley, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy for a term expiring July 1, 2008.

Thomas C. Carper, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Reform Board (Amtrak) for a term of five years.

Nancy A. Naples, of New York, to be a Member of the Reform Board (Amtrak) for a term of five years.

Ana M. Guevara, of Florida, to be United States Alternate Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of two years.

Goli Ameri, of Oregon, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Educational and Cultural Affairs).

William Joseph Hawe, of Washington, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Washington for the term of four years.

Larry Woodrow Walther, of Arkansas, to be Director of the Trade and Development Agency.

Neil Romano, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Gregory B. Jaczko, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the term of five years expiring June 30, 2013.

John J. Sullivan, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of Commerce.

Douglas H. Shulman, of the District of Columbia, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue for the term prescribed by law.

Robert F. Cohen, Jr., of West Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission for a term of six years expiring August 30, 2012.

David J. Kramer, of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor.

Jamsheed K. Choksy, of Indiana, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2014.

Dawn Ho Delbanco, of New York, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2014.

Gary D. Glenn, of Illinois, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2014.

David Hertz, of Indiana, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2014.

Marvin Bailey Scott, of Indiana, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for the remainder of the term expiring January 26, 2010.

Carol M. Swain, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2014.

Jeffrey J. Grieco, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

Joxel Garcia, of Connecticut, to be Medical Director in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations, and to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services.

Jan Cellucci, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the National Museum and Library Services Board for a term expiring December 6, 2012.

William J. Hagenah, of Illinois, to be a Member of the National Museum and Library Services Board for a term expiring December 6, 2012.

Mark Y. Herring, of South Carolina, to be a Member of the National Museum and Library Services Board for a term expiring December 6, 2012.

Julia W. Bland, of Louisiana, to be a Member of the National Museum and Library Services Board for a term expiring December 6, 2012.

Sally Epstein Shaywitz, of Connecticut, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Board for Education Sciences for a term expiring November 28, 2011.

Frank Philip Handy, of Florida, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Board for Education Sciences for a term expiring November 28, 2011.

Jonathan Baron, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Board for Education Sciences for a term expiring November 28, 2011.

Margaret Scobey, of Tennessee, to be Ambassador to the Arab Republic of Egypt.

4 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

2 Army nominations in the rank of general.

4 Coast Guard nominations in the rank of admiral.

1 Marine Corps nomination in the rank of general.

19 Navy nominations in the rank of admiral.

Routine lists in the Air Force, Army, Coast Guard, Foreign Service, Marine Corps, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Navy.

Pages S2195–97

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

David R. Hill, of Missouri, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

Barbara McConnell Barrett, of Arizona, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Finland.

T. Vance McMahan, of Texas, to be Representative of the United States of America on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

G. Steven Agee, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit.

24 Air Force nominations in the rank of general.

4 Marine Corps nominations in the rank of general.

Pages S2194–97

Nominations Withdrawn: Senate received notification of withdrawal of the following nominations:

Charles A. Gargano, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Austria, which was sent to the Senate on November 7, 2007.

David R. Hill, of Missouri, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, which was sent to the Senate on December 3, 2007.

Page S2197

Messages from the House: **Page S2128**

Enrolled Bills Presented: **Page S2128**

Executive Communications: **Pages S2128–29**

Petitions and Memorials: **Pages S2129–30**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Pages S2130–32**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S2134–38**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S2138–67**

Additional Statements: **Pages S2126–28**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S2167–86**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: Page S2186

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S2186

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10:15 a.m. and recessed, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late former Senator Howard Metzenbum, in accordance with S. Res. 485, at 2:36 a.m., until 12:00 noon on Tuesday, March 18, 2008. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S2194.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2009 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, after receiving testimony from Alphonso Jackson, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Armed Services: Committee ordered favorably reported 2,614 nominations in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of John J. Sullivan, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of Commerce, and Simon Charles Gros, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of Transportation for Governmental Affairs, and promotion lists in the United States Coast Guard and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Commissioned Corps.

Prior to this action, committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of John J. Sullivan, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of Commerce, after the nominee testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

FOREST MANAGEMENT IN THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST REGION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Public Lands and Forests concluded a hearing to examine old-growth forest science, focusing on policy and management in the Pacific Northwest region, after receiving testimony from Linda Goodman, Regional Forester, Pacific Northwest Region, United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service; James Caswell, Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior; Marvin D. Brown, Oregon Department of Forestry, Salem; David A. Perry, and John Tappeiner, both of Oregon State University Department of Forest Engineering, Corvallis; Paul H. Beck, Herbert Lumber Company, Riddle, Oregon; and Randi Spivak, American Lands Alliance, Washington, D.C.

U.S. ECONOMIC INTERESTS AND SECURITY

Committee on Finance: Committee concluded a hearing to examine customs reauthorization relative to the activity of the U.S. Customs and Border Protection agency and the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency, both of the Department of Homeland Security, focusing on strengthening United States economic interests and security, after receiving testimony from Samuel H. Banks, Sandler and Travis Trade Advisory Services, Inc., Washington, D.C.; Charlene N. Stocker, Procter and Gamble Distributing, LLC, Cincinnati, Ohio, on behalf of the American Association of Exporters and Importers; Greg P. Brown, Ford Global Technologies, Dearborn, Michigan; and Antoinette M. Tease, Antoinette M. Tease, P.L.L.C., Billings, Montana.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee ordered favorably reported the following:

S. 2731, to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2009 through 2013 to provide assistance to foreign countries to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria, with amendments; and

The nominations of William Raymond Steiger, of Wisconsin, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Mozambique, Department of State, and a promotion list in the Foreign Service.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee ordered favorably reported the following:

S. 579, to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Director of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences to make grants for the development and operation of research centers regarding environmental factors that may be related to the etiology of breast cancer, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1810, to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the provision of scientifically sound information and support services to patients receiving a positive test diagnosis for Down syndrome or other prenatal and postnatal diagnosed conditions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 999, to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve stroke prevention, diagnosis, treatment, and rehabilitation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1760, to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to the Healthy Start Initiative, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1042, to amend the Public Health Service Act to make the provision of technical services for medical imaging examinations and radiation therapy treatments safer, more accurate, and less costly, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

The nominations of Jan Cellucci, of Massachusetts, William J. Hagenah, of Illinois, Mark Y. Herring, of South Carolina, and Julia W. Bland, of Louisiana, each to be a Member of the National Museum and Library Services Board, Jamsheed K. Choksy, of Indiana, Gary D. Glenn, of Illinois, David Hertz, of Indiana, Marvin Bailey Scott, of Indiana, Carol M. Swain, of Tennessee, and Dawn Ho Delbanco, of New York, each to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities, Jonathan Baron, of Maryland, Sally Epstein Shaywitz, of Connecticut, and Frank Philip Handy, of Florida, each to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the National Board for Education Sciences, Javaid Anwar, of Nevada, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Harry S Truman Scholarship Foundation, Neil Romano, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor, Joxel Garcia, of Connecticut, to be Medical Director in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service and to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services, and Robert F. Cohen, Jr., of West Virginia, and Michael F. Duffy, of the District of Columbia, each to be a Member of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 38 public bills, H.R. 5602–5639; 8 resolutions, H.J. Res. 78–79; and H. Res. 1045–1050 were introduced.

Pages H1700–02

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H1702–03**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Journal: The House agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal by a yea–and–nay vote of 222 yeas to 183 nays, with 1 voting "present", Roll No. 136.

Pages H1621, H1626–27

Moment of Silence: The House observed a moment of silence in honor of in honor of all those serving in the military, past and present, during the war in Iraq. **Page H1621**

Privileged Resolution—Intent To Offer: Representative Price (GA) announced his intention to offer a privileged resolution. **Pages H1624–25**

Question of Privilege: The Chair ruled that the resolution offered by Representative Price (GA) did not constitute a question of the privileges of the House. Agreed to table the motion to appeal the ruling of the Chair by a yea–and–nay vote of 222 yeas to 192 nays, Roll No. 135. **Pages H1625–26**

Revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2010 through 2013: The House passed H. Con. Res. 312, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2008, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2009, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2010 through 2013, by a yea–and–nay vote of 212 yeas to 207 nays, Roll No. 141. Consideration of the measure began on Wednesday, March 12th. **Pages H1627–59, H1661–84**

Rejected:

Kilpatrick amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 110–548), submitted on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus, that sought an alternative budget that would balance the budget in FY 2012. The CBC budget would have funded programs and services in the areas of health care, education, veterans benefits and services for low-income families. It also provided for additional services for the administration of justice and funded the recommendations of the House Committee on Homeland Security (by a recorded vote of 126 ayes to 292 noes, Roll No. 137); **Pages H1633–46**

Lee amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 110–548), submitted on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, that sought to provide at least $551.7 billion for domestic, non-military discretionary spending in FY09; provide a $118.9 billion economic stimulus package; extend unemployment insurance, food stamp benefits, and Medicaid payments to states; and, spend $468.3 billion on defense. The Progressive Caucus budget balances by FY12 and rebalances again in FY18, upon completion of the Reinvest and Rebuild

America Initiative (by a recorded vote of 98 ayes to 322 noes, Roll No. 138); and **Pages H1646–59**

Ryan (WI) amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 3 printed in H. Rept. 110–548) that sought to balance the budget by 2012, retain provisions enacted in 2001/2003, prevent expansion of the AMT for the next 3 years, and achieve full repeal in 2013. Provides total discretionary budget authority of $1.04 trillion in fiscal year 2009, a 4.3-percent increase from 2008 enacted level. It imposes a moratorium on congressional earmarks for the balance of the 110th Congress; requires a separate vote on increasing the public debt; requires cost estimates on conference reports and unreported bills; prohibits domestic add-ons to emergency war spending bills; limits long-term spending commitments; prevents use of reconciliation to increase spending; limits ''advance appropriations'' to $23.565 billion in 2010; provides a $7.3-billion domestic emergency reserve fund; provides for contingency war funds; incorporates bipartisan Legislative Line Item Veto. Calls for 1 percent decrease in entitlement program spending (by a recorded vote of 157 ayes to 263 noes, Roll No. 140). **Pages H1661–80**

H. Res. 1036, the rule providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution, was agreed to on Wednesday, March 12th.

Oath of Office—Seventh Congressional District of Indiana: Representative-elect André Carson presented himself in the well of the House and was administered the Oath of Office by the Speaker. Earlier, the Clerk of the House transmitted a facsimile copy of a letter from Mr. Matthew Tusing, Deputy Secretary of State, Office of the Indiana Secretary of State, indicating that, according to the unofficial results of the Special Election held on March 11, 2008, the Honorable André Carson was elected Representative to Congress for the Seventh Congressional District, State of Indiana. **Pages H1660, H1699**

Whole Number of the House: The Speaker announced to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. André Carson, the whole number of the House is adjusted to 431. **Page H1660**

Call of the House: The Speaker called the House to order and ascertained the presence of a quorum (384 present, Roll No. 139). **Pages H16760–61**

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure which was debated on Wednesday, March 12th:

Recognizing the exceptional sacrifice of the 69th Infantry Regiment, known as the Fighting 69th, in support of the Global War on Terror: H. Res. 991, recognizing the exceptional sacrifice of the 69th Infantry Regiment, known as the Fighting 69th, in support of the Global War on Terror, by a 2/3 yea-and-nay vote of 406 yeas with none voting ''nay'', Roll No. 142. **Page H1684**

Pension Protection Technical Corrections Act of 2007: Agreed by unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to engross H.R. 3361, to make technical corrections related to the Pension Protection Act of 2006, in the form of the bill placed at the desk. **Pages H1685–90**

Order of Procedure: Agreed by unanimous consent that it be in order, on the legislative day of March 13, 2008, at a time to be determined by the Speaker, that the House resolve itself into a secret session as though pursuant to clause 9, rule XVII; that debate held in secret session continue for not to exceed one hour, equally divided and controlled; and at the conclusion of that debate, the secret session shall be dissolved. **Pages H1690–99**

Agreed by unanimous consent that when the secret session of the House is dissolved pursuant to the previous order of the House, the House stand adjourned. **Page H1699**

Recess: The House recessed at 7:33 p.m. and at 10:11 p.m., the House began proceedings held in secret session. **Page H1699**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea-and-nay votes and three recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H1626, H1626–27, H1645–46, H1659, H1680, H1683–84, and H1684. One quorum call (Roll No. 139) developed during the proceedings of today and appears on pages H1660–61

Adjournment: The House met at 10:30 a.m. and adjourned at 11:09 p.m.

Committee Meetings

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FDA APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies held a hearing on FNCS Budget. Testimony was heard from Nancy Montanez Johner, Under Secretary, Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services, USDA.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing on Navy Posture. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of the Navy: Donald C. Winter, Secretary; ADM Gary Roughead, USN, Chief of Naval Operations;

and LTG James T. Conway, USMC, Deputy Commandant of the Marine Corps.

The Subcommittee also met in executive session to hold a hearing on Navy Acquisition. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of the Navy: John S. Thackrah, Assistant Secretary; VADM Barry McCullough, USN, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Integration of Capabilities and Resources (N8); and LTG James F. Amos, USMC, Deputy Commandant, Combat Development and Integration.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development held a hearing on DOE—Science Research. Testimony was heard from Raymond L. Orbach, Under Secretary, Science, Department of Energy.

FINANCIAL SERVICES, GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services, and General Government held a hearing on Supreme Court. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Supreme Court of the United States: Anthony Kennedy; and Clarence Thomas, both Associate Justices.

HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Homeland Security held a hearing on Federal Emergency Management Agency—Is the agency on the right track? Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Homeland Security: David R. Paulison, Administrator, FEMA; and Matt Jadacki, Deputy Inspector General; and public witnesses.

INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment and Related Agencies continued appropriation hearings. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LABOR, HHS, EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies continued appropriation hearings. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch held a hearing U.S. House of Representatives Budget. Testimony was heard from the following officers of the House of Representatives: Daniel Beard, CAO; Lorraine Miller, Clerk; and Wilson Livingood, Sergeant-at-Arms.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, VETERANS' AFFAIRS APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies on Air Force Budget. Testimony was heard from GEN T. Michael Moseley, USAF, Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force.

The Subcommittee also continued appropriation hearings. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

EUROPEAN, SOUTHERN AND AFRICA COMMAND BUDGET

Committee on Armed Services: Held a hearing on Fiscal Year 2009 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for the U.S. European Command, Southern Command and Africa Command. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: GEN Bantz J. Craddock, USA, Commander, U.S. European Command; ADM James Stavridis, USN, Commander, U.S. Southern Command; and GEN William E. Ward, USA, Commander, U.S. Africa Command.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT ENERGY POSTURE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness held a hearing on Department of Defense Energy Posture. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: Wayne Arny, Deputy Under Secretary, Installations and Environment; Chris DiPetto, Deputy Director, Systems and Software Engineering (Development Test and Evaluation), Office of the Under Secretary (Acquisition and Technology); and GEN Michael P. C. Carns, USAF (Ret.), Chairman, Defense Science Board Task Force on Energy Strategy; and David M. Walker, Comptroller General, GAO.

IRREGULAR WARFARE THREAT ENVIRONMENT

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Terrorism,Unconventional Threats and Capabilities held a hearing on Fiscal Year 2009 National Defense Authorization Budget Request—Department of Defense Science and Technology: Responding to the 21st Century Irregular Warfare Threat Environment. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: Allan Shaffer, Principle Deputy Director, Defense Research and Engineering; Thomas H. Killion, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Research and Technology, Department of the Army; RADM William Landay, III, USN, Chief of Naval

Research, Assistant Deputy Commandant of the Marine Corps for Science, Technology and Engineering, Director, Test, Evaluation and Technology Requirements; Terry Jaggers, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Science, Technology and Engineering, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Acquisition; and Anthony J. Tether, Director, Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency.

BLACK COLLEGES OUTLOOK

Committee on Education and Labor: Held a hearing on America's Black Colleges and Universities: Models of Excellence and Challenges for the Future. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Ordered reported the following bills: H.R. 3754, To authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to accept, as part of a settlement, diesel emission reduction Supplemental Environmental Projects, and for other purposes; H.R. 1198, amended, Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Act of 2007; H.R. 2464, amended, Wakefield Act; H.R. 1237, amended, Cytology Proficiency Improvement Act of 2007; H.R. 3701, amended, Keeping Seniors Safe From Falls Act of 2007; H.R. 2063, amended, Food Allergy and Anaphylaxis, Management Act of 2007; H.R. 3825, amended, Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act of 2007; and H.R. 1418, amended, Reauthorization of the Traumatic Brain Injury Act.

COMMERCE BUDGET

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Held a hearing entitled ''Department of Commerce Budget for Fiscal Year 2009.'' Testimony was heard from Carlos M. Gutierrez, Secretary of Commerce.

CREDIT CARDHOLDERS' BILL OF RIGHTS

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit held a hearing on The Credit Cardholders' Bill of Rights: Providing New Protections for Consumers. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

REDUCING GLOBAL CHILD MORTALITY

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Africa and Global Health held a hearing on Child Survival: The Unfinished Agenda to Reduce Global Child Mortality. Testimony was heard from Kent R. Hill, Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Global Health, U.S. Agency for International Development, Department of State; former Senator William H. Frist of Tennessee; and public witnesses.

WAR POWERS—CONGRESSIONAL PERSPECTIVE

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights, and Oversight held a hearing on War Powers for the 21st Century: The Congressional Perspective. Testimony was heard from Representatives Jones of North Carolina; and former Representatives Mickey Edwards of Oklahoma; and David E. Skaggs of Colorado.

THREAT ASSESSMENT AND COORDINATION GROUP

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Intelligence, Information Sharing and Terrorism Risk Assessment held a hearing entitled ''Making Homeland Security Intelligence Work for State, Local, and Tribal Partners: An Interagency Threat Assessment Coordination Group (ITACG) Progress Report.'' Testimony was heard from Thomas E. McNamara, Program Manager, Information Sharing Environment, Office of the Director of National Intelligence; Michael E. Leiter, Acting Director, National Counterterrorism Center; Charles E. Allen, Under Secretary, Intelligence and Analysis, Department of Homeland Security; and Wayne Murphy, Assistant Director, Directorate of Intelligence, FBI, Department of Justice.

ORPHAN WORKS

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet, and Intellectual Property held a hearing on Promoting the Use of Orphan Works: Balancing the Interests of Copyright Owners and Users. Testimony was heard from Marybeth Peters, Register of Copyrights, U.S. Copyright Office, Library of Congress; and public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT—OFF-ROAD VEHICLES ON FEDERAL LAND

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands held an oversight hearing on the Impacts of Unmanaged Off-Road Vehicles on Federal Land. Testimony was heard from Henri Bisson, Deputy Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior; Joel Holtrop, Deputy Chief, National Forest System, Forest Service, USDA; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water and Power held a hearing on the following bills: H.R. 317, Arkansas Valley Conduit Act; H.R. 4841, Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians Settlement Act; and H.R. 5293, Shoshone-Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Reservation Water Rights Settlement Act. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of the Interior: Majel Russell, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Indian Affairs; the following officials of the Bureau of Reclamation: Karl Wirkus, Deputy Commissioner for Operations; and Robert Johnson, Commissioner; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Ordered reported the following measures: S. 550, To preserve existing judgeships on the Superior Court of the District of Columbia; H.R. 5551, To amend title 11, District of Columbia Official Code, to implement the increase provided under the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 2008, in the amount of funds made available for the compensation of attorneys representing indigent defendants in the District of Columbia courts; H.R. 4106, amended, Telework Improvements Act if 2007; H.R. 2780, to amend section 8339(p) of title 5, United States Code, to clarify the method for computing certain annuities under the Civil Service Retirement System which are based on part-time service; H.R. 4881, Contracting and Tax Accountability Act of 2007; H.R. 3033, amended, Contractors and Federal Spending Accountability Act of 2007; H.R. 3928, as amended, Government Contractor Accountability Act of 2007; H.R. 3548, amended, Plain Language in Government Communications Act of 2007; H. Con. Res. 310, Expressing support for a national day of remembrance for Harriet Ross Tubman; H. Res. 578, Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that there should be established a National Watermelon Month; H. Res. 886, amended, Expressing sympathy to the victims and families of the tragic acts of violence in Colorado Springs, Colorado and Arvada, Colorado; H. Res. 892, amended, Expressing support for designation of March 11, 2008, as ''National Funeral Directors and Mortician Recognition Day''; H. Res. 952, Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that there should be established a National Teacher Day to honor and celebrate teachers in the United States; H. Res. 994, amended, Expressing support for the designation of a National Glanzmann's Thrombasthenia Awareness Day; H. Res. 1005, amended, Supporting the goals and ideals of Borderling Personality Awareness Month; H. Res. 1016, amended, Expressing the condolences of the House of Representatives on the death of William F. Buckley, Jr; H. Res. 1021, amended, Supporting the goals, ideals, and history of National Women's History Month; H.R. 4185, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11151 Valley Boulevard in El Monte, California, as the ''Marisol Heredia Post Office Building;'' H.R. 5395, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11001 Dunklin Drive in St. Louis, Missouri, as the ''William ''Bill'' Clay Post Office Building;'' H.R. 5472, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2650 Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Street, Indianapolis, Indiana, as the ''Julia M. Carson Post Office Building;'' H.R. 5479, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 117 North Kidd Street in Ionia, Michigan, as the ''Alonzo Woodruff Post Office Building;'' H.R. 5483, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 10449 White Granite Drive in Oakton, Virginia, as the ''Private First Class David H. Sharrett II Post Office Building;'' H.R. 5489, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6892 Main Street in Gloucestor, Virginia, as the ''Congresswoman Jo Ann S. Davis Post Office;'' H.R. 5517, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 7231 FM 1960 in Humble, Texas, as the ''Texas Military Veterans Post Office;'' and H.R. 5528, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 Commercial Street in Brockton, Massachusetts, as the ''Rocky Marciano Post Office Building.''

GENETICALLY ENGINEERED PLANT CONTAMINATION COSTS

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Domestic Policy held a hearing on Is USDA Accounting for Costs to Farmers Caused by Contamination from Genetically Engineered Plants? Testimony was heard from Cindy Smith, Administrator, Animal and Plant Inspection Service, USDA; and public witnesses.

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE ACT OF 2007

Committee on Oversight and Government Reform: Subcommittee on Federal Workforce, Postal Services and the District of Columbia held a hearing on H.R. 3268, Government Accountability Office Act of 2007. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the GAO: Gene Dodaro, Acting Comptroller General; Paul Coran, Chairman, and Anne Wagner, General Counsel, both with the Personnel Appeals Board; and Shirley Jones, Employee Advisory Counsel; Curtis Copeland, Specialist in American National Government, CRS, Library of Congress; and public witnesses.

EPA LIBRARY CLOSURES

Committee on Science and Technology: Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight held a hearing on EPA Library Closures: Better Access for a Broader Audience? Testimony was heard from John Stephenson, Director, Natural Resources and Environment, GAO; and public witnesses.

NASA SCIENCE PROGRAMS BUDGET

Committee on Science and Technology: Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics held a hearing on NASA's Science Programs: Fiscal Year 2009 Budget Request and Issues. Testimony was heard from S. Alan Stern,

Associate Administrator, Science Mission Directorate, NASA; and public witnesses.

SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH PROGRAM

Committee on Small Business: Held a hearing entitled "Legislation to Reauthorize the Small Business Innovation Research (SBIR) Program. Testimony was heard from Steven C. Preston, Administrator, SBA; and public witnesses.

U.S. PARALYMPIC MILITARY PROGRAM

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Economic Opportunity held a hearing on U.S. Paralympic Military Program. Testimony was heard from Danny D. Scott, M.D., Physical and Rehabilitation Service, Denver VA Medical Center, Department of Veterans Affairs; representatives of veterans organizations; and public witnesses.

VA POST IN-PATIENT CARE

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on Care of Seriously Wounded After In-Patient Care. Testimony was heard from Madhulika Agarwal, M.D., Chief Patient Care Services Officer, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and public witnesses.

IRS BUDGET/TAX SEASON

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Oversight held a hearing on 2008 tax return filing season, IRS operations the fiscal Year 2009 budget proposals, and National Taxpayer Advocate's Annual Report. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the IRS, Department of the Treasury: Linda Stiff, Acting Commissioner; and Nina E. Olson, National Taxpayer Advocate.

OVERHEAD ARCHITECTURE

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Met in executive session to hold a hearing on Overhead Architecture. Testimony was heard from departmental witnesses.

BRIEFINGS—HOT SPOTS AND SOUTHWEST BORDER SECURITY

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Subcommittee on Terrorism, Human Intelligence, Analysis and Counterintelligence, met in executive session to receive a briefing on Hot Spots. The Subcommittee was briefed by departmental witnesses.

The Subcommittee also met in executive session to receive a briefing on Southwest Border Security. The Subcommittee was briefed by departmental witnesses.

EPA—IMPLICATIONS OF SUPREME COURT DECISION

Select Committee on Energy Independence and Global Warming: Held a hearing entitled "Massachusetts *v* U.S. EPA Part II: Implications of the Supreme Court Decision." Testimony was heard from Stephen L. Johnson, Administrator, EPA; from the following officials of the State of Kansas: Josh Svaty, member of the House; and Roderick Bermby, Secretary, Department of Health and Environment; and public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

MUSEUM OF THE HISTORY OF POLISH JEWS

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Commission concluded a hearing to examine Poland's Museum of the History of Polish Jews, after receiving testimony from Sigmund Rolat, Museum of the History of Polish Jews North American Council, New York, New York; and Ewa Junczyk-Ziomecka, Chancellery of the President of the Republic of Poland, and Ewa Wierzycka, Museum of the History of Polish Jews, both of Warsaw, Poland.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, MARCH 14, 2008

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia, to hold hearings to examine ways to reform the District of Columbia Public Schools (DCPS) system, 10 a.m., SD–342.

House

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing on Mental Health Overview, 9 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Seapower and Expeditionary Forces, hearing on Fiscal Year 2009 National Defense Authorization Budget Request for Navy Shipbuilding, 10 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and Labor, hearing on Ensuring the Availability of Federal Student Loans, 9 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 2176, To provide for and approve the settlement of certain land claims of the Bay Mills Indian Community; and H.R. 4115, To provide for and approve the settlement of certain land claims of the Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Final Résumé of Congressional Activity

FIRST SESSION OF THE ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS

The first table gives a comprehensive résumé of all legislative business transacted by the Senate and House. The second table accounts for all nominations submitted to the Senate by the President for Senate confirmation.

DATA ON LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY

January 4 through December 31, 2007

	Senate	*House*	*Total*
Days in session	190	164	..
Time in session	1,375 hrs., 54′	1,477 hrs., 52′	..
Congressional Record:			
Pages of proceedings	16,071	16,951	..
Extensions of Remarks	..	2,664	..
Public bills enacted into law	30	135	..
Private bills enacted into law	..	..	..
Bills in conference	5	7	..
Measures passed, total	621	1,127	1,748
Senate bills	102	44	..
House bills	147	516	..
Senate joint resolutions	5	3	..
House joint resolutions	6	8	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	28	9	..
House concurrent resolutions	32	94	..
Simple resolutions	301	453	..
Measures reported, total*	422	486	908
Senate bills	257	2	..
House bills	72	328	..
Senate joint resolutions	5	..	..
House joint resolutions	1	..	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	8	..	..
House concurrent resolutions	6	7	..
Simple resolutions	73	149	..
Special reports	22	8	..
Conference reports	1	12	..
Measures pending on calendar	333	48	..
Measures introduced, total	3,033	6,194	9,227
Bills	2,524	4,930	..
Joint resolutions	27	75	..
Concurrent resolutions	64	278	..
Simple resolutions	418	911	..
Quorum calls	6	9	..
Yea-and-nay votes	442	648	..
Recorded votes	..	529	..
Bills vetoed	1	6	..
Vetoes overridden	1	1	..

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

January 4 through December 31, 2007

Civilian Nominations, totaling 490, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	276
Unconfirmed	180
Withdrawn	31
Returned to White House	3
Other Civilian Nominations, totaling 3,807, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	3,799
Unconfirmed	8
Air Force Nominations, totaling 6,096, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	6,090
Unconfirmed	5
Returned to White House	1
Army Nominations, totaling 6,721, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	6,698
Unconfirmed	19
Returned to White House	4
Navy Nominations, totaling 4,691, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	4,688
Unconfirmed	3
Marine Corps Nominations, totaling 1,342, disposed of as follows:	
Confirmed	1,341
Unconfirmed	1

Summary

Total nominations carried over from the First Session	0
Total nominations received this Session	23,147
Total confirmed	22,892
Total unconfirmed	216
Total withdrawn	31
Total returned to the White House	8

HISTORY OF BILLS ENACTED INTO PUBLIC LAW

(110th Cong., 1st Sess.)

BILLS ENACTED INTO PUBLIC LAW (110TH, 1ST SESSION)

	Law No.
S. 1	110–81
S. 159	110–1
S. 214	110–34
S. 229	110–45
S. 277	110–47
S. 375	110–78
S. 377	110–83
S. 474	110–95
S. 494	110–17
S. 521	110–25
S. 597	110–150
S. 676	110–38
S. 801	110–46
S. 863	110–179
S. 888	110–151
S. 966	110–50
S. 975	110–79
S. 1002	110–19
S. 1099	110–74
S. 1104	110–36
S. 1352	110–43
S. 1396	110–168
S. 1537	110–39
S. 1612	110–96
S. 1701	110–48
S. 1704	110–44
S. 1716	110–80
S. 1868	110–51
S. 1896	110–169
S. 1916	110–170
S. 1927	110–55
S. 1983	110–94
S. 2106	110–113
S. 2174	110–152
S. 2206	110–120
S. 2258	110–109
S. 2271	110–174
S. 2371	110–153
S. 2436	110–176
S. 2484	110–154
S. 2488	110–175
S. 2499	110–173
S.J. Res. 7	110–119
S.J. Res. 8	110–155
S.J. Res. 13	110–171
H.R. 1	110–53
H.R. 6	110–140
H.R. 49	110–7
H.R. 50	110–132
H.R. 57	110–40
H.R. 137	110–22
H.R. 188	110–3
H.R. 327	110–110
H.R. 335	110–8
H.R. 342	110–13
H.R. 365	110–143
H.R. 366	110–156
H.R. 414	110–29
H.R. 433	110–9
H.R. 434	110–4
H.R. 437	110–30
H.R. 465	110–133
H.R. 475	110–2
H.R. 514	110–10
H.R. 521	110–12
H.R. 544	110–14
H.R. 556	110–49
H.R. 577	110–11
H.R. 584	110–15
H.R. 625	110–31
H.R. 660	110–177
H.R. 692	110–41
H.R. 710	110–144
H.R. 727	110–23
H.R. 742	110–6
H.R. 753	110–20
H.R. 797	110–157
H.R. 954	110–87
H.R. 988	110–27
H.R. 995	110–106
H.R. 1003	110–21
H.R. 1045	110–158
H.R. 1124	110–97
H.R. 1129	110–16
H.R. 1130	110–24
H.R. 1132	110–18
H.R. 1260	110–58
H.R. 1284	110–111
H.R. 1335	110–59
H.R. 1384	110–60
H.R. 1402	110–32
H.R. 1425	110–61
H.R. 1429	110–134
H.R. 1434	110–62
H.R. 1495	110–114
H.R. 1617	110–63
H.R. 1675	110–35
H.R. 1676	110–37
H.R. 1681	110–26
H.R. 1722	110–64
H.R. 1808	110–112
H.R. 1830	110–42
H.R. 2011	110–159
H.R. 2025	110–65
H.R. 2077	110–66
H.R. 2078	110–67
H.R. 2080	110–33
H.R. 2089	110–121
H.R. 2127	110–68
H.R. 2206	110–28
H.R. 2272	110–69
H.R. 2276	110–122
H.R. 2309	110–70
H.R. 2358	110–82
H.R. 2408	110–145
H.R. 2429	110–54
H.R. 2467	110–98
H.R. 2546	110–117
H.R. 2563	110–71
H.R. 2570	110–72
H.R. 2587	110–99
H.R. 2602	110–118
H.R. 2640	110–180
H.R. 2654	110–100
H.R. 2669	110–84
H.R. 2671	110–146
H.R. 2688	110–73
H.R. 2761	110–160
H.R. 2764	110–161
H.R. 2765	110–101
H.R. 2778	110–102
H.R. 2779	110–115
H.R. 2825	110–103
H.R. 2863	110–75
H.R. 2952	110–76
H.R. 3006	110–77
H.R. 3052	110–104
H.R. 3106	110–105
H.R. 3206	110–57
H.R. 3218	110–88
H.R. 3222	110–116
H.R. 3233	110–107
H.R. 3297	110–123
H.R. 3307	110–124
H.R. 3308	110–125
H.R. 3311	110–56
H.R. 3315	110–139
H.R. 3325	110–126
H.R. 3375	110–89
H.R. 3382	110–127
H.R. 3446	110–128
H.R. 3470	110–162
H.R. 3518	110–129
H.R. 3528	110–86
H.R. 3530	110–130
H.R. 3569	110–163
H.R. 3571	110–164
H.R. 3572	110–131
H.R. 3580	110–85
H.R. 3625	110–93
H.R. 3648	110–142
H.R. 3668	110–90
H.R. 3678	110–108
H.R. 3688	110–138
H.R. 3690	110–178
H.R. 3703	110–147
H.R. 3739	110–148
H.R. 3974	110–165
H.R. 3996	110–166
H.R. 4009	110–167
H.R. 4118	110–141
H.R. 4252	110–136
H.R. 4343	110–135
H.R. 4839	110–172
H.J. Res. 20	110–5
H.J. Res. 43	110–91
H.J. Res. 44	110–52
H.J. Res. 52	110–92
H.J. Res. 69	110–137
H.J. Res. 72	110–149

BILLS VETOED

H.R. 1591,making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes. Vetoed May 1, 2007.

S. 5, to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for human embryonic stem cell research. Vetoed June 20, 2007.

H.R. 976, to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to extend and improve the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.Vetoed Oct. 3, 2007.

H.R. 1495,to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes. Vetoed Nov. 2, 2007.Veto Overridden and became Public Law 110-149, Nov. 9, 2007.

H.R. 3043,making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes. Vetoed Nov. 13, 2007.

H.R. 3963,to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to extend and improve the Children's Health Insurance Program, and forother purposes. Vetoed Dec. 12, 2007.

H.R. 1585,to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2008 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes. Vetoed Dec. 28, 2007.3

Title	Bill No.	Date introduced	Committee		Date Reported		Report No.		Date of passage		Public Law	
			House	Senate	House	Senate	House 110–	Senate 110–	House	Senate	Date approved	No. 110–
To redesignate the White Rocks National Recreation Area in the State of Vermont as the "Robert T. Stafford White Rocks National Recreation Area".	S. 159	Jan. 4, 2007	NR			.....	.....	.....	Jan. 5, 2007	Jan. 4, 2007	Jan. 17, 2007	1
To revise the composition of the House of Representatives Page Board to equalize the number of members representing the majority and minority parties and to include a member representing the parents of pages and a member representing former pages, and for other purposes.	H.R. 475	Jan. 16, 2007	HA			.....	.....	.....	Jan. 19, 2007	Jan. 23, 2007	Feb. 2, 2007	2
To provide a new effective date for the applicability ofcertain provisions of law to Public Law 105-331.	H.R. 188	Jan. 4, 2007	FS	BHUA			.....	.....	Jan. 16, 2007	Jan. 25, 2007	Feb. 8, 2007	3
To provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 through July 31, 2007, and for other purposes.	H.R. 434	Jan. 12, 2007	SB	SB			.....	.....	Jan. 17, 2007	Feb. 1, 2007	Feb. 15, 2007	4
Making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes.	H.J. Res. 20	Jan. 29, 2007	App			.....	.....	.....	Jan. 31, 2007	Feb. 14, 2007	Feb. 15, 2007	5
To amend the Antitrust Modernization Commission Act of 2002, to extend the term of the Antitrust Modernization Commission and to make a technical correction.	H.R. 742	Jan. 31, 2007	Jud			.....	.....	.....	Feb. 7, 2007	Feb. 12, 2007	Feb. 26, 2007	6
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1300 North Frontage Road West in Vail, Colorado, as the "Gerald R. Ford, Jr. Post Office Building".	H.R. 49 (S. 194)	Jan. 4, 2007	OGR	HS&GA			.....	.....	Jan. 29, 2007	Feb. 17, 2007	Mar. 7, 2007	7
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 152 North 5th Street in Laramie, Wyoming, as the "Gale W. McGee Post Office".	H.R. 335 (S. 219)	Jan. 9, 2007	OGR	HS&GA			.....	.....	Jan. 29, 2007	Feb. 17, 2007	Mar. 7, 2007	8
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1700 Main Street in Little Rock, Arkansas, as the "Scipio A. Jones Post Office Building".	H.R. 433	Jan. 12, 2007	OGR	HS&GA			.....	.....	Feb. 5, 2007	Feb. 17, 2007	Mar. 7, 2007	9
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 16150 Aviation Loop Drive in Brooksville, Florida, as the "Sergeant Lea Robert Mills Brooksville Aviation Branch Post Office".	H.R. 514	Jan. 17, 2007	OGR	HS&GA			.....	.....	Feb. 5, 2007	Feb. 17, 2007	Mar. 7, 2007	10
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3903 South Congress Avenue in Austin,Texas, as the "Sergeant Henry Ybarra III Post Office Building".	H.R. 577	Jan. 19, 2007	OGR	HS&GA			.....	.....	Feb. 5, 2007	Feb. 17, 2007	Mar. 7, 2007	11
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2633 11th Street in Rock Island, Illinois, as the "Lane Evans Post Office Building".	H.R. 521 (S. 412)	Jan. 17, 2007	OGR	HS&GA			.....	.....	Jan. 29, 2007	Feb. 17, 2007	Mar. 15, 2007	12
To designate the United States courthouse located at 555 Independence Street in Cape Girardeau, Missouri, as the "Rush Hudson Limbaugh, Sr. United States Courthouse".	H.R. 342	Jan. 9, 2007	TI	EPW	Feb. 12, 2007		10	.....	Feb. 12, 2007	Mar. 9, 2007	Mar. 21, 2007	13

Title	Bill No.	Date introduced	Committee		Date Reported		Report No.		Date of passage		Public Law	
			House	Senate	House	Senate	House 110–	Senate 110–	House	Senate	Date approved	No. 110–
To designate the United States courthouse at South Federal Place in Santa Fe, New Mexico, as the "Santiago E. Campos United States Courthouse".	H.R. 544	Jan. 17, 2007	TI		Feb. 16, 2007	.....	18	.....	Mar. 6, 2007	Mar. 9, 2007	Mar. 21, 2007	14
To designate the Federal building located at 400 Maryland Avenue Southwestin the District of Columbia as the Lyndon Baines Johnson Department of Education Building.	H.R. 584	Jan. 19, 2007	TI		Feb. 16, 2007	.....	17	.....	Mar. 6, 2007	Mar. 9, 2007	Mar. 23, 2007	15
To provide for the construction, operation, and maintenance of an arterial road in St. Louis County, Missouri.	H.R. 1129	Feb. 16, 2007	TI			.....	.....	.....	Feb. 27, 2007	Mar. 13, 2007	Mar. 28, 2007	16
To endorse further enlargement of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and to facilitate the timely admission of new members to NATO, and for other purposes.	S. 494	Feb. 6, 2007		FR	.....	Mar. 9, 2007	.....	34	Mar. 26, 2007	Mar. 15, 2007	April 9, 2007	17
To amend the Public Health Service Act to provide waivers relating to grants for preventive health measures with respect to breast and cervical cancers.	H.R. 1132 (S. 624)	Feb. 16, 2007	EC		Mar. 27, 2007	Mar. 29, 2007	76	0	Mar. 27, 2007	Mar. 29, 2007	April 20, 2007	18
To amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to reinstate certain provisions relating to the nutrition services incentive program.	S. 1002	Mar. 27, 2007	E&L			.....	.....	.....	Mar. 28, 2007	Mar. 27, 2007	April 23, 2007	19
To redesignate the Federal building located at 167 North Main Street in Memphis, Tennessee, as the "Clifford Davis and Odell Horton FederalBuilding".	H.R. 753	Jan. 31, 2007	TI		Mar. 26, 2007	.....	72	.....	Mar. 26, 2007	April 10, 2007	May 2, 2007	20
To amend the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 to reauthorize the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy.	H.R. 1003	Feb. 12, 2007	FA	FR		April 12, 2007	.....	55	Mar. 13, 2007	April 18, 2007	May 2, 2007	21
To amend title 18, United States Code, to strengthen prohibitions against animal fighting, and for other purposes.	H.R. 137 (S. 261)	Jan. 4, 2007	Jud Agr	Jud	Mar. 1, 2007	.....	27	0	Mar. 26, 2007	April 10, 2007	May 3, 2007	22
To amend the Public Health Service Act to add requirements regarding trauma care, and for other purposes.	H.R. 727	Jan. 30, 2007	EC		Mar. 27, 2007	.....	77	.....	Mar. 27, 2007	Mar. 29, 2007	May 3, 2007	23
To amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to extend the authority to withhold from public availability a financial disclosure report filed by an individual who is a judicial officer or judicial employee, to the extent necessary toprotect the safety of that individual or a family member of that individual, and for other purposes.	H.R. 1130	Feb. 16, 2007	Jud	HS&GA	Mar. 20, 2007		59	.....	Mar. 21, 2007	April 19, 2007	May 3, 2007	24
To designate the Federal building and United States courthouse and customhouse located at 515 West First Street in Duluth, Minnesota, as the "Gerald W. Heaney Federal Building and United States Courthouse and Customhouse".	S. 521 (H.R. 187)	Feb. 7, 2007	TI	EPW		Mar. 29, 2007	.....	0	April 23, 2007	April 10, 2007	May 8, 2007	25
To amend the Congressional Charter of The American National Red Cross to modernize its governance structure, to enhance the ability of the board of governors of The American National Red Cross to support the critical mission of The American National Red Cross in the 21st century, and forother purposes.	H.R. 1681	Mar. 26, 2007	FA		April 16, 2007	.....	87	.....	April 17, 2007	April 23, 2007	May 11, 2007	26

Title	Bill No.	Date introduced	Committee		Date Reported		Report No.		Date of passage		Public Law	
			House	Senate	House	Senate	House 110–	Senate 110–	House	Senate	Date approved	No. 110–
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5757 Tilton Avenue in Riverside, California, as the "Lieutenant Todd Jason Bryant Post Office".	H.R. 988	Feb. 12, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		May 22, 2007	.....	0	April 16, 2007	May 23, 2007	May 25, 2007	27
Making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes.	H.R. 2206	May 8, 2007	App Bud			.....	.....	.....	May 10, 2007	May 17, 2007	May 25, 2007	28
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 60 Calle McKinley, West in Mayaguez, Puerto Rico, as the "Miguel Angel Garcia Mendez Post Office Building".	H.R. 414	Jan. 11, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		May 22, 2007	.....	0	Feb. 12, 2007	May 23, 2007	June 1, 2007	29
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 500 West Eisenhower Street in Rio Grande City, Texas, as the "Lino Perez, Jr. Post Office".	H.R. 437	Jan. 12, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		May 22, 2007	.....	0	Feb. 13, 2007	May 23, 2007	June 1, 2007	30
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4230 Maine Avenue in Baldwin Park, California, as the "Atanacio Haro-Marin Post Office".	H.R. 625	Jan. 22, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		May 22, 2007	.....	0	April 23, 2007	May 23, 2007	June 1, 2007	31
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 320 South Lecanto Highway in Lecanto,Florida, as the "Sergeant Dennis J. Flanagan Lecanto Post Office Building".	H.R. 1402	Mar. 8, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		May 22, 2007	.....	0	April 23, 2007	May 23, 2007	June 1, 2007	32
To amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to conform the District charter to revisions made by the Council of the District of Columbia relating to public education.	H.R. 2080	May 1, 2007	OGR			.....	.....	.....	May 8, 2007	May 22, 2007	June 1, 2007	33
To amend chapter 35 of title 28, United States Code, to preserve the independence of United States attorneys.	S. 214	Jan. 9, 2007		Jud	.....	Feb. 12, 2007	.....	0	May 22, 2007	Mar. 20, 2007	June 14, 2007	34
To suspend the requirements of the Department of Housing and Urban Development regarding electronic filing of previous participation certificates and regarding filing of such certificates with respect to certain low-income housing investors.	H.R. 1675	Mar. 26, 2007	FS	BHUA	April 23, 2007	May 17, 2007	106	0	April 24, 2007	May 24, 2007	June 15, 2007	35
To increase the number of Iraqi and Afghani translators and interpreters who may be admitted to the United States as special immigrants, and for other purposes.	S. 1104	April 12, 2007	Jud		May 21, 2007	.....	158	.....	May 22, 2007	April 12, 2007	June 15, 2007	36
To reauthorize the program of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for loan guarantees for Indian housing.	H.R. 1676	Mar. 26, 2007	FS	BHUA	April 20, 2007	May 17, 2007	102	0	April 24, 2007	May 24, 2007	June 18, 2007	37
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.	S. 676	Feb. 17, 2007	FA	FR		Mar. 9, 2007	.....	35	June 11, 2007	Mar. 15, 2007	June 21, 2007	38
To authorize the transfer of certain funds from the Senate Gift Shop Revolving Fund to the Senate Employee Child Care Center.	S. 1537	May 25, 2007			.....	.....	.....	.....	June 6, 2007	May 25, 2007	June 21, 2007	39
To repeal certain sections of the Act of May 26, 1936, pertaining to the Virgin Islands.	H.R. 57	Jan. 4, 2007	NR	ENR		Feb. 15, 2007	.....	19	Jan. 17, 2007	June 12, 2007	June 29, 2007	40

Title	Bill No.	Date introduced	Committee		Date Reported		Report No.		Date of passage		Public Law	
			House	Senate	House	Senate	House 110–	Senate 110–	House	Senate	Date approved	No. 110–
To amend title 4, United States Code, to authorize the Governor of a State, territory, or possession of the United States to order that the National flag be flown athalf-staff in that State, territory, or possession in the event of the death of a member of the Armed Forces from that State, territory, or possession who dies while serving on active duty.	H.R. 692	Jan. 24, 2007	Jud	Jud	May 9, 2007	June 7, 2007	139	0	May 15, 2007	June 14, 2007	June 29, 2007	41
To extend the authorities of the Andean Trade Preference Act until September 30, 2009.	H.R. 1830	Mar. 29, 2007	WM			.....	.....	.....	June 27, 2007	June 28, 2007	June 30, 2007	42
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".	S. 1352	May 10, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		May 22, 2007	.....	0	June 19, 2007	May 23, 2007	July 3, 2007	43
To temporarily extend the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.	S. 1704	June 27, 2007			.....	.....	.....	.....	June 28, 2007	June 27, 2007	July 3, 2007	44
To redesignate a Federal building in Albuquerque, New Mexico, as the "Raymond G. Murphy Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center".	S. 229	Jan. 9, 2007	VA	VA			.....	.....	June 25, 2007	April 12, 2007	July 5, 2007	45
To designate a United States courthouse located in Fresno, California, as the "Robert E. Coyle United StatesCourthouse".	S. 801	Mar. 7, 2007	TI	EPW		Mar. 29, 2007	.....	0	June 25, 2007	April 10, 2007	July 5, 2007	46
To modify the boundaries of Grand Teton National Park toinclude certain land within the GT Park Subdivision, and for other purposes.	S. 277	Jan. 12, 2007	NR	ENR		Feb. 15, 2007	.....	16	June 27, 2007	June 19, 2007	July 13, 2007	47
To provide for the extension of transitional medical assistance (TMA) and the abstinence education program through the end of fiscal year 2007, and for other purposes.	S. 1701	June 27, 2007			.....	.....	.....	.....	July 11, 2007	June 27, 2007	July 18, 2007	48
To ensure national security while promoting foreign investment and the creation and maintenance of jobs, to reform the process by which such investments are examined for any effect they may have on national security, to establish the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, and for other purposes.	H.R. 556 (S. 1610)	Jan. 18, 2007	FS EC FA	BHUA	Feb. 23, 2007	.....	24	.....	Feb. 28, 2007	June 29, 2007	July 26, 2007	49
To enable the Department of State to respond to a critical shortage of passport processing personnel, and for otherpurposes.	S. 966	Mar. 22, 2007	FA	FR		June 27, 2007	.....	109	July 16, 2007	June 29, 2007	July 30, 2007	50
To temporarily extend the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.	S. 1868	July 24, 2007			.....	.....	.....	.....	July 25, 2007	July 24, 2007	July 31, 2007	51
Approving the renewal of import restrictions contained in the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003, and for other purposes.	H.J. Res. 44	May 24, 2007	WM			.....	.....	.....	July 23, 2007	July 24, 2007	Aug. 1, 2007	52

Title	Bill No.	Date introduced	Committee		Date Reported		Report No.		Date of passage		Public Law	
			House	Senate	House	Senate	House 110–	Senate 110–	House	Senate	Date approved	No. 110–
To provide for the implementation of the recommendations of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States.	H.R. 1 (S. 4)	Jan. 5, 2007	HS EC Jud Int FA TI OGR WM	HS&GA		.....	.....	.....	Jan. 9, 2007	July 9, 2007	Aug. 3, 2007	53
To amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide an exception to the 60-day limit on Medicare reciprocal billing arrangements between two physicians during the period in which one of the physicians is ordered to active duty as a member of a reserve component of the Armed Forces.	H.R. 2429	May 22, 2007	EC WM	Fin			.....	.....	May 23, 2007	July 24, 2007	Aug. 3, 2007	54
To amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to provide additional procedures for authorizing certainacquisitions of foreign intelligence information and forother purposes.	S. 1927	Aug. 1, 2007			.....	.....	.....	.....	Aug. 4, 2007	Aug. 3, 2007	Aug. 5, 2007	55
To authorize additional funds for emergency repairs and reconstruction of the Interstate I-35 bridge located in Minneapolis, Minnesota, that collapsed on August 1, 2007, to waive the $100,000,000 limitation on emergency relief funds for those emergency repairs and reconstruction, and for other purposes.	H.R. 3311	Aug. 2, 2007	TI			.....	.....	.....	Aug. 3, 2007	Aug. 3, 2007	Aug. 6, 2007	56
To provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 through December 15, 2007, and for other purposes.	H.R. 3206	July 27, 2007	SB			.....	.....	.....	July 30, 2007	July 31, 2007	Aug. 8, 2007	57
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6301 Highway 58 in Harrison, Tennessee, as the "Claude Ramsey Post Office".	H.R. 1260	Mar. 1, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Aug. 1, 2007	.....	0	May 14, 2007	Aug. 3, 2007	Aug. 9, 2007	58
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 508 East Main Street in Seneca, SouthCarolina, as the "S/Sgt Lewis G. Watkins Post Office Building".	H.R. 1335	Mar. 6, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Aug. 1, 2007	.....	0	May 14, 2007	Aug. 3, 2007	Aug. 9, 2007	59
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 118 Minner Avenue in Bakersfield, California, as the "Buck Owens Post Office".	H.R. 1384 (S. 1781)	Mar. 7, 2007	OGR			.....	.....	0	July 30, 2007	Aug. 3, 2007	Aug. 9, 2007	60
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4551 East 52nd Street in Odessa, Texas, as the "Staff Sergeant Marvin "Rex" Young Post OfficeBuilding".	H.R. 1425	Mar. 9, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Aug. 1, 2007	.....	0	May 21, 2007	Aug. 3, 2007	Aug. 9, 2007	61
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 896 Pittsburgh Street in Springdale, Pennsylvania, as the "Rachel Carson Post Office Building".	H.R. 1434	Mar. 9, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Aug. 1, 2007	.....	0	April 23, 2007	Aug. 3, 2007	Aug. 9, 2007	62

Title	Bill No.	Date introduced	Committee		Date Reported		Report No.		Date of passage		Public Law	
			House	Senate	House	Senate	House 110–	Senate 110–	House	Senate	Date approved	No. 110–
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 561 Kingsland Avenue in University City, Missouri, as the "Harriett F. Woods Post Office Building".	H.R. 1617	Mar. 21, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Aug. 1, 2007	.....	0	May 14, 2007	Aug. 3, 2007	Aug. 9, 2007	63
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 601 Banyan Trail in Boca Raton, Florida, as the "Leonard W. Herman Post Office".	H.R. 1722	Mar. 27, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Aug. 1, 2007	.....	0	May 22, 2007	Aug. 3, 2007	Aug. 9, 2007	64
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11033 South State Street in Chicago, Illinois, as the "Willye B. White Post Office Building".	H.R. 2025	April 25, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Aug. 1, 2007	.....	0	May 14, 2007	Aug. 3, 2007	Aug. 9, 2007	65
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 20805 State Route 125 in Blue Creek, Ohio, as the "George B. Lewis Post Office Building".	H.R. 2077	April 30, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Aug. 1, 2007	.....	0	May 21, 2007	Aug. 3, 2007	Aug. 9, 2007	66
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14536 State Route 136 in Cherry Fork,Ohio, as the "Staff Sergeant Omer T. 'O.T.' Hawkins Post Office".	H.R. 2078	April 30, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Aug. 1, 2007	.....	0	May 21, 2007	Aug. 3, 2007	Aug. 9, 2007	67
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 408 West 6th Street in Chelsea, Oklahoma, as the "Clem Rogers McSpadden Post Office Building".	H.R. 2127	May 3, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Aug. 1, 2007	.....	0	June 18, 2007	Aug. 3, 2007	Aug. 9, 2007	68
To invest in innovation through research and development, and to improve the competitiveness of the United States.	H.R. 2272	May 10, 2007	Sci			.....	.....	.....	May 21, 2007	July 19, 2007	Aug. 9, 2007	69
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3916 Milgen Road in Columbus, Georgia, as the "Frank G. Lumpkin, Jr. Post Office Building".	H.R. 2309	May 14, 2007	OGR			.....	.....	.....	July 30, 2007	Aug. 3, 2007	Aug. 9, 2007	70
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 309 East Linn Street in Marshalltown,Iowa, as the "Major Scott Nisely Post Office".	H.R. 2563 (S. 1539)	June 5, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Aug. 1, 2007	.....	0	June 18, 2007	Aug. 3, 2007	Aug. 9, 2007	71
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 301 Boardwalk Drive in Fort Collins, Colorado, as the "Dr. Karl E. Carson Post Office Building".	H.R. 2570 (S. 1732)	June 5, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Aug. 1, 2007	.....	0	July 16, 2007	Aug. 3, 2007	Aug. 9, 2007	72
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 103 South Getty Street in Uvalde, Texas, as the "Dolph Briscoe, Jr. Post Office Building".	H.R. 2688 (S. 1596)	June 12, 2007	OGR			.....	.....	0	July 30, 2007	Aug. 3, 2007	Aug. 9, 2007	73
To amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, to make individuals employed by the Roosevelt Campobello International Park Commission eligible to obtain Federalhealth insurance.	S. 1099	April 12, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		June 19, 2007	.....	0	July 30, 2007	June 22, 2007	Aug. 9, 2007	74
To authorize the Coquille Indian Tribe of the State of Oregon to convey land and interests in land owned by theTribe.	H.R. 2863	June 26, 2007	NR		July 30, 2007	.....	274	.....	July 30, 2007	Aug. 2, 2007	Aug. 13, 2007	75
To authorize the Saginaw Chippewa Tribe of Indians of the State of Michigan to convey land and interests in land owned by the Tribe.	H.R. 2952	July 10, 2007	NR		July 30, 2007	.....	275	.....	July 30, 2007	Aug. 2, 2007	Aug. 13, 2007	76

Title	Bill No.	Date introduced	Committee		Date Reported		Report No.		Date of passage		Public Law	
			House	Senate	House	Senate	House 110–	Senate 110–	House	Senate	Date approved	No. 110–
To improve the use of a grant of a parcel of land to theState of Idaho for use as an agricultural college, and for other purposes.	H.R. 3006	July 11, 2007	Agr NR			.....	.....	.....	July 30, 2007	Aug. 3, 2007	Aug. 13, 2007	77
To waive application of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to a specific parcel of real property transferred by the United States to 2 Indian tribes in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes.	S. 375	Jan. 24, 2007	NR	IA	July 30, 2007	April 10, 2007	276	44	July 30, 2007	May 22, 2007	Aug. 13, 2007	78
Granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate forest fire protection compact.	S. 975	Mar. 23, 2007	Jud	Jud			.....	.....	July 30, 2007	July 13, 2007	Aug. 13, 2007	79
To amend the U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007, to strike a requirement relating to forage producers.	S. 1716	June 27, 2007		ANF	.....		.....	.....	July 30, 2007	July 25, 2007	Aug. 13, 2007	80
To provide greater transparency in the legislative process.	S. 1	Jan. 4, 2007			.....	.....	.....	.....	July 31, 2007	Jan. 18, 2007	Sept. 14, 2007	81
To require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint and issue coins in commemoration of Native Americans and the important contributions made by Indian tribes and individual Native Americans to the development of the United States and the history of the United States, and for other purposes.	H.R. 2358	May 17, 2007	FS	BHUA			.....	.....	June 12, 2007	Aug. 3, 2007	Sept. 20, 2007	82
To establish a United States-Poland parliamentary youth exchange program, and for other purposes.	S. 377	Jan. 24, 2007	FA	FR		Mar. 9, 2007	.....	33	Sept. 5, 2007	Mar. 15, 2007	Sept. 20, 2007	83
To provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 601 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008.	H.R. 2669	June 12, 2007	E&L		June 25, 2007	.....	210	.....	July 11, 2007	July 20, 2007	Sept. 27, 2007	84
To amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs and for medical devices, to enhance the postmarket authorities of the Food and Drug Administration with respect to the safety of drugs, and for other purposes.	H.R. 3580	Sept. 19, 2007	EC			.....	.....	.....	Sept. 19, 2007	Sept. 20, 2007	Sept. 27, 2007	85
To provide authority to the Peace Corps to provideseparation pay for host country resident personal services contractors of the Peace Corps.	H.R. 3528	Sept. 14, 2007	FA			.....	.....	.....	Sept. 17, 2007	Sept. 19, 2007	Sept. 27, 2007	86
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 365 West 125th Street in New York, New York, as the "Percy Sutton Post Office Building".	H.R. 954	Feb. 8, 2007	OGR	HS&GA			.....	.....	Sept. 5, 2007	Sept. 11, 2007	Sept. 28, 2007	87
To designate a portion of Interstate Route 395 located in Baltimore, Maryland, as "Cal Ripken Way".	H.R. 3218	July 27, 2007	TI			.....	.....	.....	Sept. 5, 2007	Sept. 12, 2007	Sept. 28, 2007	88
To extend the trade adjustment assistance program under the Trade Act of 1974 for 3 months.	H.R. 3375	Aug. 3, 2007	WM		Sept. 24, 2007	.....	345	.....	Sept. 25, 2007	Sept. 25, 2007	Sept. 28, 2007	89

Title	Bill No.	Date introduced	Committee		Date Reported		Report No.		Date of passage		Public Law	
			House	Senate	House	Senate	House 110–	Senate 110–	House	Senate	Date approved	No. 110–
To provide for the extension of transitional medical assistance (TMA), the abstinence education program, and the qualifying individuals (QI) program, and for other purposes.	H.R. 3668	Sept. 26, 2007	EC WM			.....	.....	.....	Sept. 26, 2007	Sept. 27, 2007	Sept. 29, 2007	90
Increasing the statutory limit on the public debt.	H.J. Res. 43	May 17, 2007		Fin	.....	Sept. 24, 2007	.....	184	May 17, 2007	Sept. 27, 2007	Sept. 29, 2007	91
Making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2008, and for other purposes.	H.J. Res. 52	Sept. 25, 2007	App Bud			.....	.....	.....	Sept. 26, 2007	Sept. 27, 2007	Sept. 29, 2007	92
To make permanent the waiver authority of the Secretary of Education with respect to student financial assistance during a war or other military operation or national emergency.	H.R. 3625	Sept. 20, 2007	E&L			.....	.....	.....	Sept. 25, 2007	Sept. 27, 2007	Sept. 30, 2007	93
To amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to renew and amend the provisions for the enhanced review of covered pesticide products, to authorize fees for certain pesticide products, and to extend and improve the collection of maintenance fees, and for other purposes.	S. 1983	Aug. 2, 2007	Agr			.....	.....	.....	Sept. 24, 2007	Aug. 2, 2007	Oct. 9, 2007	94
To award a congressional gold medal to Michael Ellis DeBakey, M.D.	S. 474 (H.R. 1154)	Feb. 1, 2007	FS	BHUA			.....	.....	Oct. 2, 2007	Mar. 27, 2007	Oct. 16, 2007	95
To amend the penalty provisions in the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, and for other purposes.	S. 1612	June 13, 2007	FA	BHUA		June 13, 2007	.....	82	Oct. 2, 2007	June 26, 2007	Oct. 16, 2007	96
To extend the District of Columbia College Access Act of1999.	H.R. 1124	Feb. 16, 2007	OGR		April 30, 2007	.....	112	.....	May 14, 2007	Sept. 18, 2007	Oct. 24, 2007	97
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 69 Montgomery Street in Jersey City, New Jersey, as the "Frank J. Guarini Post Office Building".	H.R. 2467	May 23, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Sept. 26, 2007	.....	0	Sept. 10, 2007	Oct. 3, 2007	Oct. 24, 2007	98
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 555 South 3rd Street Lobby in Memphis, Tennessee, as the "Kenneth T. Whalum, Sr. Post Office Building".	H.R. 2587	June 6, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Sept. 26, 2007	.....	0	Sept. 10, 2007	Oct. 3, 2007	Oct. 24, 2007	99
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 202 South Dumont Avenue in Woonsocket, South Dakota, as the "Eleanor McGovern Post Office Building".	H.R. 2654	June 11, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Sept. 26, 2007	.....	0	Sept. 10, 2007	Oct. 3, 2007	Oct. 24, 2007	100
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 44 North Main Street in Hughesville, Pennsylvania, as the "Master Sergeant Sean Michael Thomas Post Office".	H.R. 2765	June 18, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Sept. 26, 2007	.....	0	July 30, 2007	Oct. 3, 2007	Oct. 24, 2007	101
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3 Quaker Ridge Road in New Rochelle, New York, as the "Robert Merrill Postal Station".	H.R. 2778	June 19, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Sept. 26, 2007	.....	0	Sept. 10, 2007	Oct. 3, 2007	Oct. 24, 2007	102
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 326 South Main Street in Princeton, Illinois, as the "Owen Lovejoy Princeton Post Office Building".	H.R. 2825	June 21, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Sept. 26, 2007	.....	0	Sept. 10, 2007	Oct. 3, 2007	Oct. 24, 2007	103

Title	Bill No.	Date introduced	Committee		Date Reported		Report No.		Date of passage		Public Law	
			House	Senate	House	Senate	House 110–	Senate 110–	House	Senate	Date approved	No. 110–
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 954 Wheeling Avenue in Cambridge, Ohio, as the "John Herschel Glenn, Jr. Post Office Building".	H.R. 3052	July 16, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Sept. 26, 2007	.....	0	Sept. 5, 2007	Oct. 3, 2007	Oct. 24, 2007	104
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 805 Main Street in Ferdinand, Indiana, as the "Staff Sergeant David L. Nord Post Office".	H.R. 3106 (S. 2023)	July 19, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Sept. 26, 2007	.....	0	Sept. 5, 2007	Oct. 3, 2007	Oct. 24, 2007	105
To amend Public Law 106-348 to extend the authorization for establishing a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor veterans who became disabled while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States.	H.R. 995	Feb. 12, 2007	NR	ENR		Sept. 17, 2007	.....	165	Mar. 5, 2007	Oct. 24, 2007	Oct. 25, 2007	106
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at Highway 49 South in Piney Woods, Mississippi, as the "Laurence C. and Grace M. Jones Post Office Building".	H.R. 3233 (S. 2131)	July 31, 2007	OGR	HS&GA			.....	.....	Oct. 1, 2007	Oct. 19, 2007	Oct. 26, 2007	107
To amend the Internet Tax Freedom Act to extend the moratorium on certain taxes relating to the Internet and to electronic commerce.	H.R. 3678	Sept. 27, 2007	Jud		Oct. 12, 2007	.....	372	.....	Oct. 16, 2007	Oct. 25, 2007	Oct. 31, 2007	108
To temporarily extend the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965, to amend the definition of an eligible not-for-profit holder, and for other purposes.	S. 2258	Oct. 30, 2007			.....	.....	.....	.....	Oct. 30, 2007	Oct. 30, 2007	Oct. 31, 2007	109
To amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of VeteransAffairs to develop and implement a comprehensive program designed to reduce the incidence of suicide among veterans.	H.R. 327	Jan. 9, 2007	VA	VA	Mar. 20, 2007		55	.....	Mar. 21, 2007	Sept. 27, 2007	Nov. 5, 2007	110
To increase, effective as of December 1, 2007, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans.	H.R. 1284	Mar. 1, 2007	VA	VA	Mar. 20, 2007		56	.....	Mar. 21, 2007	Oct. 18, 2007	Nov. 5, 2007	111
To designate the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Augusta, Georgia, as the "Charlie Norwood Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center".	H.R. 1808	Mar. 29, 2007	VA	VA			.....	.....	Oct. 23, 2007	Oct. 31, 2007	Nov. 8, 2007	112
To provide nationwide subpoena authority for actions brought under the September 11 Victim Compensation Fund of 2001.	S. 2106	Sept. 27, 2007	Jud	Jud			.....	.....	Oct. 30, 2007	Oct. 3, 2007	Nov. 8, 2007	113
To provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes.	H.R. 1495	Mar. 13, 2007	TI		Mar. 29, 2007	.....	80	.....	April 19, 2007	May 16, 2007	Nov. 9, 2007	114
To recognize the Navy UDT-SEAL Museum in Fort Pierce, Florida, as the official national museum of Navy SEALS and their predecessors.	H.R. 2779	June 19, 2007	AS-H	AS-S			.....	.....	Oct. 1, 2007	Oct. 31, 2007	Nov. 13, 2007	115
Making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for otherpurposes.	H.R. 3222	July 30, 2007		App	.....	Sept. 14, 2007	279	155	Aug. 5, 2007	Oct. 3, 2007	Nov. 13, 2007	116

Title	Bill No.	Date introduced	Committee		Date Reported		Report No.		Date of passage		Public Law	
			House	Senate	House	Senate	House 110–	Senate 110–	House	Senate	Date approved	No. 110–
To designate the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Asheville, North Carolina, as the "Charles George Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center".	H.R. 2546	May 24, 2007	VA	VA			.....	.....	June 25, 2007	Nov. 1, 2007	Nov. 15, 2007	117
To name the Department of Veterans Affairs medical facility in Iron Mountain, Michigan, as the "Oscar G. Johnson Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Facility".	H.R. 2602	June 6, 2007	VA	VA			.....	.....	June 25, 2007	Nov. 7, 2007	Nov. 16, 2007	118
Providing for the reappointment of Roger W. Sant as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.	S.J. Res. 7	Mar. 8, 2007	HA	RAdm			.....	.....	Nov. 5, 2007	July 31, 2007	Nov. 16, 2007	119
To provide technical corrections to Public Law 109-116 (2 U.S.C. 2131a note) to extend the time period for the Joint Committee on the Library to enter into an agreement to obtain a statue of Rosa Parks, and for other purposes.	S. 2206	Oct. 18, 2007	HA			.....	.....	.....	Nov. 5, 2007	Oct. 18, 2007	Nov. 19, 2007	120
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 701 Loyola Avenue in New Orleans, Louisiana, as the "Louisiana Armed Services Veterans Post Office".	H.R. 2089	May 1, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Nov. 14, 2007	.....	0	Oct. 15, 2007	Nov. 16, 2007	Nov. 30, 2007	121
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 203 North Main Street in Vassar, Michigan, as the "Corporal Christopher E. Esckelson Post Office Building".	H.R. 2276	May 10, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Nov. 14, 2007	.....	0	Oct. 1, 2007	Nov. 16, 2007	Nov. 30, 2007	122
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 950 West Trenton Avenue in Morrisville, Pennsylvania, as the "Nate DeTample Post Office Building".	H.R. 3297	Aug. 1, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Nov. 14, 2007	.....	0	Oct. 15, 2007	Nov. 16, 2007	Nov. 30, 2007	123
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 570 Broadway in Bayonne, New Jersey, as the "Dennis P. Collins Post Office Building".	H.R. 3307 (S. 2107)	Aug. 1, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Nov. 14, 2007	.....	0	Oct. 30, 2007	Nov. 16, 2007	Nov. 30, 2007	124
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 216 East Main Street in Atwood, Indiana, as the "Lance Corporal David K. Fribley Post Office".	H.R. 3308	Aug. 1, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Nov. 14, 2007	.....	0	Oct. 9, 2007	Nov. 16, 2007	Nov. 30, 2007	125
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 235 Mountain Road in Suffield, Connecticut, as the "Corporal Stephen R. Bixler Post Office".	H.R. 3325	Aug. 2, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Nov. 14, 2007	.....	0	Oct. 1, 2007	Nov. 16, 2007	Nov. 30, 2007	126
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 200 North William Street in Goldsboro, North Carolina, as the "Philip A. Baddour, Sr. Post Office".	H.R. 3382	Aug. 3, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Nov. 14, 2007	.....	0	Oct. 1, 2007	Nov. 16, 2007	Nov. 30, 2007	127
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 202 East Michigan Avenue in Marshall,Michigan, as the "Michael W. Schragg Post Office Building".	H.R. 3446	Aug. 3, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Nov. 14, 2007	.....	0	Oct. 30, 2007	Nov. 16, 2007	Nov. 30, 2007	128
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1430 South Highway 29 in Cantonment, Florida, as the "Charles H. Hendrix Post Office Building".	H.R. 3518	Sept. 10, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Nov. 14, 2007	.....	0	Oct. 9, 2007	Nov. 16, 2007	Nov. 30, 2007	129

Title	Bill No.	Date introduced	Committee		Date Reported		Report No.		Date of passage		Public Law	
			House	Senate	House	Senate	House 110–	Senate 110–	House	Senate	Date approved	No. 110–
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1400 Highway 41 North in Inverness, Florida, as the "Chief Warrant Officer Aaron Weaver Post Office Building".	H.R. 3530	Sept. 14, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Nov. 14, 2007	.....	0	Oct. 9, 2007	Nov. 16, 2007	Nov. 30, 2007	130
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4320 Blue Parkway in Kansas City, Missouri, as the "Wallace S. Hartsfield Post Office Building".	H.R. 3572 (S. 2150)	Sept. 18, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Nov. 14, 2007	.....	0	Oct. 15, 2007	Nov. 16, 2007	Nov. 30, 2007	131
To reauthorize the African Elephant Conservation Act and the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994.	H.R. 50	Jan. 4, 2007	NR	EPW	July 23, 2007	Aug. 2, 2007	244	0	July 23, 2007	Nov. 16, 2007	Dec. 6, 2007	132
To reauthorize the Asian Elephant Conservation Act of 1997.	H.R. 465	Jan. 12, 2007	NR	EPW	July 23, 2007	Aug. 2, 2007	245	212	July 23, 2007	Nov. 16, 2007	Dec. 6, 2007	133
To reauthorize the Head Start Act, to improve program quality, to expand access, and for other purposes.	H.R. 1429	Mar. 9, 2007	E&L		Mar. 23, 2007	.....	67	.....	May 2, 2007	June 19, 2007	Dec. 12, 2007	134
To amend title 49, United States Code, to modify age standards for pilots engaged in commercial aviation operations.	H.R. 4343	Dec. 11, 2007	TI			.....	.....	.....	Dec. 11, 2007	Dec. 12, 2007	Dec. 13, 2007	135
To provide for an additional temporary extension of programs under the Small Business Act and the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 through May 23, 2008, and for other purposes.	H.R. 4252	Dec. 4, 2007	SB			.....	.....	.....	Dec. 5, 2007	Dec. 7, 2007	Dec. 14, 2007	136
Making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2008, and for other purposes.	H.J. Res. 69	Dec. 12, 2007	App			.....	.....	.....	Dec. 13, 2007	Dec. 13, 2007	Dec. 14, 2007	137
To implement the United States-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement.	H.R. 3688	Sept. 27, 2007	WM		Nov. 5, 2007	.....	421	.....	Nov. 8, 2007	Dec. 4, 2007	Dec. 14, 2007	138
To provide that the great hall of the Capitol Visitor Center shall be known as Emancipation Hall.	H.R. 3315	Aug. 2, 2007	TI		Nov. 8, 2007	.....	436	.....	Nov. 13, 2007	Dec. 6, 2007	Dec. 18, 2007	139
To move the United States toward greater energy independence and security,to increase the production of clean renewable fuels, to protect consumers,to increase the 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.	H.R. 6	Jan. 12, 2007	WM NR Bud R			.....	.....	.....	Jan. 18, 2007	June 21, 2007	Dec. 19, 2007	140
To exclude from gross income payments from the Hokie Spirit Memorial Fund to the victims of the tragic event at Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University.	H.R. 4118	Nov. 8, 2007	WM			.....	.....	.....	Dec. 4, 2007	Dec. 6, 2007	Dec. 19, 2007	141
To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude discharges of indebtedness on principal residences from gross income, and for other purposes.	H.R. 3648	Sept. 25, 2007	WM	Fin	Oct. 1, 2007		356	.....	Oct. 4, 2007	Dec. 14, 2007	Dec. 20, 2007	142
To provide for a research program for remediation of closed methamphetamine production laboratories, and for other purposes.	H.R. 365	Jan. 10, 2007	Sci	EPW	Feb. 7, 2007		8	.....	Feb. 7, 2007	Dec. 11, 2007	Dec. 21, 2007	143
To amend the National Organ Transplant Act to provide that criminialpenalties do not apply to human organ paired donation, and for otherpurposes.	H.R. 710	Jan. 29, 2007	EC			.....	.....	.....	Mar. 7, 2007	July 9, 2007	Dec. 21, 2007	144

Title	Bill No.	Date introduced	Committee		Date Reported		Report No.		Date of passage		Public Law	
			House	Senate	House	Senate	House 110–	Senate 110–	House	Senate	Date approved	No. 110–
To designate the Department of Veterans Affairs outpatient clinic in Green Bay, Wisconsin, as the "Milo C. Huempfner Department of Veterans Affairs Outpatient Clinic".	H.R. 2408	May 21, 2007	VA	VA			.....	.....	Oct. 23, 2007	Dec. 13, 2007	Dec. 21, 2007	145
To designate the United States courthouse located at 301North Miami Avenue, Miami, Florida, as the "C. Clyde Atkins United States Courthouse".	H.R. 2671	June 12, 2007	TI	EPW	Sept. 14, 2007		326	.....	Oct. 29, 2007	Dec. 13, 2007	Dec. 21, 2007	146
To amend section 5112(p)(1)(A) of title 31, United States Code, to allow an exception from the $1 coin dispensing capability requirement for certain vending machines.	H.R. 3703	Sept. 27, 2007	FS			.....	.....	.....	Nov. 13, 2007	Dec. 17, 2007	Dec. 21, 2007	147
To amend the Arizona Water Settlements Act to modify therequirements for the statement of findings.	H.R. 3739	Oct. 3, 2007	NR	IA	Dec. 11, 2007		484	.....	Dec. 11, 2007	Dec. 14, 2007	Dec. 21, 2007	148
Making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2008, and for other purposes.	H.J. Res. 72	Dec. 18, 2007	App			.....	.....	.....	Dec. 19, 2007	Dec. 19, 2007	Dec. 21, 2007	149
To amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research.	S. 597	Feb. 14, 2007		HS&GA	.....	Nov. 7, 2007	.....	222	Dec. 11, 2007	Nov. 14, 2007	Dec. 21, 2007	150
To amend section 1091 of title 18, United States Code, to allow the prosecution of genocide in appropriate circumstances.	S. 888	Mar. 15, 2007	Jud	Jud		Mar. 26, 2007	.....	0	Dec. 5, 2007	Mar. 29, 2007	Dec. 21, 2007	151
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 175 South Monroe Street in Tiffin, Ohio, as the "Paul E. Gillmor Post Office Building".	S. 2174	Oct. 17, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Nov. 14, 2007	.....	0	Dec. 17, 2007	Nov. 16, 2007	Dec. 21, 2007	152
To amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to make technical corrections.	S. 2371	Nov. 15, 2007			.....	.....	.....	.....	Dec. 5, 2007	Nov. 15, 2007	Dec. 21, 2007	153
To rename the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development as the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.	S. 2484	Dec. 13, 2007			.....	.....	.....	.....	Dec. 17, 2007	Dec. 13, 2007	Dec. 21, 2007	154
Providing for the reappointment of Patricia Q. Stonesifer as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.	S.J. Res. 8	Mar. 8, 2007	HA	RAdm			.....	.....	Dec. 5, 2007	July 31, 2007	Dec. 21, 2007	155
To designate the Department of Veterans Affairs Outpatient Clinic in Tulsa, Oklahoma, as the "Ernest Childers Department of Veterans Affairs Outpatient Clinic".	H.R. 366	Jan. 10, 2007	VA	VA			.....	.....	June 25, 2007	Dec. 19, 2007	Dec. 26, 2007	156
To amend title 38, United States Code, to improve compensation benefits for veterans in certain cases of impairment of vision involving both eyes, to provide for the use of the National Directory of New Hires for income verification purposes, to extend the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide an educational assistance allowance for qualifying workstudy activities, and to authorize the provision of bronze representationsof the letter "V" for the graves of eligible individuals buried in private cemeteries in lieu of Government-provided headstones or markers.	H.R. 797 (S. 1163)	Feb. 5, 2007	VA	VA	Mar. 20, 2007	.....	57	.....	Mar. 21, 2007	Nov. 2, 2007	Dec. 26, 2007	157

Title	Bill No.	Date introduced	Committee		Date Reported		Report No.		Date of passage		Public Law	
			House	Senate	House	Senate	House 110–	Senate 110–	House	Senate	Date approved	No. 110–
To designate the Federal building located at 210 Walnut Street in Des Moines, Iowa, as the "Neal Smith Federal Building".	H.R. 1045	Feb. 14, 2007	TI	EPW	Mar. 12, 2007		46	.....	Mar. 13, 2007	Dec. 19, 2007	Dec. 26, 2007	158
To designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 100 East 8th Avenue in Pine Bluff,Arkansas, as the "George Howard, Jr. Federal Building and United States Courthouse".	H.R. 2011	April 24, 2007	TI	HS&GA EPW	June 25, 2007		209	.....	June 25, 2007	Dec. 19, 2007	Dec. 26, 2007	159
To extend the Terrorism Insurance Program of the Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes.	H.R. 2761	June 18, 2007	FS	BHUA	Sept. 6, 2007		318	.....	Sept. 19, 2007	Nov. 16, 2007	Dec. 26, 2007	160
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. 2764	June 18, 2007		App	.....	July 10, 2007	197	128	June 22, 2007	Sept. 6, 2007	Dec. 26, 2007	161
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 744 West Oglethorpe Highway in Hinesville, Georgia, as the "John Sidney 'Sid' Flowers Post Office Building".	H.R. 3470	Sept. 4, 2007	OGR	HS&GA			.....	.....	Nov. 13, 2007	Dec. 19, 2007	Dec. 26, 2007	162
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 16731 Santa Ana Avenue in Fontana, California, as the "Beatrice E. Watson Post Office Building".	H.R. 3569	Sept. 18, 2007	OGR	HS&GA			.....	.....	Nov. 13, 2007	Dec. 19, 2007	Dec. 26, 2007	163
To amend the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 topermit individuals who have served as employees of the Office of Compliance to serve as Executive Director, Deputy Executive Director, or General Counsel of the Office, and to permit individuals appointed to such positions to serve one additional term.	H.R. 3571	Sept. 18, 2007	HA	HS&GA		Dec. 18, 2007	.....	0	Oct. 2, 2007	Dec. 19, 2007	Dec. 26, 2007	164
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 797 Sam Bass Road in Round Rock, Texas, as the "Marine Corps Corporal Steven P. Gill Post Office Building".	H.R. 3974	Oct. 25, 2007	OGR	HS&GA			.....	.....	Nov. 13, 2007	Dec. 19, 2007	Dec. 26, 2007	165
To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions, and for other purposes.	H.R. 3996	Oct. 30, 2007	WM		Nov. 6, 2007	.....	431	.....	Nov. 9, 2007	Dec. 6, 2007	Dec. 26, 2007	166
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 567 West Nepessing Street in Lapeer, Michigan, as the "Turrill Post Office Building".	H.R. 4009	Oct. 30, 2007	OGR	HS&GA			.....	.....	Dec. 11, 2007	Dec. 19, 2007	Dec. 26, 2007	167
To authorize a major medical facility project to modernize inpatient wards at the Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Atlanta, Georgia.	S. 1396	May 15, 2007	VA	VA			.....	.....	Dec. 19, 2007	Dec. 13, 2007	Dec. 26, 2007	168
To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11 Central Street in Hillsborough, New Hampshire, as the "Officer Jeremy Todd Charron Post Office".	S. 1896	July 30, 2007	OGR	HS&GA		Aug. 1, 2007	.....	0	Dec. 19, 2007	Aug. 3, 2007	Dec. 26, 2007	169
To amend the Public Health Service Act to modify the program for the sanctuary system for surplus chimpanzees by terminating the authority for the removal of chimpanzeesfrom the system for research purposes.	S. 1916	Aug. 1, 2007	EC	HEL&P		Dec. 12, 2007	.....	0	Dec. 19, 2007	Dec. 13, 2007	Dec. 26, 2007	170

Title	Bill No.	Date introduced	Committee		Date Reported		Report No.		Date of passage		Public Law	
			House	Senate	House	Senate	House 110–	Senate 110–	House	Senate	Date approved	No. 110–
Granting the consent of Congress to the International Emergency Management Assistance Memorandum of Understanding.	S.J. Res. 13	May 21, 2007		Jud	.....	Sept. 27, 2007	.....	0	Dec. 17, 2007	Oct. 2, 2007	Dec. 26, 2007	171
To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make technical corrections, and for other purposes.	H.R. 4839	Dec. 19, 2007	WM			.....	.....	.....	Dec. 19, 2007	Dec. 19, 2007	Dec. 29, 2007	172
To amend titles XVIII, XIX, and XXI of the Social Security Act to extend provisions under the Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP programs, and for other purposes.	S. 2499	Dec. 18, 2007			.....	.....	.....	.....	Dec. 19, 2007	Dec. 18, 2007	Dec. 29, 2007	173
To authorize State and local governments to divest assets in companies that conduct business operations in Sudan, to prohibit United States Government contracts with such companies, and for other purposes.	S. 2271	Oct. 31, 2007	FS OGR FA E&L	BHUA		.....	Oct. 31, 2007	213	Dec. 18, 2007	Dec. 12, 2007	Dec. 31, 2007	174
To promote accessibility, accountability, and openness in Government by strengthening section 552 of title 5, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Freedom of Information Act), and for other purposes.	S. 2488	Dec. 14, 2007	OGR			.....	.....	.....	Dec. 18, 2007	Dec. 14, 2007	Dec. 31, 2007	175
To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the term of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.	S. 2436	Dec. 10, 2007			.....	.....	.....	.....	Dec. 19, 2007	Dec. 19, 2007	Jan. 4, 2008	176
To amend title 18, United States Code, to protect judges, prosecutors, witnesses, victims, and their family members, and for other purposes.	H.R. 660	Jan. 24, 2007	Jud WM OGR	Jud	July 10, 2007		218	.....	July 10, 2007	Dec. 17, 2007	Jan. 7, 2008	177
To provide for the transfer of the Library of Congress police to the United States Capitol Police, and for other purposes.	H.R. 3690	Sept. 27, 2007	HA TI		Dec. 4, 2007	.....	470	.....	Dec. 5, 2007	Dec. 17, 2007	Jan. 7, 2008	178
To amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to fraud in connection with major disaster or emergency funds.	S. 863	Mar. 13, 2007	Jud	Jud		May 22, 2007	.....	69	Dec. 19, 2007	Dec. 4, 2007	Jan. 7, 2008	179
To improve the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, and for other purposes.	H.R. 2640	June 11, 2007	Jud	Jud			.....	.....	June 13, 2007	Dec. 19, 2007	Jan. 8, 2008	180

TABLE OF COMMITTEE ABBREVIATIONS

AG .....Aging
Agr .....Agriculture
ANF .....Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
App .....Appropriations
AS-H .....Armed Services (House)
AS-S .....Armed Services (Senate)
BHUA ....Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Bud .....Budget
CST .....Commerce, Science, and Transportation
E&L .....Education and Labor
EC .....Energy and Commerce
ENR .....Energy and Natural Resources
EPW .....Environment and Public Works
ETH .....Ethics
Fin .....Finance
FS .....Financial Services
FA .....Foreign Affairs
FR .....Foreign Relations
HEL&P ..Health, Education, Labor and Pensions
HS .....Homeland Security
HS&GA ..Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
HA .....House Administration
HK .....Hurricane Katrina
IA .....Indian Affairs
Int .....Intelligence
Jud .....Judiciary
NR .....Natural Resources
OGR .....Oversight and Government Reform
R .....Rules
RAdm ....Rules and Administration
Sci .....Science and Technology
SB .....Small Business
SOC .....Standards of Official Conduct
TI .....Transportation and Infrastructure
VA .....Veterans' Affairs
WM .....Ways and Means

NOTE. –The bill in parentheses is a companion measure.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

12 noon, Tuesday, March 18

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Senate will meet in a pro forma session.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Friday, March 14

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Consideration of the Senate amendment to H.R. 3773—FISA Amendments Act of 2008.

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.