United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 154 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 10, 2008 No. 57

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 10, 2008.

I hereby appoint the Honorable HENRY CUELLAR to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

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

Whether the darkness is fear, anxiety, prejudice, or mere confusion, wake us with Your dawn, O Lord.

Free us, that we may be children of light; bold in faith, humble in truth, and loving in service.

Empower us to reach out to all our brothers and sisters across this Nation.

May we walk with compassion, enveloped with the sense of unity as we approach a new day of universal understanding.

Lord, make us all heralds of good news, whether richly blessed or humbled by need. For You can strengthen us by the sheer determination to build Your kingdom with the help of one another, both now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

THE GOVERNMENT OF VIETNAM SHOULD END IMPRISONMENT, DETENTION AND HARASSMENT OF SIGNERS OF MANIFESTO ON FREEDOM AND DEMOCRACY FOR VIETNAM

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

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 1089, which I introduced on Tuesday, calling for an end to the Vietnamese Government's imprisonment, detention and harassment of those who signed the Manifesto on Freedom and Democracy For Vietnam.

On April 8, 2006, 118 Vietnamese citizens signed a manifesto in support of peaceful action to bring democracy and basic human rights to the Vietnamese people. Thousands of Vietnamese people have since signed this document, refusing to be silent while their government continues to violate their human rights. In retaliation, the Government of Vietnam has jailed, detained and harassed those brave people.

I introduced this important resolution to mark the 2-year anniversary of the original signing of the manifesto and to highlight the ongoing human rights atrocities in Vietnam.

Not only does my resolution call on the Government of Vietnam to release peaceful advocates, but it also asks our State Department to establish a list of Countries of Particular Concern based on human rights violations, which would hold nations like Vietnam accountable.

PAYTON POE ALEXANDER—NEW TEXAN

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, the miracle of birth is a remarkable, happy event. None of us pick our parents or the place from which we come. The good Lord makes those decisions, and some of us have the fortune of being born in America.

Yesterday, April 9, at 10:28 a.m. in the central Texas town of Waco, another child took his first breath of the

Printed on recycled paper.

crisp air of life, being born in the land of the free.

Payton Poe Alexander showed up tipping the scales at 9 pounds-1 ounce and a height of 22 inches. Not bad for his first day on earth. His mother, Kara, my daughter, and his father Shane, are right-thinking, God-fearing people. Payton's little 2-year-old sister Elizabeth, shall we say, is inquisitive.

Mr. Speaker, we all get excited when kids are born, because we see in those innocent eyes the hope of the world, the chance that this new child might make a difference for the rest of us.

My hope for my new grandson is that he grows up embodying the spirit of truth, justice and the American way, and that he plays football for the University of Texas and not Texas A&M.

And that's just the way it is.

OPPOSE THE BUSH COLOMBIA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT

(Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the Bush Colombia Free Trade Agreement. Like many here, I would like to see our relationship with Colombia strengthened, but the NAFTA-style Colombia FTA would actually do more harm than good.

The Bush administration refuses to change its stubborn ways. By deciding to force the trade agreement through Congress without seeking support or input from the House leadership, the administration continues to demonstrate its lack of judgment and sensibility.

Despite many serious concerns about the Colombia Free Trade Agreement, this administration continues to believe that it can unilaterally demand and approve legislation as it pleases, when it pleases. Unfortunately, it doesn't work that way.

Until the Bush administration understands that it must make fundamental changes in its approach to trade, this House will oppose its one-sided trade deals. We need trade deals that work for American working families. The Bush Colombia FTA is not it.

MR. CARTER—DON'T MEET WITH HAMAS

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

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, The Washington Post reports that President Carter will visit Syria next week to meet with a Hamas assassin, Khaled Meshal. The State Department lists Hamas as a foreign terrorist organization, and it is responsible for the murder of at least 26 American citizens: David and Nava Applebaum of Ohio, killed just before Nava's wedding; Alan Beer of Ohio; Marla Bennet of California; Benjamin Blustein of Pennsylvania; David Boim of New York; Yael Botwin of California; Dina Carter of North Carolina; Janis Ruth Coulter of Massachusetts; Sara Duker of New Jersey; Matthew Eisenfeld of Connecticut; Tzvi Goldstein of New York; Judith Greenbaum of New Jersey; David Gritz of Massachusetts; Dina Horowitz of Florida; Rabbi Eli Horowitz of Illinois; Tehilla Nathanson of New York, age 3; Malka Roth of New York; Mordechai Reinitz of New York; Yitzhak Reinitz of New York; Leah Stern of New Jersey; Goldie Taubenfeld of New York; Shmuel Taubenfeld, 3 months old, of New York; Nachshon Wachsman of New York; Ira Weinstein of New York; and Yitzhak Weinstock of California.

President Carter, the voices from the grave beseech you, do not meet with the man that ordered the murder of these American citizens.

I urge Members to sign our letter asking former President Carter not to meet with the killer of American citizens.

SUPPORT THE STOP OUTSOURCING SECURITY ACT

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, the State Department decided to renew Blackwater's $1.2 billion contract for another year. It has been over 6 months since Blackwater contractors killed 17 innocent Iraqi civilians, 16 months since the Christmas Eve murder in the Green Zone, and 35 months since a Blackwater helicopter dropped CS gas on a traffic jam in Baghdad. Yet there have been no arrests, no charges, no trials, no convictions. Nothing.

The Department of Justice, the FBI and State Department have remained completely silent about these investigations. Meanwhile, those contractors are still working side-by-side with our troops in Iraq.

But what is even more appalling is that our government has ignored those abuses and renewed Blackwater's contract. If you owned a company, would you rehire someone who has killed dozens of innocent people? The State Department's decision not only puts the lives of innocent Iraqi civilians at risk, but it threatens the safety of our troops and jeopardizes our mission in Iraq.

I urge my colleagues to sign on to my bill, H.R. 4102, the SOS, or Stop Outsourcing Security Act, and phase out the use of military security contractors in Iraq and Afghanistan.

WINNING IN IRAQ

(Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, yesterday General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker updated members of the House Armed Services Committee and Foreign Affairs Committee regarding the conditions on the ground in Iraq. Noting successes on the military and political fronts, both indicated reasons to be optimistic about the progress being made.

Having recently visited Iraq, I am not surprised to hear about these successes. Violence is down and reconciliation is happening. But the progress is fragile, a sentiment echoed by both Ambassador Crocker and General Petraeus.

During the hearing, many of my Democrat colleagues asked about the cost of the war. Is it expensive? Yes, the cost is expensive. My question to them is, what will be the cost of defeat, and are you willing to pay for it?

HONORING ABBY LEVINE ON THE OCCASION OF HIS 90TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a remarkable and outstanding member of our community, Mr. Abby Levine. Abby and his wife Mildred have devoted their lives to addressing critical social, political and humanitarian issues.

Abby is celebrating an important milestone this week, the occasion of his 90th birthday. At nine decades young, Abby, in addition to his other commitments, is working to build a vibrant Jewish community among young people in South Florida.

Abby and Mildred helped establish the Levine-Weinberger Jewish Life Center at Florida Atlantic University, which has become the nerve center of Jewish life on campus. Abby and Mildred are also generous supporters of a number of other causes, including the Boca Raton Community Hospital, and their dedication to improving our community is deeply valued.

Madam Speaker, I join countless friends, family members and loved ones in South Florida in wishing Abby a wonderful birthday, and many more years of good health and happiness.

□ 1015

NEW EMPLOYEE VERIFICATION SYSTEM

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on November 1, the Nation's employment verification system, E-Verify, is going to expire.

E-Verify is a broken employment verification system that has helped grow the number of illegal immigrants in America to over 12 million. We have got to find new solutions.

Our bill, H.R. 5515, the New Employment Verification Act or NEVA, would

replace the current paper-based and error-prone I–9 process upon which E-Verify is based with an electronic verification system. H.R. 5515 would use the existing new hire registry reporting process already used by over 90 percent of U.S. employers. This bill will create a national employment verification system for new hires that's reliable and efficient.

With E-Verify scheduled to expire this year, now is the time for the Congress to create a new way to move forward that prevents unauthorized employment. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 5515.

HONORING THE UNIVERSITY OF MEMPHIS BASKETBALL TEAM

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, as an alumnus of the University of Memphis Law School and the congressman from the University of Memphis district, I still grieve over the outcome of the game Monday night, but I want to congratulate the University of Kansas for winning the national basketball championship and thank the city of San Antonio for being such a wonderful host.

On behalf of the citizens of Memphis, I want the country to know we love our team. They brought our city together, which needed a unifying force. We are proud that our coach who made that team what it was has been named the National Coach of the Year by the Naismith Society.

Our players played valiantly. We came very, very close to a national championship. We won more games than any team in NCAA history. We will look back upon this year with fondness and appreciation and we will, like General MacArthur, return.

THE HUGO CHAVEZ RULE

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, it pains me greatly to stand here in the well and report to our colleagues that the Rules Committee late yesterday afternoon reported out what can only be described as the Hugo Chavez rule.

For the first time in the 34-year history of trade promotion authority, we have now decided that we are going to take the action of turning our backs on an agreement that we have made with our closest, most important and strongest ally on the continent of South America.

The Vice President of Colombia has described this action as a slap in the face. Hugo Chavez and the narcoterrorists in Colombia are celebrating this action. It is an absolute outrage that we would do this.

I have to say that this administration 4 years ago embarked on these negotiations, 2 years ago completed the negotiations, a year and a half ago signed the negotiations. Since August of last year, 265 meetings have been held with Democratic Members by members of the administration, cabinet officials and all, and 27 meetings have been held with the Democratic leadership.

It is time for us to complete this work. It's time for us to strengthen this very important alliance.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote ''no'' on the Hugo Chavez rule.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2537, BEACH PROTECTION ACT OF 2007

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1083 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1083

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2537) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relating to beach monitoring, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII before the beginning of consideration of the bill and except pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Each amendment so printed may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or his designee and shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration in the House of H.R. 2537 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART).

All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1083 provides an open rule with a preprinting requirement for consideration of H.R. 2537, the Beach Protection Act of 2007.

The resolution provides 1 hour of general debate, controlled by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Some of our Nation's greatest treasures are the beautiful beaches that surround our country. So many of us have spent time with our families and friends enjoying our country's picturesque coastlines. Our beaches not only provide a place for relaxation and recreation, they are also a vital economic engine that draws tourists from all over the globe.

As a mother and a grandmother, I want to ensure that our Nation's children are swimming and enjoying our beaches that are safe and free of any harmful contamination. Unfortunately, a recent EPA report found that human health studies over the last 50 years have linked swimming and polluted water with significant adverse health effects. Swimming-related diseases can range from minor gastrointestinal diseases to more serious illnesses such as meningitis or hepatitis.

This is extremely troubling and is a great concern to all of us. According to the National List of Beaches, only 57 percent of the Nation's coastal recreation areas are being monitored.

In my home State of California, 114 of our 356 beaches are not monitored, leaving a huge amount of people at risk. That is why I would like to thank Representative PALLONE for his work on such an important piece of legislation, legislation that builds on the ambitious vision that the 1972 Clean Water Act set forth.

As an original author of the 2000 bill, my friend from New Jersey has long been recognized for his efforts to clean up our Nation's beaches.

I would also like to thank Representative TIM BISHOP for his leadership and work on this issue.

The Beach Protection Act builds on the great effort of the original BEACH Act and is a vital tool that will help ensure the safety of our national coastal treasures. Under the 2000 BEACH Act, the EPA was required to work with States to ensure they use the latest science to test beach waters to protect the public health.

States are required to notify the public if tests showed water quality standards were violated. The law also helps States set up monitoring and notification programs in order to provide up-to-date information on the condition of all public beaches.

H.R. 2537, the Beach Protection Act of 2007, advances the good work of the original act and takes us into the next generation of water monitoring. The bill increases the authorization through 2012 for the EPA's beach program by $10 million to $40 million per year. This money will be used to provide grants to States along the coasts and Great Lakes for recreational water monitoring and notification programs.

H.R. 2537 also clarifies and enhances public notification when coastal waters are likely contaminated. Visitors to our beaches need to know when there is potential threat to their health. The bill clarifies that the public must be notified within 24 hours when a contaminated water sample is found. The bill also requires that a physical sign must be posted at any beach where the water may be contaminated. This information is essential for public awareness and avoidance of harmful pollutants.

H.R. 2537 also promotes increased compliance. It requires the EPA administrator to conduct an annual review of implementation by State and local governments. If the public is not being protected, it requires the EPA to take corrective actions.

Representative PALLONE has shown tremendous leadership with this bill that puts public safety at the forefront and goes to great lengths to protect our Nation's beaches. I know he has worked closely with my friend and colleague, Representative EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, who chairs the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

Later today we will debate the chairwoman's manager's amendment that directs the EPA to complete and use a rapid-testing technology. This type of testing is intended to shorten the period between when a water sample is taken and when results are made public. When this testing is in place, the period of time necessary for testing coastal waters is likely to shorten from 24 to simply 2 or 3 hours.

Passage of the Beach Protection Act of 2007 is an important step to promoting public health and ensuring that the millions of people who visit our coastal treasures remain safe.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to thank my good friend, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) for the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Florida is the number one travel destination in the world, with over 80 million visitors last year. They contributed over $60 billion to the economy of the State.

Part of the reason so many people come to Florida is because of the over 1,200 miles of beautiful beaches throughout the State. Florida's great beaches provide an endless wealth of recreational opportunities. But in order for everyone to enjoy those great beaches we have to make sure that the waters are safe and that they are clean.

In 2000, Congress passed the Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health Act. That legislation was passed to limit and prevent human exposure to polluted coastal recreation waters by assisting States and local governments to implement beach monitoring assessment and public notification programs. In addition, that act required States and tribes with coastal recreation waters to adopt minimum water quality standards for pathogens and pathogen indicators.

The legislation being brought to the floor today with this rule would reauthorize the BEACH Act through 2012 and increase the annual authorized appropriation from $30 million to $40 million.

□ 1030

Again, Mr. Speaker, the majority likes to proclaim that they have offered yet another bill under what they call an open rule; but this is not an open rule, this is a restrictive rule.

According to a Survey of Activities of the House Committee on Rules from the 104th Congress, an open rule is defined as ''one under which any Member may offer an amendment that complies with the standing rules of the House and the Budget Act.''

A modified open rule, requiring preprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, is defined as a type of rule that permits the offering only of those amendments printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Because Members under this rule must submit their amendments prior to floor consideration, they are prohibited from offering amendments on the floor as the debate progresses.

So if a Member is watching the debate and has an idea to improve the bill, this rule prevents that Member from offering their amendment. So by its very nature, this rule is restrictive. It is not an open rule and the majority should stop calling it that.

I also would like to point out that once again the majority offers even this modified open rule, or modified restrictive rule on noncontroversial bills, bills with obvious bipartisan support. For example, the underlying legislation passed the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee by a unanimous vote.

If the majority really wants to live up to their campaign promise of a more open and bipartisan Congress, then they should offer a truly open rule on this bill, and on bills where there is some controversy as well.

On Tuesday, a distinguished member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS), offered an amendment to the rule which would have allowed the House to consider this noncontroversial bill under a truly open rule. However, that amendment was defeated.

So instead, here we are 16 months into the new majority under another restrictive rule. Other than on appropriations bills, the new majority has allowed only one open rule. Today they had the chance to double the number of open rules; but instead, they decided to use a restrictive process for a noncontroversial bill.

I don't know what they are afraid of. The original BEACH Act was considered under a true open rule. We should have considered this bill under suspension of the rules which doesn't even require a rule, it just goes automatically to the floor because it is noncontroversial, and we should have instead finished our work on bipartisan legislation to protect Americans from international terrorism, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act known as FISA.

Or we could have considered legislation to postponed the scheduled 10.1 percent cut in Medicare payments for physicians and other health care professionals.

Instead, what we are doing today, Mr. Speaker, what the majority leadership has decided to do today is to make this a day of legislative action that will live in infamy. Ever since 1974, legislation has existed, Mr. Speaker, to permit agreements that are negotiated with foreign governments by the United States, trade agreements, to come to this floor under the Trade Act of 1974 that established trade promotion authority, certainty in the rules process for when an agreement is negotiated so that our negotiating partners, countries we are negotiating with, know that there are certain rules. That if the United States makes a deal, enters into an agreement, that that agreement will be brought to the floor.

And so what the majority leadership in this Congress has done today is to say yes, yes, yes, but for and except Colombia. Colombia, that happens to be our best ally and friend in this hemisphere, under the measure today being brought to the floor by the majority leadership of this House, they are being insulted. And so our trade rules apply, yes; but for Colombia, Mr. Speaker. That is what the majority leadership has decided to do today.

What they have told Colombia, in the midst of a war against narcotraffickers, financed by narcotrafficking,

the enemies of Colombia, what the Democratic leadership of this House is telling the democratically elected government of Colombia today is: We don't care; we don't care. The trade rules apply to the world, but not to you.

Well, fortunately, there is an administration, an executive branch that is standing with the people of Colombia and their democratically elected government and President, President Alvaro Uribe. And there are a lot of Members in this House, Mr. Speaker, who also stand with the people of Colombia as they fight the terrorists, as they bravely confront the terrorists. There are a lot of us in this House who stand with the people of Colombia, and a lot of us in the Senate who do also. But unfortunately, the majority leadership has said to Colombia today: No, you're on your own.

Well, I want the people of Colombia to know that they are not alone. We will continue to stand with the people of Colombia and their democratically elected government despite this day of legislative action that will live in infamy because that is what the majority leadership has scheduled today. The exception, the legislative exception for, in this instance, the best ally that the United States has in this hemisphere, Colombia. And that's more than unfortunate.

Now, with regard to the legislation on beaches that is absolutely noncontroversial, it should have been brought to the floor automatically. Obviously we are all in support of that legislation, Mr. Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring us back to the measure at hand which is H. Res. 1083 which provides for consideration of H.R. 2537, the Beach Protection Act of 2007, and I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), a member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. CASTOR. I thank my good friend and colleague from the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, oftentimes there is great irony here in Washington, and here is another example. The House will consider today this rule and the Beach Protection Act. The intent of the Beach Protection Act is to protect America's beautiful coastlines from water pollution. But here is the irony: Big oil interests have filed an amendment that puts our beaches and America's coastlines at risk. Their proposed amendment seeks to open up our beautiful coastlines to offshore drilling of oil and gas. New offshore oil and gas drilling represents a real hazard to our marine environment, especially in my home State of Florida and the Tampa Bay area.

The beaches, the coastal environment, marine resources and our billion-dollar tourism industry in Florida should not be sacrificed for a small amount of oil and natural gas because the oil and natural gas that is projected to be recovered if we open up our offshore areas to drilling, it is projected to provide less than 1 month, 1 month supply of oil and gas.

In addition, researchers at the Department of Oceanography at the University of South Florida have warned that it would only take 24 hours for an petroleum spill in the eastern Gulf of Mexico to sully Florida's panhandle beaches and then sweep through the gulf's powerful loop current, travel through the Florida Keys and contaminate estuaries and beaches from the Everglades to Cape Canaveral.

We only have to look back to 2005, Hurricane Katrina, Hurricane Rita, and Hurricane Wilma ended up resulting in many oil and gas pollutants seriously affecting the beaches in the Gulf of Mexico. The storms caused 124 oil spills into the waters of the Gulf of Mexico. During Hurricane Katrina alone, 233,000 gallons of oil were spilled. There was 508,000 gallons of oil spilled during Hurricane Rita. A full year after Hurricane Katrina, BP admitted that a damaged oil well valve in the Gulf of Mexico was still leaking oil.

The knee-jerk reaction to take every opportunity, even a bill called the Beach Protection Act, to open up our beautiful coastline to additional oil drilling, especially in hurricane-prone waters like Florida's gulf coast is ridiculous, not just ironic.

So let's stay true to the Beach Protection Act, fight water pollution, strengthen our natural resources and our tourism economy and vote down the Peterson amendment today.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, just the State I am honored to represent alone, Florida, exports are expected to jump by over $160 million, and 1,700 jobs are to be created in the first year alone if the agreement with Colombia is ratified. That is just the State that I am honored to represent alone.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague bringing up the issue of energy and the connection of energy to this bill because that is what we intend to do here today.

The irony behind this debate is that Americans really appreciate healthy beaches; but what they are really mad about is high gas prices. I have three kids, 15, 13 and 8. My wife is driving them all over the world to attend every event that kids do today, and the soccer moms of the world are outraged over the price of gas that they are paying.

And what has this Democrat majority been doing to continue to affect the price of gas, we just heard it, let's take more assets off the ability to explore. We just heard it from my colleague who just said no more exploration for oil. Where is the plan that the Speaker touted would lower gas prices? That was over 700 days ago. We want answers. We want this majority to do something about the high cost of gasoline.

We have truck drivers prepared to strike over the price of diesel, $4 a gallon gasoline is on the horizon, and this majority is doing nothing, nothing.

Here is the energy plan: When you have no energy plan, you plan to fail. When this majority took over, the price of a barrel of crude oil was $58. What is it today, $110 per barrel. That translates into a gasoline price of originally $2.33 a gallon to now, $3.34, $3.50, $3.75, and $4. At $3.44, that is a $1.01 increase since this majority took over. Where is the energy plan to lower gasoline prices? The Speaker's plan means that you pay more in energy costs in this country.

The beaches that are affected in this legislation, Great Lakes, the coastal beaches, guess what, if I want to take advantage of these healthy beaches, I would have to drive about 285 miles to get to the Great Lakes. I would have to drive a lot farther, almost 745 miles to get to the gulf coast. Last year the cost to Chicago would be about $53. This year the cost is $76. We lose discretionary income when we allow gas prices to go up.

Another connection, to go to the great State of Florida to take my family on a vacation, that would have cost me last year $138 to drive. This year, $200 to drive. Do you think that is not going to affect the economy of the Florida coastal areas? Do you think that is going to halt our folks going to your State, my friend from Miami, to enjoy these great, healthy beaches. My folks can't afford to drive to these beaches to enjoy them anymore.

And what is the Democrat plan for gas prices? Silence. Nothing. The only plan is the plan to fail. The only plan is higher prices. Here it is: $58 a barrel when you came in, $110 a barrel today.

Let me give you some quotes. Speaker NANCY PELOSI said on April 24, 2006, ''Democrats have a commonsense plan to bring down skyrocketing gas prices.''

□ 1045

Well, these skyrocketing prices aren't going down, folks. Speaker PELOSI's plan is to have skyrocketing price increases for gasoline, not decreases. We got it wrong.

It's this whole change mentality. Change is good. Change can be bad. The change in this majority has been bad for the cost of energy in this country.

And what are we doing? We're talking about healthy beaches. Healthy beaches. We ought to be talking about the price of gasoline. We ought to be talking about the price of diesel fuel. We ought to be talking about the price of electricity generation, nuclear power, clean coal technology. But no, healthy beaches. I hope my folks can enjoy and benefit by these healthy beaches.

It's been days since Majority Leader STENY HOYER said, ''Democrats believe that we can do more for the American people who are struggling to deal with high gas prices.'' Mr. Majority leader, what did you do? You raised prices. You didn't decrease prices. You raised prices. Everyone knows that prices have gone up.

Truckers are going to strike over record diesel prices. Diesel this week was at an average of more than $4 a gallon in Oregon and Washington, and nearly $4.12.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. In California, according to the American Trucking Association, if a trucker is filling up a 300-gallon semi, that bill could top $1,200.

We want to talk about competitive nature. We want manufacturing jobs in this country. Energy prices are killing our ability to compete in the world economy. It's killing our ability to get or product to the ports to ship them overseas to be competitive. It's killing our ability to manufacture the goods using innovation and technology, because that requires energy.

No energy plan is a plan to fail. Change is not always good. This is a change that the Democrat majority has brought us. $58.31, the price of a barrel of crude oil upon the assumption of the leadership here in this chamber. Current price today, $110.61. I have those on Velcro tabs so I can just keep following that price as it keeps going up.

Sometimes a barrel of crude oil is hard to follow. People don't know what it translates into. Well, I translated it earlier, from $2.33 a gallon, to, on average, $3.34 a gallon, and we know it's going to hit 4. We know it's going to hit 4. And when it hits 4, who are they going to call? They're going to call us. And what are we going to say? We're going to say, ''Oh, the Democrats promised a plan in 2006 to lower prices.'' They're in the majority now. Let's see their plan.

A failure to plan is a plan that fails. You have no plan. We're increasing our costs. The economy is hurting, and we bring healthy beaches to the floor. Healthy beaches. High energy costs.

And my colleague who just followed me talked about excluding exploration of energy. She tied this debate to energy. She understood the importance.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Democrats have voted, not once, not twice, but four times to raise energy taxes on the 110th Congress.

There's a debate in the State of Illinois to lower our gas tax. Why? So the average American citizen can afford to do the job. In rural America, when we have to drive long distances, this directly affects the pocketbook of every citizen in rural America. Every citizen. They're going to drive 20, 30, 40 miles just to go to work.

Talk about the inner cities and the traffic congestion, the people who are idling, they're going to end up paying more.

Four times the Democrats have said we're going to change the gas price debate here in America and we're going to lower prices. We know that that hasn't worked. Not only have they added insult to injury, they said not only aren't we paying enough in gas prices now, but we want to put more taxes on gasoline. Shoot, $3.50 is not enough. Let's get to 4. Let's pay $4.50 a gallon. Let's pay higher energy costs.

And what do we see? The periodicals and newspapers, the print media are starting to understand. In the Buffalo News, April 9: $4 Gasoline Seems Possible This Summer.

There used to be a time when Americans got outraged at $3 a gallon. Well, we've sensitized them to over $3 a gallon. They were promised by the Democrat majority they would lower gas prices. They've increased gas prices. Now we have to get prepared for $4 a gallon.

What's next?

No energy plan is a plan to fail. The Washington Times: Price at the Pump Likely to Reach $4. Fox News, Denver, Colorado: $4 Per Gallon Creeps Closer.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Friends, healthy beaches are important. We all want to benefit from them. I'd like to take my family to a beach. A lot of my constituents like to go there. But if they can't afford the gasoline in the minivan to get them to appreciate these healthy beaches, for what benefit?

The Democrats, when they were in the majority, promised us, I've got the quotes, they promised us lower gas prices, lower gas prices. I read the quotes. Speaker PELOSI, Majority Leader HOYER, I've got one from JIM CLYBURN. Lower prices.

What do we have? Higher prices? And it's about time you started accepting responsibility and do something about these high prices.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thought we were doing a rule and not special orders right now.

We are working on the rule for the beaches, and we want to keep Americans safe from water pollutants.

I want to say we have an obligation to ensure Americans are safe and healthy, and this act would do it.

I reserve my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I would understand my colleague would be upset about speaking. I would understand why you would be ashamed about talking about healthy beaches and not addressing the real concerns of America which is high energy costs.

I've been on the floor numerous times, motions to recommit over the past year and a half to talk about energy crises. One the big things I've talked about is coal to liquid technologies.

You know what? It was your colleague who stepped on the floor and talked about we don't want oil exploration off the coast. We don't want more crude oil supplies.

Well, I have a solution that would help keep our beaches healthy. Let's use coal to liquid technologies. Let's mine our vast abundant resource of coal right here. Let's build a coal to liquid refinery. In fact, Sasol, the South African energy company, just announced that the Brits are going to buy synthetic aviation fuel.

You know, we had all these aviation industry folks just go bankrupt, these low cost airlines that could get to these healthy beaches. You know one reason why they went bankrupt? The high cost of aviation fuel. Those are jobs gone. Those are the inability of me and my family on a low cost airline to appreciate these healthy beaches.

Well, I have a solution. They've been to the floor on motion to commit coal to liquid technology. Get our coal, refine it in to liquid fuels, put it in a pipeline and ship it to our commercial and military aviation.

I've been using this chart for a year and a half. Has this majority moved on decreasing our reliance on imported crude oil? Negligibly. Zip, zero. Maybe on the RFS. I voted for it. I appreciate that.

But doing anything to expand our ability to get our own resources, no, we're here talking about healthy beaches. We don't want to talk about crude oil exploration. We want to talk about pristine beaches. We don't want to talk about that we're paying $110 per barrel of crude oil when it was $58 when you all came into the majority. Translates to a dollar more in gas. It's going to reach 4.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. So we have some options. We can be here spending all day talking about healthy beaches while our businesses and industries fall further behind, fail to compete because of high energy costs.

I haven't even got involved in climate change. Climate change is going

to bring additional cost to your gas tank, to your electricity. In fact, the only one who's been intellectually honest about this is Chairman DINGELL. What does he say? Fifty cents a gallon more to comply with climate change.

Now, if we want to do that, then let's vote on it. But you know what? You won't do it because it'll take that $4 a gallon a gas and move it up to $4.50.

Guess what? People are going to say, let's re-evaluate this. Let's understand if all the world nations are going to comply. Do we want all this pain, all that job dislocation, all these higher energy costs and no benefit?

If India and China do not comply, we get no benefit. All pain, no gain. All pain, job dislocation, higher energy costs, no gain. We ought to insist, before we go into any climate change agreement, that India and China sign on the dotted line verifiable that we know they're going to comply.

You know what? I've talked to them. They're not going to do it. They are not going to do it.

So why assume these costs? Why burden the American consumer? Why deplete our hotel and tourism industry by people not being able to get there, either through airlines who have failed or the ability to drive the long distances to get there.

This majority has had no plan to address. Well, they have. They've promised, lower gas prices, 2006. This Democrat majority promised lower gas prices, lower gas prices. What do we have? Higher gas prices. And no plan to mitigate.

You know how you mitigate it? You bring on more supply. And you all won't do that.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of the gentleman if he has any remaining speakers.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Yes. We have an additional speaker.

Ms. MATSUI. I reserve.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a deep concern. We, as a country, will be a second-rate nation in the next decade if we don't have an energy policy. America needs an energy policy. We need to have a plan of how we're going to have available, affordable fuel for everybody to run our companies, to heat our homes, to drive our cars.

We don't have an energy policy, folks. We have a policy where we've locked up our resources and we're going to let the rest of the world produce. Our dependence on foreign oil has increased 2 percent a year every year for 20 years.

□ 1100

We are on that path of maybe going to 3 percent a year. Because when we don't produce, they do and we pay. We have the rest of the world consuming greater and greater amounts of energy making us now bid for our energy.

I find it interesting. They like to say it's the six big American oil companies, or I guess it's five, that are the cause of our energy prices. The fact is, this Congress and the last three administrations are the reason we have high energy prices. This Congress locked up. This map right here shows we're the only country in the world that's locked up the outer continental shelf, the best and safest place to produce energy. Every country in the world produces there. Cuba will soon be producing energy 50-some miles off our coasts where we prohibit.

We need to have an energy policy. We need to open up our midwest. We need to open up our offshore. I have the bill. I heard talk in here a little bit ago about how we are going to savage the beaches. My bill opens up for natural gas only. The first 25 miles are locked up. The second 25 miles are only open if States choose to. The second 50 miles are open; States can still close it with the legislation. And the second hundred miles are open.

I ask for some Member of this Congress to show me a natural gas well that has ever polluted a beach. Natural gas bubbles up under the ground all over the country from gas pressure in the earth. Natural gas comes out of the ground naturally, and if we put a 6-inch hole in the ground, it comes out in a commercial way that we can heat our homes.

America has had the highest natural gas prices in the world. Natural gas is not a world price. Oil is a world price. Natural gas is not a world price. For 7 years now, soon going on 8, we've had the highest natural gas prices in the world, and our fertilizer companies are leaving because they use so much of it. Our petrochemical manufacturers are leaving, our polymers and plastic companies are leaving. People who have bend metal, treat metal, cook food are going to do it in other places where natural gas is a fraction than it is here. Clean, green natural gas is what America ought to be running on until we have viable renewable.

I met with wind people this morning. I'm for all the wind we can get. But if we double wind and solar, which so many people are counting on, in the next 5 years we will be less than three-quarters of 1 percent of our energy needs.

I find it unexplainable that we have the highest fuel prices for trucks and cars, the highest heating home costs on record, and this Congress doesn't even talk about it. We don't have a plan. We are doing stimulus packages because energy is taking the life out of our economy.

We're going to need to do a stimulus package every 6 months, because as soon as we inject another $220 billion in, the energy policies of this country are going to suck it right back out because Americans are going to spend more and more. We have $3.40 gasoline, soon to be $4, and if we have a storm in the gulf this summer, we will be looking at $5 gasoline. $5 gasoline will sink our economy.

We must have an energy policy.

Ms. MATSUI. I reserve.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. We have no further speakers, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciated the debate. Obviously, the legislation is of importance, the subject is of importance. We do need to preserve, protect that great treasure that our beaches are, but there are a number of issues that do need to be discussed that are not being discussed.

Unfortunately, one issue that should not be discussed is going to be discussed today which is to single out and discriminate against Colombia, our best friend in this hemisphere, in a shocking way, ultimately an unfortunate way.

We have no further speakers on this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

First, let me say that there is no need to open up more sensitive natural areas to drilling. The United States has 3 percent of the world's resources but 25 percent of the demand. It is obvious that there is no way for us to drill our way to energy independence.

If we are really concerned about lowering energy costs and reducing dependence on foreign oil, we need to invest in renewable resources, and we have passed legislation to do just that.

The open rule before us today is a fair rule that allows for debate on the important issues that face our country, from water pollutants to public health concerns. It is Congress' responsibility to set high standards and assert proper oversight of these issues.

The underlying bill, H.R. 2537, takes huge steps to promote public health throughout the great beaches of our country and ensure that our beaches will be preserved for future generations to enjoy and benefit from.

Congress has a distinct obligation to future generations to keep our water clean and preserve our beaches. This bill increases funding for States to effectively monitor the coasts, ensure swift public notification and takes us into the next generation of water monitoring. We have a commitment to keep the millions who visit our beaches safe and informed. This bill does just that, and I urge its adoption.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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 which the Chair will put de novo.

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

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

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. 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 approval of the Journal will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of H. Res. 1083 and motion to suspend the rules on H. Res. 1038.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 182, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 178]

YEAS—228

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Butterfield
Calvert
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
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards
Ellison
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fortenberry
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
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
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Welch (VT)
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—182

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Goode
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
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
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Pence
Perlmutter
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Sali
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—19

Andrews
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Buyer
Cubin
Ferguson
Gohmert
Gordon
Granger
Jones (OH)
Klein (FL)
Larson (CT)
Pearce
Ramstad
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sires
Weiner
Wexler

□ 1130

Mr. HAYES changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. ALTMIRE, McDERMOTT, and CARNEY changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 9, 2008.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a scanned copy of a certificate from the Honorable Debra Bowen, Secretary of State for the State of California, indicating that, according to the semi-final official canvass of votes from the Special Election held April 8, 2008, the Honorable Jackie Speier was elected Representative to Congress for the Twelfth Congressional District, State of California.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER.

Enclosure.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

I, Debra Bowen, Secretary of State of the State of California, hereby certify:

That according to the semi-final official canvass of votes cast in the Special Primary Election held on the 8th day of April, 2008 in the 12th Congressional District, Jackie Speier was elected to the office of United States Representative, District 12 for the term prescribed by law.

In witness whereof, I hereunto set my hand and affix the Great Seal of the State of California at Sacramento, this 9th day of April 2008.

DEBRA BOWEN,
Secretary of State.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE JACKIE SPEIER, OF CALIFORNIA, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Will the Representative-elect and the members of the California delegation present themselves in the well.

Ms. SPEIER 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 JACKIE SPEIER TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. STARK. Madam Speaker and my colleagues, as dean of the California delegation, it's my privilege, my honor, and my pleasure to introduce the newest Member of the California delegation, JACKIE SPEIER.

JACKIE was overwhelmingly elected by the residents of California's 12th Congressional District this week in a special election to succeed our late and esteemed colleague Tom Lantos. Prior to his passing, Tom endorsed JACKIE for the seat, and I know he would share our pride in welcoming her today.

JACKIE first came to Congress with me, with my class, as Chief of Staff for Congressman Leo Ryan, who held the same congressional seat that she has just won. She was in Guyana with Leo helping to investigate the Reverend Jim Jones when her boss was assassinated and JACKIE was seriously wounded.

She survived and went on to serve as the youngest member ever elected to the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors and served 10 years in the State Assembly, another 8 years in the California Senate.

She comes to us with an outstanding record of legislative victories, which she will, no doubt, extend in the U.S. Congress.

I would like you to join me in welcoming JACKIE; her husband, Barry; and her children, Jackson and Stephanie to our congressional family.

Welcome, JACKIE.

Madam Speaker, I yield to my assistant dean, the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

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

I would like to, on behalf of the California GOP delegation, extend a hearty congratulations to our new colleague. Of course, it is with mixed emotions that we're here because we are very still thinking about the life and the contribution of our colleague Tom Lantos but very pleased that you are going to be able to work in the spirit of bipartisanship that the California delegation has pursued for years.

And I will say that while members of your family have been introduced, I have to quickly say, as I just did to you, that I'm sorry that your mother is not here. I hope very much that she's watching on television because we spent a great evening together years ago, and I'm glad that she is doing well. And we are looking forward to working for our State together.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. SPEIER. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

It is a real honor to be introduced by the dean of the California delegation, who was, as he mentioned, serving his district with distinction when I was a mere staffer here in the U.S. House of Representatives. And I'm thrilled to be joining the gentlewoman from California, Congresswoman ANNA ESHOO, one of my longest and dearest friends, and the gentleman from California, Congressman THOMPSON, who taught me all I needed to know when I first arrived in the State capital back in 1986.

Madam Speaker, I didn't think it was possible for a person to be filled with both pride and humility at the same time. But that is exactly how I feel today. I am proud to have been chosen by a substantial majority of San Francisco and San Mateo County voters. I'm humbled by the faith they have placed in me and by the awesome legacy this particular seat holds.

Recently, I was introduced as having been elected to replace Tom Lantos. I had to laugh. I was elected to succeed Congressman Lantos. No one will ever replace him.

I also follow in the footsteps of Leo Ryan, who served this Chamber with distinction until he was assassinated 30 years ago, and I am honored to introduce his daughter Erin Ryan, who is in the Members gallery.

I was privileged to serve on Congressman Ryan's staff because I learned from one of the best. He taught me three important lessons: One, question the status quo; two, always listen to the people you represent; and, three, always stand up for what you believe in even if you have to stand alone.

Madam Speaker, I was struck with something while campaigning for this seat. A public servant is never more in tune with her constituents than when she is first running for the office. While holding over 60 community meetings across my district this year, the most common question was, ''When will we get out of Iraq?'' It was asked by voters across the spectrum: veterans, students, parents, the prosperous, middle class, those still working towards their piece of the American Dream.

The process to bring the troops home must begin immediately. The President wants to stay the course, and a man who wants to replace him suggests we could be in Iraq for a hundred years.

But, Madam Speaker, history will not judge us kindly if we sacrifice four generations of Americans because of the folly of one.

And, Madam Speaker, as passionate as people are about getting out of Iraq, they are also worried, about their jobs, their houses, and their futures. I got an earful from taxpayers outraged that the Fed bailed out Bear Stearns while neighbors are losing their homes to predatory lending practices. A man in a union hall put it simply: ''When will our government care as much for Main Street Americans as Wall Street speculators?''

As long as I am here, I will strive to make sure that the voices of Main Street are heard as loudly as the voices of Wall Street.

Madam Speaker, you are an inspiration to me, to America, and to women all over the world. I stand before you eager to learn and ready to help make the laws of the greatest country on Earth reflect its values: fairness, justice, and a guarantee that working men and women, parents, students, seniors, the disabled, and the disaffected, every American, has the right to a seat at the table of opportunity.

Thank you very much.

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 of office to the gentlewoman from California, the whole number of the House is 432.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2537, BEACH PROTECTION ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on adoption of House Resolution H. Res. 1083, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 192, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 179]

YEAS—224

Abercrombie	Capuano	Delahunt
Ackerman	Cardoza	DeLauro
Allen	Carnahan	Dicks
Altmire	Carney	Dingell
Arcuri	Carson	Doggett
Baca	Castor	Donnelly
Baird	Chandler	Doyle
Baldwin	Clarke	Edwards
Barrow	Clay	Ellison
Bean	Cleaver	Ellsworth
Becerra	Clyburn	Emanuel
Berkley	Cohen	Engel
Berman	Conyers	Eshoo
Berry	Cooper	Etheridge
Bilbray	Costa	Farr
Bishop (GA)	Costello	Fattah
Blumenauer	Courtney	Filner
Boren	Cramer	Foster
Boswell	Crowley	Frank (MA)
Boucher	Cuellar	Giffords
Boyd (FL)	Cummings	Gillibrand
Boyda (KS)	Davis (AL)	Gonzalez
Brady (PA)	Davis (CA)	Gordon
Braley (IA)	Davis (IL)	Green, Al
Brown, Corrine	Davis, Lincoln	Green, Gene
Butterfield	DeFazio	Grijalva
Capps	DeGette	Gutierrez

Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
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)
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Speier
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
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—192

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Biggert
Bilirakis
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
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
Obey
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Andrews
Bachus
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Buyer
Cubin
Davis, Tom
Ferguson
Granger
Jones (OH)
Larson (CT)
Ramstad
Rush
Sires
Weiner

□ 1150

Mr. LINCOLN DAVIS of Tennessee changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSS). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1038, 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. CARNEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 1038.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 3, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 180]

YEAS—406

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
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
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Filner
Flake
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
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
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
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
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
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
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz

Waters	Westmoreland	Woolsey
Watson	Wexler	Wu
Watt	Whitfield (KY)	Wynn
Waxman	Wilson (NM)	Yarmuth
Weiner	Wilson (OH)	Young (AK)
Welch (VT)	Wilson (SC)	Young (FL)
Weldon (FL)	Wittman (VA)	
Weller	Wolf	

NAYS—3

Kucinich	Nadler	Paul

NOT VOTING—22

Andrews	Forbes	Pryce (OH)
Bishop (NY)	Granger	Ramstad
Bishop (UT)	Gutierrez	Rangel
Buyer	Hunter	Rush
Cubin	Jones (OH)	Schwartz
Davis, Tom	Larson (CT)	Sires
Fallin	Meeks (NY)	
Ferguson	Petri	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes to vote.

□ 1157

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:

Ms. SCHWARTZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 180, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

□ 1200

RELATING TO THE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5724, UNITED STATES-COLOMBIA TRADE PROMOTION AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1092 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1092

Resolved, That section 151(e)(1) and section 151(f)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 shall not apply in the case of the bill (H.R. 5724) to implement the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 1092 relates to the consideration of H.R. 5724, the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement. The rule suspends the timelines for House consideration that are in the fast track law with respect to consideration of this specific trade agreement.

Mr. Speaker, we in Congress have a fiduciary obligation to ensure that the legislation passed through this Chamber represents the best interests of those that sent us here, the American people. To outsource that very basic legislative responsibility is to advocate the duties constitutionally prescribed to our branch and raises questions as to why we are here in the first place. The situation we find ourselves in today deals directly with that issue.

The President has attempted to dictate the legislative schedule of the Congress according to his political calendar. Over the objections of congressional leadership, he sent Congress the Colombia Free Trade Agreement in an attempt to force consideration of the measure within 60 days by using a provision known as Trade Promotion Authority, or fast track.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to dispel a few myths about the action that we take today. The rule we are taking up today does not in any way affect the Colombia Free Trade Agreement. It simply removes the timeline for considering it. It gives the House of Representatives the right to schedule when the agreement is undertaken.

There are some who have called into question whether Congress has the right to suspend fast track procedures for trade agreements. One need look no further than the Trade Act of 1974, the legislation that establishes fast track, to see that the very statute itself allows that, like any rule of the House, fast track procedures can be suspended.

We have also heard some raise questions about what consequences our action here today will have on the Senate's consideration of the Colombia Free Trade Agreement. The answer is, it will have no effect.

The rule today was necessitated by the partisan and irresponsible actions of the President. Instead of working with Congress to reach agreements on this accord, he instead took the unprecedented step of sending the Colombia trade deal to Congress over the objection of congressional leaders.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have been promised a lot when it comes to trade. However, in a country whose economy has been devastated by ill-conceived trade deals, it can only be expected that the American people will remain wary. The promise of good-paying work on the horizon has consistently been dashed by the reality of job loss.

Last Friday's unemployment rate was 5.1 percent, and more jobs, over 80,000, were lost last month alone. It is yet another indicator of the worsening economic situation facing millions of America's families. Each day it becomes clearer that our country is teetering on the edge of economic disaster, and, for millions, financial ruin is just around the corner. It is simply not the right time to move forward with this trade agreement.

The American people deserve an agreement that actually responds to the needs of the American worker, not makes promises that will not be met. By passing the rule today, we will no longer be bound by arbitrary deadlines and the House can bring up the agreement at the appropriate time and under the appropriate conditions.

Mr. Speaker, there is yet another reason why this free trade agreement is untimely and requires additional consideration moving toward passage. We have been promised time after time in trade legislation that there would be side agreements protecting the life and work of labor, that there would be environmental safeguards, that there would no longer be child labor. None of that has come true.

And it certainly makes one suspicious on this trade bill also because of the number of trade unionists who have been murdered. This makes the Colombia Free Trade Agreement hard to justify, given the continued violence against the union leaders, subsistence farmers, indigenous people and Afro-Colombians.

While President Uribe has made some progress, systematic killings are still far too prevalent to warrant the passage of this bill. Persecution of trade unionists is well-known because since the beginning of this year, 12 have already been murdered. Rewarding the Colombia Government with this bill under those conditions eliminates any leverage the U.S. Government has to improve the respect for human rights and the rule of law in the future.

To push forward at a time of economic insecurity is simply irresponsible for working families at home. To push forward in the midst of gross violations of human rights in Colombia is simply wrong.

It is the prerogative of Congress to suspend fast track if the timing necessitates it and only when it is in the best interests of the American people. By passing the rule today, we are reestablishing the House of Representatives as coequal to the President, and, in do doing so, we are standing up for America's working families.

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

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

I want to begin by expressing my appreciation to my very good friend, the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Rules, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen many, many unexpected political alliances that have been formed over the past years that I have been privileged to serve here, but I never expected to be taking up a rule that aligns with the goals of Hugo Chavez and South American narcoterrorists.

The U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement would deliver a significant blow

to Chavez's authoritarian designs for the region and the FARC's terrorist agenda. No one was quicker, no one was quicker to condemn the President's decision to send this FTA implementing legislation to Congress, than Hugo Chavez himself. So that is why, Mr. Speaker, what we are considering today is nothing more than the Hugo Chavez rule.

The agreement, the agreement that we hope very much we can see this institution pass, would help to strengthen democratic institutions, provide real economic opportunity for the Colombian people and solidify the rule of law. So naturally it is vehemently opposed by someone who is systematically dismantling representative democracy and free markets and resorting to corruption and crony capitalism to enrich government coffers at the expense of the working poor. That is the legacy of Hugo Chavez.

Naturally, naturally, Mr. Speaker, this agreement is also vehemently opposed by a terrorist organization that simply cannot continue to survive in a thriving, stable and transparent democracy with strong institutions and an increasingly prosperous population.

The Government of Colombia, its business leaders and its private sector unions all strongly support this agreement for the very reasons it is opposed by the region's most nefarious forces. It would be a giant leap forward in solidifying their attempts to take back their country from the violent and lawless groups that tore it apart for decades. And yet here we are today considering a rule that blocks consideration of the agreement under the rules of the Trade Promotion Authority which were established over 30 years ago.

Many supporters of this Hugo Chavez rule like to argue that this rule is as much about process as it is substance. I regularly make the argument that process is substance. So let's examine these claims, Mr. Speaker.

The argument has been made that by sending up the implementing legislation without an invitation, the President has violated the rules set forth by the Trade Act of 1974 and Congress must take special action to assert its role.

Mr. Speaker, over the last few years we have witnessed a number of struggles between the first two branches of government, so congressional prerogative is a familiar theme these days. And I am a strong supporter of congressional prerogative. As a result, the argument in this case has found an overly credulous audience in this body and proven persuasive to the uninformed, so I will do my Democratic colleagues the favor of reviewing the details of Trade Promotion Authority.

The statute outlines very clearly the responsibilities of the administration. It sets forth a number of negotiating principles. It demands that the administration closely consult with Congress prior to, during and after the negotiating process. It requires notification 90 days before entering into negotiations. Prior to signing, it requires notice of potential changes to trade remedy laws 180 days in advance and notification of intent to sign 90 days in advance, followed by advisory committee reports within 30 days. Sixty days after signing, a list of law changes is due. Ninety days after signing, an International Trade Commission report is due. All of this is designed to ensure that the concerns and prerogatives of the United States Congress are met.

The administration, Mr. Speaker, upheld both the letter and the spirit of the law at every single step. High ranking officials met with Congress 160 times prior to and during negotiations. They have held nearly 450 meetings since August of 2007 and taken 55 Members of Congress to Colombia to see the situation there for themselves. To say that the administration has not upheld their end of the bargain is outright laughable.

Now, what is Congress' end of the bargain under TPA? To hold an up or down vote within 60 days in the House and 90 days in the Senate. That is the deal, close consultation followed by a timely vote. Congress gets the final say, but it has the responsibility to not let a complicated and time-consuming negotiation go to waste or languish indefinitely.

We have a negotiation that was launched 4 years ago, concluded 2 years ago, and signed a year-and-a-half ago. Now, after all of this, all of this consultation, all of this time, the Democratic leadership wants to make an unprecedented, never before has this been done, an unprecedented rule change to allow them to abrogate their role under TPA, all the time while blaming the administration, and the administration is somehow to blame for a broken process. They are just making up this nonsense as they go along.

Mr. Speaker, ironically, on Wednesday morning when the Democratic leadership was announcing their intention to take this highly divisive, partisan and unprecedented action, I was sending a letter to several of my Democratic colleagues in which I was reaching out to them in hopes that they would join me in a special order next week to talk about Colombia. As colleagues who have gone to the country for ourselves, I was hoping that we could come together to simply share what we had seen firsthand in Colombia.

Under TPA, the House has, as I said, 60 days to debate and work together to reach consensus, 60 days to work in a bipartisan way. I thought that our special order describing our experiences would be a constructive and congenial way to begin. Unfortunately, the Democratic leadership has cut off this substantive process before it could even begin, killing any hope of bipartisanship on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, their actions are causing even more damage abroad. They are sabotaging our relationship with or best and closest ally in South America. This is an ally that faces a hostile neighbor on its border which threatens not just Colombia, but the very ideals of democracy and free markets. This ally faces an even graver daily threat within its borders; a threat that has been weakened by President Uribe's brave efforts, but one that still exists.

□ 1215

I have gone to Colombia twice in the past few months, once with Commerce Secretary Gutierrez and once with the Speaker's House Democracy Assistance Commission. I have seen myself the transformation that has taken place. I have seen the safe and orderly streets of Bogota and Medellin. I have seen the new opportunities and economic growth.

I have met with the attorney general and discussed extensively his efforts to prosecute violent offenders and end the days of impunity for murderers. I have sat down with former members of the paramilitaries, whose leaders have gone to jail and who are now struggling to reintegrate into society with the help of government-funded social programs. This is a country that has come miraculously far in just a few short years and has so far to go.

I find it shocking that the Democratic leadership would turn their backs on our friend and ally who has accomplished so much and who asks for our continued help in accomplishing even more. This week we have all heard the lengthy testimony of General Petraeus and Ambassador Crocker. A very common theme I have heard from my Democratic colleagues throughout this testimony is concern for America's lost prestige abroad. They decry what they call our unilateralism and our disregard for the concerns of our allies.

Yet today they propose to flagrantly commit what the Colombian Vice President has called a slap in the face. Editorial boards across this country have similarly slammed this action.

The Washington Post compared it to telling Colombia to ''Drop Dead.'' The Las Vegas Review-Journal says that what we are doing is ''stabbing our trade partners in the back.''

The Democratic leadership is determined to isolate our greatest ally in South America and weaken the region's strongest advocate for democracy, flouting national security and our international credibility. The damage to our interests and our leadership will be significant and lasting.

Our friends and allies will realize that our word at the negotiating table cannot be trusted and the rules can be changed in the middle of the game according to the whims of electoral politics.

This rule must be defeated for the sake of our national security interests, our leadership in the international community and our responsibilities as an institution. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no.''

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. RANGEL.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you so much, Madam Chairlady, for giving me this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I could not disagree with my friend from California more, and there is no one in this House that I believe that the administration has not spoken to more in concern for pieces of trade legislation, and I doubt whether there is anyone that has the compassion and the concern more than I about the people of Colombia who I have learned to admire, respect and work with over the years, not only with their political problems, but certainly their fight, their narcotics and trying to preserve democracy in that country.

The President has violated protocol in terms of not fulfilling the outlines that we have been using historically. What I have to say applies whether you are a Democrat or a Republican.

If, in the rules that the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee has outlined to us, there is an area of consultation before the President actually sends a complex piece of legislation to the House, which is more conducive to bringing us together, saying to the House that you have 90 days, and if you don't do anything in 90 days that it's the House of Representatives that killed the bill designed to help our friends in this area? Or one may say, Mr. President, you forgot to consult with us? You forgot to consult with the Ways and Means Committee. You did not deal with some of the issues that we have.

As you just changed the rule and just sending it over saying it's your responsibility in the House, what we are saying is that let's give the House more time and not a timetable to see what can we do to facilitate an atmosphere that would allow the Members at least to know what's in the bill.

It is really strange that the ranking member of the Rules Committee has presented us a speech this morning that is so similar that I don't remember the last time anyone in the administration has talked about the bill.

Oh, Hugo Chavez, I go to sleep every night wondering what he is going to do. Castro, my God, we should vote for the people of Colombia and against him and make him a big threat in the community.

I am not saying these things shouldn't be considered, but how many people, Republican or Democrat have the slightest idea what's in the trade bill? Why not give them an opportunity to make this decision, not based on 40 days, 50 days or 90 days, but for us to bring up these things.

When has anyone ever heard that they didn't have a crisis in terms of peace and tranquility against terrorism and assassination in Colombia? The question we may ask is Uribe doing, a man that I respect, as much as he should? Should he be doing more?

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from New York 1 more minute.

Mr. RANGEL. The real question I think we should ask, my friend, is I know you have a problem. We have problems in every major city. Why don't you allow us to share with you some of the techniques we have, some of the technology, work with your law enforcement so at the end of the day those who claim that it is murder that stops us from voting on a trade bill, that we will be able to say that we are working with them.

I hope you would rethink the vote. This vote is going to apply to every President, every Speaker of the House that deals with us. Do you believe they can change the rules and then they say that we dictate the legislative calendar of the House of Representatives? I think not.

You change the procedure. We defend the rules of the House.

What are we giving up? We are giving us an opportunity, one, to find out what's in the trade bill, and, two, which is most important, what can we do to resolve the issues that force Members to be against it.

I appreciate the words of my friend from California, but you have to do that, you are the ranking member. I remember when I had to say things that I had to say. Let's work together on this.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to a hardworking fighter for freedom, a member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Miami, Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, what the majority leadership of this Congress, what this rule is saying to Colombia today is you voted to tie your economy to the United States, but, sorry, we don't care.

You are at war with narcoterrorists armed to the teeth by drug money and given sanctuary by neighboring governments. Sorry, we don't care.

You have voted, not once, twice, overwhelmingly, to support your brave President and his government and the Colombian armed forces as they fight the narcoterrorists and defend your rule of law. Sorry, we don't care.

Well, I say to the people of Colombia, like the President of the United States, many of us here in Congress are with you, and you are not alone despite this day of legislative action that will live in infamy.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, an expert in this issue, and a member of the Committee on Rules, Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentlelady for her leadership on this important debate, and I rise in strong support of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, the policies of the Bush administration have produced an American economy in crisis. People are losing their jobs, fuel prices are at a record high, food prices have dramatically increased, confidence in the economy is at an all-time low. Maybe this is a radical idea, but shouldn't the energy, passion and focus of the administration be on fixing these problems?

This administration has turned a cold shoulder to the plight of American workers. They have opposed efforts to extend unemployment benefits. They have no plan to help 45 million Americans get health insurance. They have even opposed expanding health benefits to children. Their absolute indifference towards our fellow citizens is stunning. It takes my breath away.

Well, that must change. The Speaker of the House has the right to prioritize legislation. She has stated quite clearly that we want to continue to work with President Uribe to make progress on improving human rights, the rule of law, ending impunity, breaking Colombia's political and military ties to drug lords and paramilitary groups and protecting and promoting basic labor rights.

If the Colombian FTA came up today for a vote, I will strongly oppose it. I have repeatedly told the Colombian Government that I am always willing to reassess my position.

But when it comes to issues like human rights, I refuse to be a cheap date. The U.N., the Red Cross and U.S. and Colombian human rights groups all describe a worsening humanitarian crisis in Colombia. The number of internally displaced grew by 27 percent over the past year due to increasing violence throughout the country.

Over each of the past 3 years, murders of civilians by the Colombian army have been increasing. Violence against trade unions continues at an extremely high level, and the vast majority of cases of murders of labor leaders remain unsolved.

It is true that murders of trade unionists in 2007 were about half of what they were in 2006. Even then, Colombia had the highest rate of trade union murders in the world. But death threats, attacks and disappearances skyrocketed. But this 1-year hiatus in the murder rate may be over. In just the first 12 weeks of 2008, 17 trade unionists have already been assassinated.

Like many of my House colleagues, I have traveled to Colombia several times in the past 7 years. I have gone to Putumayo, not just to fly over fumigated territory, but to meet with hundreds of human rights victims and campesinos on the ground. I have been to Barrancabermeja, Sincelejo and Popayan.

I have traveled to San Jose de Apartado and to Arauca, where violence from all armed actors reigns supreme and community leaders are murdered like flies. I have visited the slums of Bogota where the poor and the internally displaced struggle to survive.

I spent hours in meetings with human rights groups, with families whose loved ones are held in brutal captivity by the FARC and with victims of violence by the paramilitaries and the Colombian army.

I have met with the constitutional court, religious and labor leaders, with indigenous peoples and Afro-Colombians and dozens of government and military officials. There is so much more to Colombia than the administration's day and a half excursion tours to Medellin and Cartagena.

Congress must insist upon improvements in human rights in Colombia and not paint a rosy picture simply to secure a trade agreement. U.S. policy must take responsibility for the behavior of Colombian behavior forces trained with U.S. tax dollars, take into account the continued suffering of the civilian population in the midst of an ongoing conflict and support the rights of victims after a decade of atrocities.

I remain dedicated to the Colombian people. I will never advocate walking away from Colombia. I also strongly support the right of the Speaker of the House to take up trade agreements when it makes the most sense to do so.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this rule and to remain engaged with Colombia on these important issues.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, for a unanimous consent request in opposition to this Hugo Chavez rule, I yield to my friend from Michigan (Mr. CAMP).

(Mr. CAMP of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Today's vote to delay consideration of the U.S.-Colombia free trade agreement is nothing short of the majority party playing politics and catering to their special interests. The actions of the majority remind me of those of a school yard bully—when losing, simply change the rules of the game. We should reject these changes, and we should honestly and fairly debate the merits of this deal.

It's ironic that the majority party is delaying a vote on the agreement because by and large it benefits American workers most. The United States already grants Colombia duty-free access to U.S. markets. Colombian goods cross our borders virtually tariff-free. But, 80 percent of American made consumer products, and none of our agricultural products that we send to Colombia enjoy that same duty-free access. This is a one-way street. The U.S.-Colombia free trade agreement would remove the tariffs on American products and create an even playing field for our workers.

I am disappointed to see the Speaker stand in the way of lowering tariffs on American products. I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, who is a strong opponent of this Hugo Chavez rule, the gentleman from Shreveport, Louisiana (Mr. MCCRERY).

Mr. MCCRERY. Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose this extraordinary, unprecedented, and, I believe, dangerous change to the House Rules.

Congress first gave trade promotion authority to the President in 1974, in order to allow him to engage directly with our competitors around the world to level the playing field, eliminate barriers to American exports and create jobs for American workers.

Passing this rule would undermine that authority and damage United States credibility abroad because our trading partners could rightfully question the commitments of our government in negotiating trade agreements. I have heard it said that this rule will allow us to consider this agreement this year after the election, but what this rule would do is to eliminate the uncertainty under TPA that Congress will vote on this agreement.

It doesn't guarantee a vote by any time certain. It doesn't push the vote off until after the election. It simply turns off the clock entirely.

Even postponing congressional consideration of this agreement does tremendous damage to America's competitiveness. Right now Canada, the European Union, are completing trade agreements with Colombia. As a result, they will gain a competitive advantage over American products.

□ 1230

Colombia will buy tractors, mining equipment and fertilizer from Canada, France, and Germany, instead of from Illinois, Georgia, and Texas.

Chairman RANGEL, my good friend, said nobody is talking about the economic benefits, they are all talking about Hugo Chavez. Well, my good friend knows that is not the case. And besides, the reason we are not talking about it all that much is because it is a no-brainer from an economic standpoint. I am mystified as to why any Member would oppose this agreement when all it does is level the playing field for American workers.

Today, American workers compete against imports from Colombia that enter our country virtually duty free, while our exports going to Colombia face high tariffs. This agreement eliminates those obstacles to our goods and services and supports American jobs.

I agree with Chairman RANGEL's assessment last month that denying a vote on this agreement wouldn't help address the concerns about labor violence in Colombia. In fact, this agreement would help Colombian labor unions. The agreement includes robust, enforceable international labor organization core labor standards, standards included with the strong support of the Democratic leadership to require Colombia to continue the tremendous progress it has made to improve labor rights.

I plead with my colleagues today: Do not make a vote which will undermine the credibility of the United States, making it more difficult for any future administration to eliminate barriers to the sale of products made by us. Vote "no" on this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, we certainly do need a balanced, enlightened trade policy. But this debate is not about trade, it is about the guiding principle of the Bush Administration—arrogance—arrogance that has served our country so poorly.

This President, personally proclaiming himself to be a "uniter, not a divider" at the beginning, quickly transformed himself into the "decider." And that lone decider has unleashed one divisive, disastrous decision after another on our land. Mr. CHENEY's current chief of staff, he summed up this attitude very directly: "We're going to push and push and push until some larger force is going to make us stop." Well today, our Speaker, backed up by this House, says "Stop."

The go-it-alone, disdain for allies, dismissal of anyone who has a different point of view, has left this White House isolated. It has left us with a disastrous war, and now Mr. Bush's recession.

We'll secure a more responsible, enlightened trade policy, but we won't secure it until we trade it for a new President.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1½ minutes to my Rules Committee colleague, the gentleman from Pasco, Washington, who is vigorously opposed to this Hugo Chavez rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we need to stop this unprecedented attempt to rewrite trade laws and jeopardize fair trade for our American farmers.

Washington State is the most trade-dependent State in the Nation. One in three Washington jobs is tied to international trade. Since 1991, Colombia has had open, free entry into the U.S. for many of their products, while steep tariffs block our farmers' access into Colombia.

This agreement would immediately, immediately, Mr. Speaker, eliminate tariffs for Washington State apples, cherries, pears, wheat, beef, and more. If the issue is the economy, what better way to stimulate our Nation's economy than to level the playing field and wipe out unfair trade barriers for our farmers.

Mr. Speaker, Representatives and Senators are elected to vote, so let's do our job and vote on the Colombia agreement. What the House is now considering is an effort to delay, to hide, to slam the door, shut the door on free

and fair trade that millions of Americans' jobs depend on. I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this Hugo Chavez rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), a valued member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I thank our distinguished Chair.

There is a fundamental issue that we face in this rule, and it is this: Does Congress cede its authority under the Constitution to the executive, or does it exercise it?

Mr. Speaker, from a distance—I have only been here a little over a year—I watched with dismay as a citizen, seeing Congress year after year relinquish its authority, turn that over to the executive, not do its job of accountability and oversight, not do its job on trade, essentially not exercise the constitutional authority that we are custodians of, each and every one of the 435 Members who have been elected.

The President exercised his prerogative under a rule that was enacted by this House in 1974, but against the advice of the Speaker and against the advice of the Senate majority leader. The President did what he could do, and that is send over on his own timetable a trade agreement when it wasn't ready to be considered.

And the Speaker, in her judgment, and I support this, stood up for the prerogatives of this legislative branch, where we have the responsibility to be the final voice of the people who sent us here.

The bottom line question is: Will Congress assert the authority that it has under the Constitution?

We can exercise it. The best circumstances, we do it in cooperation and in consultation with the executive. But if it is unilateral, a my-way-or-the-highway approach that has been so often employed by this chief executive, then it becomes incumbent upon us to stand up and assert the constitutional responsibility we have.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, to speak in opposition to this Hugo Chavez rule, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Marysville, California, the ranking member of the Trade Subcommittee, Mr. HERGER.

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, this procedural vote, if it is successful, Congress would be rebuffing the Colombia agreement through technical gimmicks and rejecting a level playing field for American workers.

Colombian workers and producers already have free access to the U.S. markets, but we don't have reciprocity. Our manufacturers and farmers need this agreement to sell their products, create jobs, and compete against foreign producers. A vote for this rule is a vote against American workers, period.

Since the agreement was signed nearly 500 days ago, congressional Republicans and the White House have tried to work with the Democratic majority to approve this agreement. We reached a bipartisan consensus nearly a year ago to ensure congressional consideration of this agreement.

In sending up the agreement, the President said that he was open to continuing discussions with the Democrats. The Democratic leadership, through this rule, has firmly shut the door to any discussions.

Members should be keenly aware of the very negative foreign policy ramifications of this vote. This rule would be cheered by belligerent leftist guerillas abetted by Venezuelan strongman Hugo Chavez who seek to undermine the democratically elected Colombian government with menacing ramifications.

This rule is a public slap in the face to a loyal ally at the epicenter of a philosophical war between democracy and totalitarianism, capitalism, and socialism.

President Uribe made it very clear that the best way to support Colombia's struggle for economic and political security is to pass this agreement. Today's action would trounce that plea and embolden the foes of democracy. I urge a ''no'' vote.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Trade.

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

Mr. LEVIN. Trade policy under the Bush administration has been badly off track. The approach of the administration and the then-Republican majority in Congress was to go their own way and dismiss bipartisan effort, starting with a side letter to the Jordan FTA thwarting enforcement of worker rights provisions negotiated by the Clinton administration.

In the cases of Morocco, Bahrain, and Oman FTAs, it was left to Democrats to negotiate with governments of those countries to bring their laws into compliance with international labor standards before a Congressional vote, with no help from the administration.

And we all remember CAFTA, where the administration's approach was go it alone from the beginning through the end, with false claims that the other nations were already in compliance with international standards.

And last year, with the loss of a congressional majority, the Bush administration was forced to include fully enforceable labor and environmental standards in the Peru FTA. And when Democrats pressed for Peru to bring into compliance with the language of the agreement, the administration attacked Democrats and refused to even participate in the changes that Peru made in its legal structure.

At that time Democrats made clear that Colombia was different from Peru with the level of violence against workers, impunity from prosecution, and laws that did not meet international standards, and that sustainable progress was required before consideration. The administration kept on insisting that the status quo was good enough and has done nothing to address these concerns.

Urged by both the House and Senate Democratic leadership not to proceed with the Colombia FTA under present circumstances, the administration decided once again to go its own way. This rule reflects the Speaker's response to assert a congressional role on international trade under the Constitution of the United States of America.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the Chair how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 13 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from New York has 11½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the ranking member of the Trade Subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, there are many reasons why what the majority is doing today is gravely harmful to our security. Colombia is a close ally under siege. And as The Washington Post points out today: ''Score this action as a boost to Venezuela's agenda of destabilizing democracy in Colombia.''

By all accounts, the Colombian agreement is a big plus for American exports and American employment. What the majority is doing is giving near free-market access to Colombia and taking nothing for our workers. This agreement would cut tariffs 80 percent on U.S. beef, and 15 percent on U.S.-tractors.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California, the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, Ms. PELOSI.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I commend her for her very distinguished leadership of the Rules Committee and for bringing this very important rule to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, the reason we are here today is one I wish could have been avoided, and I think it is important to put it in context because I have heard our colleagues talk about the merits of the bill or talk about any precedent on rules, and I have heard them talk about different things. But I think it is important to know what brought us here today.

On Monday, I received a call from the President of the United States, always an honor to receive a call from the President. This is after months of our going back and forth with members of the cabinet and the rest about when and if they would send up the Colombia Free Trade Agreement. The President informed me that he would be sending the bill over the next day.

I recommended against it. I said, Mr. President, you shouldn't send it for

two reasons. If you send it and we take it up, it will lose. Now you think it is very important to pass a Colombia free trade agreement, and in the Congress we have people who share your view. And we have others who share your view that we should pass it as soon as we address the concerns of America's working people, and others who will never be for it. But let's talk about what the possibilities are for passing it, and those possibilities are greatly diminished if you send that bill to the Congress under these circumstances.

Apart from the fact that it would be a breach of protocol, and let's just talk about that. A successful trade agenda depends on joint partnership between the Congress and the administration, as was the case recently in the Peru Free Trade Agreement. Had the administration followed the established protocol of congressional consultation relating to the submission of any free trade agreement, we would not have to take this action today.

By his actions on Tuesday, the President abandoned the traditions of consultation that have governed past agreement. In fact, the action the House takes today is more in keeping with the spirit of the rules than the White House's move to force a vote.

□ 1245

But, as I said, just from a practical standpoint, Mr. President, you simply don't have the votes. And if we are to try to arrive at a place where the concerns of the American people are addressed, we need more time to do that.

I also said what I have said many times to the President. If we are going to be successful in passing a trade agreement, we have to first tell the Americans people that we have a positive economic agenda that addresses their aspirations, addresses their concerns about their economic security.

This bill's been around for a while, and matters have only gotten worse in our economy. The former Chair of the Fed has said we're in the throes of a recession. The current Chair of the Federal Reserve last week, the end of last week, testified to Congress that there's a possible recession.

Many people, I mean, the joblessness numbers of last week, again pointed to a steeper downturn in our economy.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the Speaker yield for some questions?

Ms. PELOSI. No. You control your time. With all due respect to the gentleman, I'll use mine.

The fact is, as I said to the President, many people in America now are concerned about their jobs. They're concerned about losing their homes. Most people won't, but most people are concerned about losing their living standard.

When the cost of groceries and gasoline and the cost of health care and education and other staples continues to go up, and the purchasing power of the income that people have is either stagnant or going down, they have concerns about their economic security.

So let's have a timetable for the American people. Let's have a timetable on our consideration of a trade bill that addresses the concerns and is compatible with the needs of America's working families. That is, I think, the only fair thing to do.

The President ignored those concerns and sent the bill over. I pledged to this body, as Speaker of the House, that at the appropriate time, if many of these concerns are addressed in terms of America's working families, that we can take up legislation for such a trade agreement.

Some have concerns about the content of the agreement. Others have concerns about the treatment of labor organizers in Colombia, and it's a real concern, and one admitted to by the administration and the Colombian Government. There are differences of opinion as to how this is changing, but let's see how we can work together to make that change.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask again if my distinguished California colleague would yield.

Ms. PELOSI. Having control of the time, I will retain the control of the time, Mr. Speaker.

The important point here is, whether it's the substance of the bill, whether it's the conditions in Colombia, they are to be, obviously, major considerations.

But what we're saying to the President, we can't do much about some of these things. We certainly can address the provisions in the bill. But I'm not here to talk about that now.

What we can do something about, what we haven't done enough about is to send a positive economic agenda forth. And these are not difficult. Most of what we're talking to the President about are part of what has passed this Congress in mostly an overwhelming bipartisan way.

Whether we're talking about rebuilding the infrastructure of America, whether we're talking about investments in an innovation agenda, our commitment to competitiveness to keep America number 1, and that innovation begins in the classroom, and we have to have a strong commitment to the education of our people, whether we're talking about tax credits for our energy bill which we passed here, which would immediately create jobs. No, if we don't do it we will lose jobs that exist now. Same thing with infrastructure. If we don't make those investments, our projects will have to discontinue. But many more are ready. Dirt is ready to fly. The projects are in the pipeline.

There is a way to create good-paying jobs right here in America. We've passed the legislation. The vehicles are there for us to do it. And at the same time, we have to address the concerns of those who have lost their jobs, whether it's unemployment insurance or summer jobs program for their children or other initiatives.

So this is nothing new. And, in fact, the whole idea that we were going into recession is nothing new to most families across America. It took a while for the President and his administration to accept that fact, and, when they did, we could talk. And when they did, we could talk, we could work together, as Mr. BOEHNER and I did, with the Secretary of the Treasury, to put together a stimulus package that had strong bipartisan support, and, as the President has said, has not gone into effect yet. And when it does, I know it will inject demand into the economy, create jobs and, I think, stimulate the economy.

But since we did that, matters have only become worse, necessitating the need for us to do more. And we certainly should do more for our economy. And we certainly should do more for our economy before we pass another trade agreement. It's all possible in the days that are before us.

But instead of having the President's timetable, we have the timetable of the House of Representatives, we have a timetable for America's working families.

And nothing that we are doing here now should be misconstrued in terms of our attitude toward Colombia. Colombia is our friend, is a neighbor in the hemisphere. The relationship between Colombia and the United States is an important one.

We have concerns about workers in Colombia, and we respect the leadership of President Uribe. And as I said to the Ambassador yesterday, I hope you will convey that message to the President, and when you do, I hope you will also tell him we congratulate him on his excellent representation in the United States in ambassador service here.

So this isn't about ending anything. It's about having a timetable that respects the concerns, the aspirations, the challenges faced by the American people. We are the people's House. Their timetable should be our timetable.

I urge our colleagues to support the rule.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds before I yield to the leader to say that I had hoped to ask the Speaker if, in fact, the votes are not there, why it is that we had to do this the day after the President sent this message up, why we could not have waited 45 days. It was my hope that the Speaker could have answered that question for us. Unfortunately, she has not.

With that, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Republican leader, our friend from West Chester, Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Let me thank my colleague from California for yielding, and say, Mr. Speaker, and to my colleagues, that our economy is struggling. Families and businesses are dealing with the rising cost of living, and certainly the job market has slowed. At a time like this we should be working together. And as the Speaker said, she and I came together and our Members came together on both sides of the

aisle earlier this year to pass an economic growth package. The checks will be going out to Americans here beginning in the middle of May and will occur, continue to go on through the end of July. These checks, again, are not out in the marketplace. We hope they'll be out there soon, and we hope it will help revive our struggling economy.

But the action that's being taken here today is going to do nothing more than to hurt American businesses and American workers.

The Speaker earlier went on about the fact that the typical protocol here was not followed; that the President send this bill to the Congress without the approval of the Speaker of the House.

Now I think it's time to set the record straight on exactly what has occurred. There have been hundreds and hundreds of meetings over the last 15 months trying to come to an agreement on how this bill shall be considered. There have been changes made. There have been side agreements that have come forth as a result of this.

And over the course of the last six or eight weeks, there have been serious conversations between the administration and the Speaker of the House about the consideration of the Colombia Free Trade Agreement. And the reason this bill was sent up here this week was because, not one time over these 6 weeks, has the Speaker agreed or made a commitment to the administration that this bill will be considered this year. The President's been willing to work with the Congress. The conversations, again, have gone on for 15 months. But not one time during that 15 months was there ever a commitment by the Democrat majority to bring this bill to the floor for a vote in the House.

I don't think the President had any choice but to bring, to send that free trade agreement to the Congress and force Congress to act.

And so what do we do? We don't go try to work to see if we can get the votes. We don't try, in a bipartisan way, to move this agreement. No, we're going to go in and cheat. We're going to change the rules under which the consideration of this free trade agreement should operate between the House and the Senate. We're not even going to give it a chance.

And anybody that thinks that well, we're just going to push this off for a couple of months, that is nonsense. This vote today is a vote to kill the Colombia Free Trade Agreement, nothing more and nothing less.

The Speaker points out, well, the President did this and, frankly, there are other priorities in the House.

Let me tell you what. When we passed the Andean Trade Preferences Act earlier this year, virtually everything that comes from Colombia to the United States comes here duty-free. The Colombian Free Trade Agreement would allow U.S. manufacturers, and U.S. workers who produce these goods, to send our goods to Colombia virtually tariff-free.

We're doing nothing here but hurting American workers and American businesses. Why?

I think the Speaker made it very clear. This action today is nothing short of political blackmail. The Speaker made it clear that she has her agenda. She wants the President to deal with her on her agenda, and we're not going to move this bill until the President deals with her agenda. That is not the way to deal with our trading partners around the world.

I've listened to candidates that are running for President, especially candidates on the Democrat side, who have talked about the fact that the United States needs to be more willing to engage the rest of the world, that we need to listen, that we need to reach out to countries around the world. There's probably no place that's more important for us to reach out than South America.

Here we have a country in South America that's doing their best to fight off terrorists in their own country. A message that we could send, not only to Colombia, but to the rest of South America that we want to engage in them, exactly as many of these contenders for the Democrat nomination, points that they have made.

What does this say to Colombia? What does it say to South America? And what does it say about free and fair trade around the world?

This is a precipitous step in the wrong direction. We're sending a very bad message for our partners around the world, all in the name of election-year politics. I think that it's regrettable, it's despicable.

If we're going to have a vote here, why don't we put the Colombian free trade bill up for a vote and let the House work its will on that bill, because the fact is, I think it would pass.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. For a Republican minority, and particularly the gentleman from California, who whine day in and day out about their inability to offer amendments to even the most minor of bills, I've never seen a group so eager to give up their right, in fact, the right of every Member of this House to offer an amendment to this trade agreement in a rush to rubber-stamp yet another failed so-called free trade agreement.

As one Republican pointed out, yeah, its been the policy since 1974. Guess what? 1974 we were the manufacturing colossus of the world. We ran trade surpluses. We had a robust middle class in America. It was bad policy then. But after 24 years of that bad trade policy, our manufacturing's cut in half. The middle class is losing ground. They're unemployed. We're borrowing $2 billion a day from the rest of the world, including Communist China, to buy things that we used to make here in America, and they think we should do more of the same.

I've heard this and played this game before. I've never voted for one. But every President since I've been here, Republican and Democrat, says, hey, we negotiated this deal in secret. You can't fail us now. Yeah, it's got big problems, but we'll fix them later.

Guess what? Later never comes. Because this Congress, until today, has never had a spine to stand up to the special interests that are pushing failed trade policies, policies that fail the American people to benefit a few on Wall Street. This is about Main Street.

The House is growing a spine today. This is a great day and the beginning of a new trade policy for the American people.

□ 1300

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, to speak in opposition to this Hugo Chavez rule, I'm happy to yield 1½ minutes to my very good friend from Morris, Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

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

Mr. WELLER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule. Why is Latin America all today watching this debate in this House? Because today the House of Representatives is going to tell the world how we treat our best friends, how we treat our best friend in Latin America. Who is our best friend in Latin America? The democracy of Colombia. Who is America's most reliable partner in counter-narcotics and counterterrorism in Latin America? The democracy of Colombia. Which elected national leader is the most popular elected official in all of this hemisphere? The President of Colombia, President Uribe. Why? Because he succeeded in reducing violence.

Today, 73 percent of Colombians today say they feel more secure and more safe prior to President Uribe 6 years ago. In fact, Colombia today is safer than Washington, DC.

Today, this House will vote to set Colombia aside, and we will turn our back on our best friend in Latin America. Why again is Latin America watching? Because leftist Hugo Chavez and his proxies, the narcotrafficking FARC, had declared they want to defeat the U.S.-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement. They can't defeat President Uribe at the ballot box, but they want to in this Congress.

The Prime Minister of Canada said it best: If the United States turns its back on its friends in Colombia, this will set back our cause far more than any Latin American dictator could hope to achieve.

Our friends in the Democratic majority say this is all about election-year politics, but we must understand that turning our back on Colombia will have long-term consequences for Latin America.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, a member of the Ways and Means Committee and Chair of the Democratic Caucus, Mr. EMANUEL.

Mr. EMANUEL. I would like to thank my colleague for lending the time.

Mr. Speaker, we are having a conversation here about trade and globalization and about how to make sure that, in fact, globalization is a win-win strategy for the American people. And we were talking about Colombia, but what we really are talking about is the effects of globalization on the American economy.

And in fact today, if you take a look at The Washington Post Business page, there's a new survey out showing the middle class feeling worse in this period of time than ever before, more squeezed by rising costs. Energy is up nearly 2 bucks a gallon since 2001. Nearly $2 up. Health care costs have doubled. College costs are up 64 percent, and yet the median household income in this country shrunk $1,100. The middle class are feeling squeezed.

Globalization can be a good thing. Trade can be a good thing. But if you don't have an agenda to make sure Americans win in that globalization, you're going to get a squeeze on the middle class where they resist the attempts to open up markets to American-made products.

What we need here, and what we are seeking here, is a new deal for the new economy for the American workers. And that means when health care costs are up like that, we make sure there's health care security to the American people, which is why it was wrong to veto a children's health care bill for America's children to give 10 million children's parents who work full-time health care.

It is why it is wrong that when we have an extension of the hope and lifetime college credit so Americans can get to community colleges, can get the chances for their kids to go to college, it is wrong to allow that tax credit to end.

It is why we are trying to make sure that, in fact, American people have a retirement security and a universal 401(k) so those who work full time, 75 million Americans, who do not have a savings plan outside of Social Security have in fact a 401(k) like the rest of us. It's an agenda to make sure there is an economic security plan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. EMANUEL. No conversation about trade is ever about trade. It's about the standard of living of the middle class of this country.

Globalization could be a good thing if you have an agenda, and just trade alone is not an agenda to make sure that the middle class of this country, that built this country since World War II are strengthened to compete and win in this globalized economy.

And what we are ensuring today is that we have in fact a trade deal that is not seen as a cost to the American people but seen as an opportunity to succeed in that world, and we today are making sure that there is a win-win strategy to that globalization.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, as I prepare to yield to the Republican whip, I'd like to yield for a unanimous consent to my good friend from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

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

Mr. SHAYS. I rise in strong opposition to H. Res. 1092, which will in effect defeat the U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement by postponing consideration of the legislation indefinitely. It is more than ironic to me that, at a time when our economy has slowed tremendously, Democratic leaders are seeking to derail efforts to enhance our export market, which has been one area of strength in our economy.

The fact is, this trade agreement will help U.S. manufacturers and high tech service providers export to Colombia, a great friend and ally, where many of our products face tariffs. If any country deserves our support for aiding efforts to build a stable economy, it is Colombia. The Government has taken great strides in preventing attacks by paramilitary groups, and if we are ever going to curtail drug production from Colombia, it will be because of a stable economy, which free trade helps create.

I urge my colleagues who support economic growth, free trade and better relations with our neighbor to reject this misguided resolution and keep the Colombia free trade agreement on track.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, with that, I would like to yield 3 minutes to my good friend from Springfield, Missouri, who will vigorously oppose this Hugo Chavez rule.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman.

I, too, vigorously oppose this rule. It seems to me the House today is doing two things that this Congress has done too often. One is, if you don't like the rules, you change the rules; and two is, we continue to take actions that reduce confidence in dealing with the United States. When you change the rules, other countries just simply don't want to deal with you.

Five hundred days since this treaty, this agreement was negotiated in good faith. Changes made sense then in elements that dealt with the environment and labor that the Colombians went back at our request to make. Sixteen months of talking to the leaders of the majority about what was the best day to bring this agreement, now 500 days old, to the floor of the House, and it's going to happen today or it's apparently not going to happen anytime in the near future.

We had no trade agreements before we went to the process of Trade Promotion Authority because nobody wants to trade with you if they don't think you're dealing in good faith. Nobody wants to deal with you if they don't think you're dealing in good faith.

This is about jobs. It is about middle-class jobs that my good friend from Illinois just talked about. I mean, how much more middle-class jobs could you try to provide than you provide when we open their market to us? Seventeen years ago we opened our market to them. This is not a debate about whether we can compete with Colombian products or whether their workers are being treated fair. Their workers already make products that come in here every day with virtually no tariff.

This agreement would let our workers send products there with no tariff. Eighty percent immediately would have no tariff. Very quickly, 100 percent would have no tariff. The 8,600 Caterpillar jobs in Illinois would be sending their products to Colombia without the 15 percent tariff. Why wouldn't we want to give those 8,600 labor union workers a 15 percent advantage that they don't have today?

When you change the rules, bad things can happen. This is about manufacturing jobs. It's about union jobs. It's about middle-class jobs. And of course, it is about our closest ally in South America, the second biggest country in South America, a country that for 17 years has had access to our markets and, in the last decade, has worked closely with us to try to solve their problems and the problems of this hemisphere.

This is a huge mistake today. It is the wrong signal to send not just to Colombia but anybody who's thinking about working with the United States of America. You have got to deal with countries in good faith. We are not doing that. We are not dealing with our own workers in good faith. I hope we do everything we can to defeat this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 1092. Colombia is an ally and a friend, and I commend President Uribe for reducing violence and unrest in Colombia. However, Colombia still leads the world in trade unionist murders. According to Human Rights Watch, 17 have been killed this year alone and more than 400 over the last 6 years. Hardly any of these murders have been investigated or prosecuted.

This is not only about human rights. This is about domestic responsibility. How can we trade away jobs when unemployment is climbing and our economy is in recession? We need to expand and strengthen trade adjustment assistance. We must educate and train American workers to better compete in the global economy.

The President had a choice. He chose to force a vote, and today he is getting that vote: a vote declaring that strong-arming Congress will not work, a vote for American workers and their families, a vote for human rights.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' and stand up for workers' families both here at home and in Colombia.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would be happy to yield to one of the greatest proponents of free trade, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from The Woodlands, Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, America's status in the world has never been smaller than this day. Who could imagine the world's largest economy cowering from Colombia behind the calls of protectionism? Who could imagine the world's greatest democracy too frightened to even debate, even consider this agreement. Who could imagine that this Congress would send a signal to the world that we are not just an unreliable leader in trade, we are an unreliable negotiator in trade? It is embarrassing and it is dangerous. And it will cost America jobs.

Today, Colombia can sell their products into America with no tariffs, no restrictions. But when we try to sell our products, we find barriers and costs. My workers in Texas want to know why can they buy products in Colombia at the local mall but we can't sell our products around the world? Colombia is a strong trading partner. They have reduced violence. They have embraced the rule of law. They are a strong ally. They deserve an up-or-down vote this year.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ 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. I thank the gentlelady from New York, and I am so much in favor of this process that I had to bring two constitutional books to the floor to be seen by my colleagues.

I support this initiative because it restores the constitutional authority to this floor and to the Speaker of the House. And for someone who has voted for trade bills that are fair, I ask my colleagues to recognize that we have an obligation to the American people. For if we look at the month of March, the third month of declining numbers of U.S. jobs, with losses widespread across all sectors and the biggest losses coming in construction and manufacturing, the experts, including Federal Chairman Ben Bernanke and former Federal Chairman Alan Greenspan, have confirmed the serious challenges to the United States economy. One former Labor Secretary has also uttered the word ''depression.''

This is an opportunity for us to be able to establish our authority on the floor to work through legislation and to ask the question of my friends on the other side of the aisle, if trade bills are so effective, why are we losing jobs? Why are people without employment? Why are we in this economic crisis?

And so we are standing up for American workers. We are standing up for the workers in Colombia. I have the greatest respect for President Uribe. I look forward to working on legislation that addresses the labor concerns of working-class indigenous Colombians, and this is a two-way street. My friends on the other side of the aisle cannot prove that ignoring the Constitution will get us jobs.

Vote for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1092, the rule for consideration of H.R. 5724 implementing the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement. I would like to thank Speaker PELOSI for her exemplary leadership on this important issue and for bringing this rule to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, it is vital to delay the consideration of the Colombia Free Trade Agreement, FTA. The Republican-controlled 109th Congress recklessly allowed the President to precipitously pass free trade agreements without sufficient consideration of the impact on our economy and hard-working Americans and without ensuring that the labor rights of workers are protected in the country seeking the FTA. Today more than ever, with our economy suffering from a substantial downturn, which includes rising unemployment and a housing foreclosure crisis, it is imperative that the Democratic-controlled 110th Congress continue our practice of providing sufficient consideration of free trade agreements prior to their implementation.

Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of visiting Colombia last year, and I am extremely concerned about the ongoing oppression of Afro-Colombian populations. Afro-Colombians face the same social barriers that all Afro-Latinos face around Latin America; social marginalization, lack of access to health care, lack of educational opportunities, lack of workforce opportunities. In Colombia, however, this marginalization is intensified by the ongoing conflict. The effects of the armed conflict, specifically forced displacement, in Colombia falls disproportionately on the back of Afro-Colombians. In fact, Colombia's highest rate of displacement in 2003 was recorded in the Chocó region, where approximately 75 percent of the population is Afro-Colombian. Because Afro-Colombians largely inhabit areas that have been neglected by the federal government, they have been extremely appealing targets for narco-traffickers, guerilla insurgent groups, and paramilitary forces. Afro-Colombians have been forcibly and violently displaced, and they continue to face a range of human rights abuses that go uninvestigated by the judicial system.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Colombian Government must be more active protecting and promoting the rights of Afro-Colombian populations. This must take the shape of providing more access to health care and education, especially for internally displaced persons. Additionally, more security must be established in typically neglected regions.

H. Res. 1092, as reported by the House Rules Committee, provides that two sections—section 151(e)(1) and section 151(f)(1)—of the Trade Act of 1974 shall not apply in the case of H.R. 5724, to implement the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement. In effect, Mr. Speaker, this rule will suspend the requirement that the Colombia Free Trade Agreement be considered within 60 legislative days in the House. It will give Congress the prerogative to schedule a vote on this piece of legislation, working with labor and many other groups concerned about American workers and fair trade.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that rushing this legislation to the floor would be an incredible mistake. We are currently in the midst of an economic downturn, with numbers released last Friday showing a sharp increase in the number of jobless Americans. According to these numbers, the number of jobs outside the agricultural sector fell by 80,000 last month, a figure that represents the biggest drop in nearly five years.

March is the third month of declining numbers of U.S. jobs, with losses widespread across all sectors and the biggest losses coming in construction and manufacturing. The experts, including Fed Chairman Ben Bernanke and Former Fed Chairman Alan Greenspan, have confirmed the serious challenges facing the United States economy.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time to strengthen the American economy. This Congress must put American workers first. I believe that, through bipartisan negotiations coupled with urgent action taken to repair the struggling American economy, we can create the conditions for a successful free trade deal with Colombia. However, Mr. Speaker, this will take time.

Instead of working with Congress to address the legitimate and serious economic concerns of the American people, the President has engaged in highly partisan politics to attempt to ram this legislation through the Congress. On Tuesday, President Bush took the unprecedented step of sending his Colombia trade deal to Congress without following established protocols of congressional consultation. By engaging in this political maneuver, the President has forced Congress to take this action.

The rule we are considering today would remove the fast-track timeline for the Colombia free-trade agreement. By doing so, this rule returns the role, provided by the Constitution, of scheduling considering of measures to the Congress. The authority to do so is provided in the Fast Track law, PL 107–210, which explicitly recognizes ''the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as relating the procedures of that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as any other rule of that House.'' Today, we are doing exactly that.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there are a number of issues that need to be addressed before a free trade deal with Colombia is approved. In addition to the concerns about the American economy and American workers, trade legislation should also benefit the people of Colombia, particularly the working classes. I remain concerned about many ongoing abuses in Colombia that, in my opinion, make such a deal inappropriate at this time. In particular, I am concerned about the suppression of labor rights in Colombia and the targeted killing of labor organizers. Two Foreign Affairs subcommittees, the Subcommittee on International Organizations, Human Rights, and Oversight and the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, held a hearing last June about the ongoing pattern of labor violence in Colombia, and I would like to see many of the issues raised in that hearing addressed before a trade deal with Colombia is signed.

I believe that President Alvaro Uribe Velez has, since taking office in August 2002, made important strides toward establishing state control throughout the country, to revitalize the

economy, and to combat corruption. I also believe that a fair free trade agreement can immensely benefit the people of Colombia. Colombia continues to face severe income disparities, coupled with poverty and inadequate social services. According to World Bank estimates, 65 percent of Colombia's population lives below the poverty line. Poverty in rural areas is particularly severe, with rates in these regions approaching 80 percent, and the World Bank estimates that 38 percent of rural residents do not have access to potable water, and 68 percent do not have access to sewage treatment services. In addition, Colombia's rural areas have an estimated illiteracy rate of 15 percent.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we must work together to develop and pass a trade bill that will benefit the American economy, and that will also trickle down to benefit all levels of Colombian society. I was proud to cosponsor and to vote for the Trade and Development Act of 2000, which included the Caribbean Basin Trade Partnership Act. This legislation expanded the Caribbean Basin Initiative, which is intended to facilitate the economic development and export diversification of the Caribbean Basin economies. I supported this initiative because it not only benefited American workers and the American economy, but it also carried true benefits for the people of the target nations. I am proud to vote for fair free trade legislation that will benefit workers both here and abroad.

Mr. Speaker, I support this rule because it will return to Congress its constitutionally granted power to schedule consideration of legislation, and it will give us the flexibility necessary to hold bipartisan negotiations regarding this legislation. I urge my colleagues to put the American economy and American workers first during this financially uncertain time, and to support the passage of H. Res. 1092.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, as I yield 1 minute to my friend from Washington, I would say to my friend from Texas that if she turns to page 1,136 of the book that she held up, she would see that that has the rule we are abrogating with this vote that we are about to take.

With that, I yield 1 minute to my good friend from Auburn, Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

Mr. REICHERT. As a representative from the State of Washington, the most dependent State on trade in the Nation, I strongly urge my colleagues to reject this unprecedented rule and allow the Colombian Free Trade Agreement to come to the floor to a vote. I traveled to Colombia last weekend to see firsthand the progress that country is making. I met with union members who support this agreement. I met with union members who oppose this agreement. I met with President Uribe. I met with the labor minister. I met with the attorney general there. I met with the people who have been disarmed and left the paramilitary organizations. I met with shantytown residents.

You want to talk about human rights? Those people are the poorest people in the world. Those are the people we can help with this agreement.

□ 1315

Not only can we help poor people here in the United States of America, but this is designed to help poor people, struggling people in Colombia. Human rights, ladies and gentlemen, is worldwide. When we give them jobs, we give them hope.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire from my colleague how many requests for time he has remaining.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I have a long list of people here I would say to my friend, the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Rules.

May I inquire how much time we have remaining, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 4¾ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. May I inquire of my friend how many speakers she has remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I have one more, who is not presently on the floor. So I will reserve my time.

Mr. DREIER. Well, I would be happy to use the 5 minutes if the gentlewoman would like to yield me 5 minutes because we've got lots of people who feel strongly about that, and I know we could expand our thoughts on this with your 5 minutes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I think I'll reserve it. Thank you very much for the offer.

Mr. DREIER. Just thought I would offer it as a possibility for consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my very good friend from Miami, who is the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret the effort today to postpone timely action on the U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement. For over a year, advocates of this agreement have worked tirelessly with our counterparts to bring it to the floor for an up-or-down vote.

We have the power to make a difference. We can make a difference not only here at home, but in Colombia and throughout the hemisphere as well. Colombia is a close ally, fighting our common enemy of drugs and antidemocratic regimes in the region. We must take a stand for our national security and against the growing influence of Iran and other rogue states in the hemisphere.

The choice is clear. This rule change is nothing but an abdication of responsibility and a decision to leave the hard decisions for another day. With the Colombian FTA, American businesses will benefit greatly, our ally will be strengthened, and our interests in the hemisphere will be secured.

I urge my colleagues to join me and vote ''no'' against this procedural vote.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I continue to reserve.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I am happy to yield 1 minute to my very good friend and a passionate free trader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING).

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I find it fascinating that the Democrat majority this week can find time to rename post offices, but somehow cannot find the time to vote on a trade agreement to help create more American jobs.

We're talking about a trade agreement to where over 90 percent of Colombian goods come into our country duty-free, yet only 3 percent of our goods go into their country duty-free. We're trying to level the playing field here, Mr. Speaker. We're trying to create more American jobs. What could be more fair?

Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to sit down with the Fed Chairman this week. And as we talk about tough economic times, we ought to learn the lessons of history. And one of the lessons of history is that starting a trade war can bring about a recession, and that's what we see the Democrats doing. People are struggling to make their paychecks stretch. Why don't we create more jobs? Why don't we level this playing field?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, when we're talking about our ally, Colombia, Hugo Chavez wants this trade agreement to never see the light of day, and our Democrat colleagues agree.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I will continue to reserve.

Mr. DREIER. May I inquire of my friend; so I assume there are no further speakers then?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. My last speaker has not yet shown up.

Mr. DREIER. So I guess I should infer from that that there won't be any more speakers, other than your close, I presume.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I think that's accurate.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my very good friend from Fairfax, the distinguished former chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Government Oversight and Reform.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. I oppose this resolution strongly, Mr. Speaker.

We call this fast track authority for a reason. No argument about process niceties can change the meaning of those words. This is supposed to be a deadline for a vote in the House.

The administration has been talking and talking, and we think that if they didn't bring this forward, it would never come up for a vote at all. This is the vote. That's the very point of the requirement we're being asked to waive today.

Look, the supposed ''failure to consult'' is just the latest pretext for the shameless politicization of free trade

policy and the abandonment of a key ally. The perverse truth underlying the political battle lines over trade that this action would harm American interests at home and abroad, in fact, American workers would benefit from the provisions in this agreement much more than their Colombian brothers and sisters.

Colombia already has access to the U.S. market under the Andean Free Trade Agreement. This opens 80 percent of Colombian markets that currently are closed, have high tariffs, to American farmers and American manufacturers.

Legislating, like elections, is about choices. And changing the rules, moving the goal line beyond reach is the wrong choice on the Colombia Free Trade Agreement.

Mr. DREIER. I would again inquire of the distinguished Chair of the Committee on Rules if, in fact, there are going to be any other speakers on the other side of the aisle.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. There are none.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time to simply say that this has been a very interesting debate. Unfortunately, our colleagues on the other side have put forward some, well, let's say some inaccuracies. The fact of the matter is that over the last 4 years, when this process began, the administration has been working very closely with hundreds and hundreds of meetings in a bipartisan way to come together so that we can do what both Democrats and Republicans alike have said that they want to do, strengthen our ties within this hemisphere and do what we can to ensure that we bring about an agreement which will work to create jobs right here in the United States.

The distinguished ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee has just reminded me of the fact that every country with which we have a free trade agreement, every single country, we enjoy a surplus of trade, a trade surplus. So the notion that pursuing these FTAs somehow costs us jobs is preposterous, and the facts don't hold it up.

One of our friends on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), talked about the fact that we were the manufacturing giant in 1974, 34 years ago, when fast track authority was put into place. And I will tell him that today we are still the world's manufacturing giant. In 1974, we had a $1.5 trillion economy; today, we have a $14.1 trillion economy.

So as was said by the Republican leader, Mr. BOEHNER, this is a no-brainer, as Mr. MCCRERY said, this is a no-brainer economically. We need to recognize that if we as a Nation are going to maintain our leadership role, we have to shape it.

Vote ''no'' on this horrible Hugo Chavez rule, Mr. Speaker.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I need to put on the record the fact that America is not the manufacturing giant. China is the manufacturing giant, followed by India.

Mr. DREIER. Would the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. No. I would like to have my time to close.

The people who talk today about free trade never mention fair trade. That's been a problem for me for a long time. If it has not affected their economy, they're very lucky.

I happen to represent an economy that has been greatly affected by trade policies that did nothing for the American workers, that did nothing to produce more jobs. The idea that we would again continue to follow that failed policy surprised me.

But the most important thing today, we are not debating the Colombia-U.S. Free Trade Compact. What we are debating today is whether or not the House of Representatives is going to take back what it is entitled to take back, and that is, responsibility for scheduling matters that come to the floor for consideration. It is a very important point. We are perfectly entitled to do it under the law. It affects the Senate not a whit.

And I am proud, frankly, to say again that our prerogatives, which have been slipping away from us for the past 12 years, all the Congress' prerogatives going to the executive department, that has to stop. And I not only want to stop this one, I would like to regain some of the abilities that we have lost already to represent the people who send us here.

I urge everyone to vote ''yes'' on this rules change today.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, Article 1, section 8 of the U.S. Constitution grants Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations. Through the years, Congress has recognized the President's role in negotiating trade deals and has granted the President a great deal of leeway with regard to trade. Congress, however, must ratify every trade deal, and the President has a great deal of responsibility to work with elected members of the legislative branch before pressing forward with any negotiated trade agreement.

One power Congress has occasionally authorized for the President is the so-called ''fast track'' negotiating authority. ''Fast track'' permits the President to negotiate a trade agreement while giving Congress an opportunity to ratify the agreement without amendment and within a certain time frame. ''Fast track'' allows the House and the Senate to set its own rules with respect to considering a trade agreement under these expedited conditions. In November 2006, using its ''fast track'' powers, the Administration signed a Trade Promotion Agreement with the South American country of Colombia.

In June 2007, I visited Colombia and met with President Uribe, other Colombian leaders, and U.S. embassy and military professionals serving there. Through the years, I have been extremely skeptical about U.S. involvement in Colombia's civil war and have voted in the House to reduce U.S. military aid to that country. That said, Colombia is an important ally of the United States and the trade agreement negotiated between the U.S. and Colombia is worthy of support. Should it pass, most U.S. exports to Colombia—including Missouri's agricultural exports—will enter that country duty-free. Under current law, nearly all Colombian goods enter the U.S. duty-free.

On April 8, 2008, the Administration took the unprecedented step of delivering the Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement to Congress without having fully consulted with the House and the Senate. In my view, the Administration's maneuver seriously jeopardizes prospects for the trade agreement's passage in the House. Without bipartisan support, I am convinced the House would reject it, sending a negative message to Colombia and derailing important benefits to Missouri agriculture that would be brought with the deal.

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to give Congress more time to review the Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement and to prevent an embarrassing defeat of the agreement on the House floor, I will vote today to delay its consideration. I remain hopeful that the agreement can be considered before the end of the 110th Congress.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 1092 and urge my colleagues to vote for this resolution.

The Administration would like to force this Congress to take up the U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement, FTA, before August.

This resolution will allow Congress, not the Administration, to decide if and when this body should take legislative action on the U.S.-Colombia FTA.

I strongly oppose the U.S.-Colombia FTA. This is yet another flawed, NAFTA-style, trade deal that harms workers in the United States and in Colombia.

Our workers and our communities have been devastated by our flawed trade policies. Since 2001, over three million valuable manufacturing jobs have been lost due to the NAFTA model of trade, now being perpetuated in the U.S.-Colombia FTA.

In Ohio, where we have lost more than 236,000 high-paying manufacturing jobs, we know the realities of these failed trade policies all too well.

The actual number is much higher because we have not included job loss in the service sector and supply chain that we cannot account for. Excluded are local businesses, such as restaurants, just down the road from closed manufacturing facilities that are forced to close their doors. The ripple effect includes a loss of health care and college educations.

Trade agreements should be responsible. The U.S.-Colombia FTA continues the destructive trade policies that spur the exodus of well paying jobs and undermine the ability of working people to protect their living standards. That is not a responsible trade deal.

Trade agreements that fail to enforce worker rights are irresponsible. Approximately 2,300 labor organizers, labor leaders and union members have been murdered in Colombia since 1991. Today, Colombia is still the most dangerous country in the world for union members.

In February, an AFL-CIO delegation met with leaders of the major Colombian labor federations. According to the AFL-CIO ''[l]eaders of the major Colombian Labor federations told the delegation they oppose any free trade deal

between the United States and Colombia until the government takes strong action to stop the violence against trade union members and ends assaults on union rights.''

The U.S. must not continue to expand a failed trade policy based on the NAFTA model. It outsources valuable American jobs and accelerates the transfer of capital out of the U.S. It is a model that harms workers, erodes environmental protections and limits access to healthcare for the poor in the countries we trade with.

Congress must take a much needed step back and bring all parties to the table to examine how we can fix our broken trade system.

Common sense suggests that our trade policies should promote workers' rights, human rights, strong protections for our natural resources and the environment, and expansion of Buy American practices that support American competitiveness. What America needs is Fair Trade, not Free Trade.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 1092 and against the Colombia Free Trade Agreement.

Colombia is an ally and friend of the United States. I commend President Uribe and his government for reducing the violence and unrest in Colombia. They have made great progress.

However, Colombia still leads the world in trade unionist murders. According to Human Rights Watch, 17 have been killed this year alone, and more than 400 over the last six years. Hardly any of these murders have been investigated or prosecuted.

It would be immoral and irresponsible to pass a free trade agreement with Colombia while these conditions persist. But this is not only about human rights. This is about domestic responsibility.

How can we trade away jobs when unemployment is climbing and our economy sinks deeper into recession? Surely, this is not the time to rush into another trade agreement. Doing so without first strengthening our economy and helping American workers is just plain wrong.

The global economy is changing rapidly, and we need to catch up. We need to expand and strengthen Trade Adjustment Assistance. We need a Trade Adjustment Assistance program that educates and trains the American workforce to better compete in the global economy.

Yet the Administration and its allies on the Hill have expressed no interest in making this program meet the needs of American workers. Advancing free trade agreements without first addressing the needs of American workers is just plain irresponsible.

We are here today because the President has once again chosen confrontation over compromise. Like with FISA, the Iraq War and countless other important issues, the President has determined that he alone knows what's best and that Congress and everyone else should just go along. Of course, his disastrous record over the last 7 years—on the economy, jobs, the deficit, health care, disaster relief and our national security, to name just a few issues—should make any fair observer pause before deferring to his judgment. By unilaterally forcing this issue, the President has yet again demonstrated his arrogant disregard for American workers and their families.

The President had a choice. He chose to force a vote, and today he is getting that vote. This vote will declare that strong-arming Congress will not work. This vote will be a vote for human rights. This vote will be a vote for American workers and their families.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes,'' and stand up for working families both here at home and in Colombia.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment that the Members of this body have been forced to make such a difficult decision with regard to the Colombia Free Trade Agreement. As you know, the Bush Administration sent this proposed agreement directly to Congress without the level of dialogue many of us would liked to have seen to ensure we can reach agreement on this matter. I fear that the poor and unprecedented decision by President Bush to place this matter before the House of Representatives without the consent of leadership will result in collateral damage to the Trade Promotion Authority protocol that is instrumental in our work to promote commerce with other countries. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to voting ''present,'' with the hope that continued dialogue between Congress and the White House will lead to a positive resolution of this entire matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, an ancient proverb cautions ''Arrogance diminishes wisdom.'' Sadly, this proposal ignores that warning, indulging institutional arrogance at the expense of wise legislating. Based on the transparent facade the President's transmittal of the Colombia Free Trade Agreement violates a ''protocol,'' the House today is asked to vitiate a law and a process upon which the administration, the Congress and the people of Colombia have relied in good faith.

The alleged breach of manners? A claimed failure to consult the House on the agreement. But, as has been said, consultation has been extensive, and those consultations have had an impact. The Government of Columbia has done a great deal—more than some may have thought wise, in fact—to address Democratic concerns about human rights, labor organizing, and other issues.

It's called ''fast track authority'' for a reason. No argument about process niceties can change the meaning of those words. There is supposed to be a deadline for a vote in this House. That's the very point of the requirement we're being asked to waive today.

In fact, the supposed failure to consult is just the latest pretext for the shameless politicization of free trade policy and the abandonment of a key ally. The perverse truth underlying the political battle lines over trade: This action would harm American interests at home and abroad. American workers would benefit from the provisions in this agreement as much or more than their Colombian brothers and sisters.

This free trade agreement would spark a tremendous increase in trade from the United States to Colombia. High quality American goods like machinery would be available at lower prices in Colombia. The agreement would therefore create jobs, spur investment, and improve our quality of life. The benefit is obvious, especially when compared to the minimal costs. Over 90 percent of Colombian goods already enter the U.S. tariff-free thanks to the recently renewed Andean Trade Preference Act, so we would be sacrificing very little.

There are still subtler yet equally vital reasons to approve the FTA. Colombia is a proud democratic ally in Latin America. It is our closest friend in an area filled with nations opposed to our shared vision of harmonious relations. Colombia has also been beset by a dynamic Marxist insurgency, funded and succored by international drug trafficking and kidnapping. This movement has brought untold death, destruction, and other hardships to Colombia. In recent years, however, the tide has turned. Owing mostly to the steadfast determination of Colombians who seek peace, guided by the unwaveringly leadership of President Álvaro Uribe, and assisted by American funding and advice, the rebels are being defeated. I have been to Colombia many times, most recently in February, and I have seen first-hand the dramatic improvement in Colombia's security situation. By growing and diversifying the Colombian economy, the free trade agreement would provide further incentive for guerillas to cease their quixotic quest for power while also demonstrating the benefits of free trade to those in neighboring countries whose leaders favor demagoguery while letting their economies fall behind.

Many Democratic leaders who oppose the agreement claim they do so because labor leaders are endangered in Colombia. This is an excuse, not a justification. I applaud the vitally important role played by Colombian labor officials. I unalterably oppose actual or threatened violence against them. More importantly, I know President Uribe agrees. His government has instituted widespread reforms to protect labor leaders and to promptly, efficiently, and legally respond to attacks against them. Since 2002, when President Uribe was inaugurated, violence directed at labor officials in Colombia has fallen 80 percent. These institutional changes and results are precisely what Democratic officials in the United States said would earn their support for the free trade agreement. But now the goal posts have been moved. Democratic leaders, beholden to union bigwigs, refuse to do the right thing. This sorry spectacle will further confirm the views of those who believe America's image abroad is deteriorating.

Make no mistake about it, this action will effectively kill this agreement, despite empty claims to the contrary. Rather than ratify provisions which would significantly improve the economies of both the United States and Colombia and solidify relations with a key American ally, the Democratic leadership prefers to cravenly supplicate themselves to their political allies in Big Labor.

Colombia has done what was asked of it. Now, the Democrats who run Congress should opt to help their constituents and aide an important ally. Legislating, like elections, is about choices. And changing the rules, moving the goal line beyond reach, is the wrong choice on the Colombia Free Trade Agreement.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 1092.

It is with careful consideration that I have chosen to support this rule removing procedural timetables from House consideration of the U.S.-Colombia Free Trade Agreement.

A vote on this rule is not a vote on the substance or quality of the Colombia FTA. It is a vote in protest of the President's failure to adequately consult the Congress under well-established protocols.

I was one of only a few members of my caucus to support trade promotion authority in

2002. It is my strong belief that forcing consideration of such measures is not the way ''fast track'' was intended to be utilized.

The President's actions place ultimate implementation of the Colombia FTA in great jeopardy. A failure of the FTA on the House floor would send the worst possible message to our friends and allies in Latin America.

I look forward to working with my colleagues here in Congress, as well as with the administration, to create the conditions for consideration of this important agreement on its own merits.

For too long, the United States has neglected its friends and allies in Latin America, and the Colombia FTA will be a beneficial tool for engagement in the region.

In the midst of growing peace and order in Colombia, removing trade barriers between our two countries will facilitate Colombia's progress and benefit both of our economies.

President Uribe and the Colombian people continue to face a number of challenges, including narco-trafficking and kidnapping by guerrilla groups, continued violence committed by armed paramilitaries, and the need to protect the rights of unions and their leaders. I have great confidence in his abilities, and I look forward to seeing continued progress in this regard.

I also look forward to seeing continued progress and bipartisan support for domestic economic measures, including additional funding to stimulate the economy, to provide support and training for workers, and to address housing, energy, and health care. I urge both President Bush and my colleagues to recommit themselves to these goals, in order to create favorable conditions for consideration of the Colombia FTA.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this irresponsible rule. The Colombia trade agreement was negotiated under trade promotion authority, which clearly specifies that once transmitted to Congress this body must take up the agreement within 90 days. The Government of Colombia negotiated this agreement with us in good faith, that we would keep our word. Unfortunately the majority now wants to change the rules of the game. This is damaging to our relationship with Colombia and damages our reputation in the world. It shows the world that Congress does not keep its word, and this will make any other country reluctant to enter into agreements with our nation. This is simply bad foreign policy.

I believe in the benefits of free and fair trade. I support efforts to remove tariffs and barriers to trade whenever possible and feel that such efforts will lead to increased economic growth for the nation as a whole. With tens of thousands of jobs in my congressional district being tied to trade, the expansion of trade means a healthy future for a number of local businesses, and in turn new jobs for my district, and the Nation.

However, I believe that all trade must be fair trade. The Colombian agreement would be fair trade. Already, the vast majority of Colombian products pay zero tariffs to enter the U.S. market. In fact 365 members of this House, many of whom now stand opposed to this fair trade bill, voted to allow Colombia this open access to our markets. It is not defensible to keep U.S. producers from the same access to Colombia, that Colombia already has to our market. Since 1991, U.S. workers and businesses have paid over a billion dollars in tariffs to sell their wares in the Colombian market. Every day we delay enactment of the Colombia FTA we hurt U.S. workers, farmers, and entrepreneurs who will benefit from opening the Colombian market.

It is disappointing that the Democratic majority has not embraced this trade agreement, as it would mean new jobs for citizens across the nation. New jobs that are very much needed in our tightening economy. Mr. Speaker, I remain committed to the benefits of free and fair trade. I urge my colleagues to reject this rule which would be detrimental to our relationship with Colombia and is more importantly reckless foreign policy.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this resolution that President Bush has regrettably made necessary.

The immediate effect of the resolution will be to allow deferral of a vote on the proposed free trade agreement with Colombia.

Some say that the longer-term effect will be to make approval of that agreement impossible. But I think the reality could be just the reverse, because as you have said, Mr. Speaker, at this point the odds are against its approval and so deferring the vote on the agreement could be the only way it might ever be approved.

I have supported Free Trade Agreements with Bahrain, Singapore, Chile, Morocco, Australia, Jordan, Oman, and Peru, I'd like the opportunity to consider the merits of a Columbia FTA, but cannot jump to the conclusion that its provisions are fully acceptable, and I am troubled by allegations that labor organizers have been terrorized by government authorities in Columbia. It seems to me that the proponents of this agreement have the burden of making a compelling case that the agreement meets criteria Congress has insisted upon with regard to labor protections.

Therefore, deferring the vote will allow additional time for the Bush Administration and the other supporters of the agreement either to the make the case that it should be approved in its current form or to work with the Colombian government and the Congress to make revisions to respond to objections raised by its opponents.

It should not have been necessary for the House to act to provide that time. If President Bush had been willing to do more to resolve those objections, we would not be taking such action. But by deciding to formally transmit the agreement, which set in motion the so-called ''fast track'' procedures of the current law applicable to trade agreements, the President has brought us to this point.

And while the details are different, that approach is very similar to the one the president has followed on many other matters—demanding approval of his proposals and refusing to work with Members of Congress to resolve objections or accommodate other suggestions.

We have seen the pattern over and over, from the repeated vetoes of legislation to expand the State Children's Health Program, SCHIP, to revising the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, FISA, and with regard to more other matters than I have time to list.

But this time, by adopting this resolution, we can give President Bush time to reconsider that way of doing business, and give the other proponents of the Colombia trade agreement time to make the case for why it should be approved.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join you today in standing up for working families in America by opposing the flawed fast track procedures.

When the President sent the Colombia Trade Agreement to Congress earlier this week, he started a clock for the agreement's consideration. He hoped that by forcing Congress to act, he would be able to win approval of the Colombia FTA. Yet, in reality, he only exposed one of the many problems that fast track trade negotiation authority created.

Today, Congress is sending a clear message to the President that we will not consider the Colombia Free Trade Agreement or any other FTA's on his time table. We will not be bullied. Congress is a coequal branch of government.

As you may know, I have long opposed the granting of fast track authority to the President because it removed Congress from shaping and drafting trade agreements, the timing of their consideration, and allowed Congress only an up or down vote on unamendable trade agreements. In doing so Congress abdicated our essential responsibility to our nation's citizens. I was pleased that this dangerous fast track authority expired last summer and has not been renewed.

As I hear from people from across central New Jersey, protecting workers' rights, human rights, and the environment are not secondary or extraneous concerns; they are central to what the United States stands for. I support trade that elevates the quality of life for citizens all over the world. The United States, and indeed the entire world, can benefit from increased trade, but increased trade in itself is not the goal we seek. Rather, we seek an improved quality of life for our people and advancement of other people's well-being.

Additionally, even on the merits I am very concerned by the Colombian agreement. As I have said before, trade done right helps lift the global standard of living and works to protect our natural environment. Trade agreements are not just about goods and commodities, they are about values. Trade agreements state what constitutes acceptable behavior in worker's rights, environmental matters, intellectual property, and so forth. We should make sure we export the goods we produce and not the workers who produce them. We must continue to demand improvements in our trade policy.

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 195, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 181]

YEAS—224

Abercrombie	Allen	Baca
Ackerman	Altmire	Baird
Aderholt	Arcuri	Baldwin

Barrow
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crowley
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
Goode
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
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)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
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)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—195

Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Brady (TX)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cuellar
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
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hill
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
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
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
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
Tancredo
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 (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Tanner

NOT VOTING—12

Andrews
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Burgess
Buyer
Ferguson
Granger
Hulshof
Larson (CT)
Ramstad
Rush
Sires

□ 1347

Mr. PENCE changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. ORTIZ and ADERHOLT changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not present to vote on rollcall votes Nos. 178, 179, 180, and 181 due to a family medical matter. Had I been present, I would have voted:

"Yea" on rollcall vote No. 178 on the Journal vote; "yea" on rollcall vote No. 179 on agreeing to H. Res. 1083, providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 2537, Beach Protection Act of 2008; "yea" on rollcall vote No. 180 on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 1038, recognizing the fifth anniversary of the Department of Homeland Security and honoring the Department's employees for their extraordinary efforts and contributions to protect and secure our Nation; and "yea" on rollcall vote No. 181 on agreeing to H. Res. 1092, relating to the consideration of the bill H.R. 5274 to implement the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2537.

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

There was no objection.

BEACH PROTECTION ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1083 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2537.

□ 1404

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2537) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relating to beach monitoring, and for other purposes, with Ms. DEGETTE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2537, the Beach Protection Act of 2007. This legislation extends the authorization of appropriations for the Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health Act, the BEACH Act, through 2012. First signed into law in October 2000, the BEACH Act has provided States, local governments and tribes vital funding for assessment and public notification programs that monitor our coastal waters.

Over the years, the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment has held numerous hearings on EPA's BEACH program. In fact, the history of the BEACH Act goes back to 1990 when Congressman William Hughes of New Jersey first introduced the Beaches Environmental Assessment, Closure and Health Act of 1990. I applaud his vision for effective coastal water quality criteria and public notification, as well as the efforts of Congressman PALLONE and Congressman BISHOP, the primary sponsors of this legislation, to carry forward this legacy.

As reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Beach Protection Act of 2007 increases the annual authorization level for State and local monitoring and notification grants by $10 million and expands the eligible uses for grants under

this program. For example, H.R. 2735 allows States to utilize a portion of their BEACH grant funding to develop and implement pollution source identification and tracking programs for coastal recreation waters, which will enable interested States to locate the likely sources of coastal water contamination.

H.R. 2537 also encourages the development and implementation of rapid testing methods for determining where and when coastal recreational waters exceed coastal water quality criteria. These rapid testing methods are designed to ensure that the public is notified of potential harmful recreational waters within a few hours, rather than days as under the current system. This provision will have a significant impact on efforts to protect the public from coming into contact with potentially harmful pollutants and contaminants at their favorite beaches.

In addition, H.R. 2537 enhances existing public notification requirements, including making beach warnings and closures available on the Internet. The bill clarifies that the public must be notified within 24 hours of the authority receiving results of contaminated water quality samples. However, because many States utilize a system where two contaminated samples must be identified before a beach is closed, H.R. 2537 also requires that a physical sign must be posted at any beach where the results of a water quality sample demonstrate the likelihood that the water may be contaminated. Again, providing more information and notice on the condition of the Nation's coastal water quality is essential to ensure that the public can avoid contact with potentially harmful pollutants while visiting their favorite beach.

The bill also enhances EPA's review of individual States' compliance with the requirement of the BEACH Act by requiring the Administrator to conduct an annual review of implementation of the BEACH Act by State and local governments and to take corrective action if State and local governments are not in compliance with BEACH Act requirements. It also requires the Government Accountability Office to audit EPA's administration of the BEACH Act.

Finally, the bill requires EPA to conduct annual compliance reviews of State and local BEACH programs.

Later today I plan to offer a bipartisan manager's amendment to the bill to address several technical recommendations made by the Environmental Protection Agency and others that will improve the bill. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the manager's amendment and the underlying legislation that I believe will make significant improvement to EPA's BEACH program.

Much of our efforts are to provide additional safeguards for our families to make sure that they do not come into contact with potentially harmful pollutants and contaminants along the Nation's coastlines. I believe this legislation accomplishes what we tried to do.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chairman, I am very excited the House is moving H.R. 2537, the Beach Protection Act of 2007. This is an example of the good we can accomplish when we are able to work in a bipartisan manner to address the Nation's water resources needs.

Beaches are an important part of American life. Our Nation has nearly 23,000 miles of ocean and Gulf shoreline along the continental United States, 5,500 miles of Great Lakes shorelines and 3.6 million miles of rivers and streams. Beaches are an important part of the coastal watershed, providing numerous recreational opportunities for millions of people, including fishing, boating, beachcombing, swimming, surfing, sunbathing and bird watching.

Each year, over 180 million people visit coastal waters for recreational purposes. This activity supports over 28 million jobs and leads to the investment of over $50 billion each year in goods and services. Public confidence in the quality of our Nation's water is important, not only to each citizen who swims, but also to the tourism and recreation industries that rely on safe and swimmable coastal waters.

To improve the public's confidence in the quality of our Nation's coastal waters and protect public health and safety, Congress passed the Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health Act of 2000, commonly called the BEACH Act in the 106th Congress.

The BEACH Act aimed to limit and prevent human exposure to polluted coastal recreational waters by assisting States and local communities to implement beach monitoring, assessment and public notification programs. The act also called on States with coastal recreational waters to adopt pathogen-related water quality standards and directed EPA to conduct research and develop updated water quality criteria to protect human health. Under the BEACH Act, EPA has been making grants to States to help them implement programs to monitor beach water quality and notify the public if water quality standards for pathogens are not being met.

An important indicator of progress to date is the fact that all eligible States are now implementing the beach monitoring assessment and public notification provisions of the BEACH Act. The number of monitored beaches has increased from approximately 1,000 in 1997 to more than 3,500 in 2006.

In addition, EPA has strengthened water quality standards throughout all the coastal recreation waters in the United States. All 35 States and territories with coastal recreation waters now have water quality standards as protective of human health as EPA's water quality criteria. This is an increase from 11 States and territories in 2000.

Further, EPA has improved public access to data on beach advisories and closings by improving the agency's electronic beach data collection and delivery systems. Moreover, EPA has been conducting cutting edge research to support the development of new water quality criteria to protect human health from pathogens and new monitoring methods to more accurately and rapidly detect pathogen contamination in recreational waters.

Faster and better decisions are good for public health and good for the economy and beach communities. We are optimistic that this work will help State beach managers make the best decisions possible about keeping beaches open or placing them under advisory.

□ 1415

Although EPA and the States have made substantial progress in implementing the BEACH Act, there is important work left to do in the areas of monitoring, research and updating the existing water quality criteria.

Reauthorizing the BEACH Act will enable EPA and the States to complete the important work they have begun so they can better protect public health and safety and continue to improve the quality of our Nation's recreational coastal waters so important to the economies of our coastal communities.

H.R. 2537 passed the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee by a unanimous vote. I would like to thank the chairman of the committee, Mr. OBERSTAR, and the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, and especially a thank you to the ranking member, Mr. MICA, for all the hard work they have done put in to allow us to bring to you a consensus bill that enjoys strong bipartisan support.

I would also very much like to thank the staff. We have a bipartisan amendment that will be offered by Ms. JOHNSON at the appropriate time. It addresses technical and clarifying matters and other matters brought to the committee's attention since the committee filed its report.

I urge all Members to support the legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to Mr. KAGEN from Wisconsin.

Mr. KAGEN. Thank you to Madam JOHNSON and subcommittee Chair FRANK PALLONE for putting together a tremendous bill.

Madam Chairman, as a Member who has the honor of representing one of the largest States in the country that has shoreline beyond measure in its value, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2537, the Beach Protection Act.

This critical piece of legislation will increase grant funding overseen by the

EPA for water quality surveys and for pollution source tracking programs, and it will also set a new standard for public notification.

H.R. 2537 will take important steps to address the serious threat to public health and the economic vitality of coastal vitality of coastal economies in northeast Wisconsin posed by beach water pollution and human pathogens.

I would be remiss, however, if I did not also recognize the exemplary job performed by the State of Wisconsin's Department of Natural Resources, who has been monitoring 34 of the 35 beaches in Door County, Brown County and Kewaunee County.

While I am also proud to applaud the beach monitoring standards employed by the State of Wisconsin, this act will also improve upon the quality of these observations and heighten public safety. After all, clean water gets good health.

Moreover, it will require the EPA to commence a study, identify potential revisions in the beach-funding distribution formula, which currently weighs the beach season conservatively, more importantly, than other factors such as Wisconsin's winter season not being adequately measured. Additionally, the bill will call upon the EPA to publish a list of pathogens affecting human health.

In closing, I urge all of our colleagues to support H.R. 2537.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I certainly appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Madam Chairman, I rise in very strong support of H.R. 2537, the Beach Protection Act, and I want to applaud Chairman OBERSTAR for his leadership in bringing this to the floor and working with Ranking Member MICA. Certainly our subcommittee Chair, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, has done extraordinary work on this, and our ranking member on the subcommittee, Mr. BOOZMAN, as well, for bringing it to the floor, I think, in a very bipartisan way.

I actually was not in the Congress in 2000 when the original BEACH Act became law, but I really feel this program could have been designed with my district in mind. In Michigan, we are unbelievably blessed to be surrounded by the Great Lakes which provide incredible recreational opportunities for boating or fishing or swimming.

Millions of Michigan residents from all over the world come to Michigan to enjoy our magnificent Great Lakes. In fact, there are more than 30 million people who find their way every year to our beaches.

We also have some especially unique challenges in the Great Lakes region in regards to quality. Unfortunately, due to inadequate underground infrastructure, many areas suffer from combined sewer overflows during our wet weather events. We often see sewage discharges right into the Great Lakes, right along the beaches near big cities like Detroit or Chicago, other populated areas.

My district faces additional challenges in that we have a very long liquid border that we share with Canada. In fact, on the Canadian side of the river next to my district is an area which we call Chemical Valley, which is the largest concentration of petrochemical manufacturing plants in North America. So we need to worry not only about discharges on the American side, but on the Canadian side of the border as well.

Frequent and proper monitoring is a critical tool in this area to ensure that those who come to enjoy our State's natural beauty can do so knowing that the waters are clean and pure.

The BEACH Act has provided resources to help State and local governments ensure that our beaches are safe for recreational activity. In many ways, the BEACH Act has been successful and this reauthorization bill and the bipartisan cooperation that went into it has improved an already outstanding Federal program, but I do believe that we can do better.

A 2007 GAO report about the impact of the BEACH Act on the Great Lakes noted that there were some important successes, but also some areas where we need to improve. First, the GAO found that the formula EPA has used to distribute the BEACH Act grants does not accurately reflect the monitoring needs of the respective States. The EPA takes into account three factors to determine the allocation of these grants: beach season length, beach miles, and then beach usage.

At the current funding levels, the beach season factor has a much greater influence than the factors of beach miles and coastal population. Great Lakes States, which have beach seasons of little longer than 4 months, lose out when compared to southern and western States, of course, that have a full year season, even though the number of people who use the beaches might be similar.

Just an example, my home State of Michigan is disadvantaged by the minimal consideration given to beach miles. In 2006, Michigan, that has 3,224 shoreline miles, received a grant out allocation of only $278,000. By contrast, one of our neighboring States, that has only 63 shoreline miles, received $243,000. Due in part to this funding disparity, Michigan is only able to monitor 212 of its 905 beaches.

I am glad that this legislation helps address this problem by requiring the EPA to conduct a study of the formula for the distribution of grants in accordance with the needs of the States. EPA must report their findings back to the Congress and suggest possible revisions for a more equitable distribution of the funds.

A second recommendation from the GAO report was that Congress should consider providing more flexibility for the grant so that they could be used to investigate and remediate contamination sources. Because of the increased monitoring, we are better able to predict which beaches would be contaminated.

But most cases local officials do not know the source of the contamination and are unable to take the action to address the cause. If they did they would still not have adequate funds to address the issue.

This legislation will allow States to use their BEACH Act grants to track sources of pollution. This change will provide the valuable information that we need to help clean up our waters and reduce pollution before it gets into our waters.

I urge my colleagues to support the passage of this legislation.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I would like to yield to our distinguished Chair of the full committee for a unanimous consent request.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2537, the Beach protection Act of 2008.

This legislation, and the underlying statute that the Beach Protection Act amends, are vital to ensuring that the public is aware of, and protected from coming into contact with, potentially harmful pollutants and contaminants in our coastal recreational waters.

I applaud the efforts of the primary sponsors of this legislation, the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, and our colleague on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Mr. BISHOP, for shepherding this important legislation through the hearing process, through Committee markup, and to the floor of the House today.

I also applaud the efforts of the gentleman from California, Mr. BILBRAY, for his efforts back in 2000 to move the initial BEACH Act to the President's desk.

The BEACH Act that was signed into law in October 2000 authorized $30 million annually for beach monitoring and assessment programs and public notification programs for fiscal years 2001 through 2005. It required States and tribes to determine minimum water quality standards that were considered "safe."

In many ways, the BEACH Act has proven successful in making the public aware of the presence of potentially harmful water contamination at local beaches, and has brought about a revolution in terms of States creating and implementing coastal recreational water monitoring and notification programs. The benefits we have seen over the last 8 years include uniform standards for coastal recreational water quality, and increased monitoring and notification of such waters.

However, inasmuch as the BEACH Act has been successful in providing more information to the public, the Bush administration's track record on utilizing all of the tools contained in the BEACH Act to protect human health has been far less successful.

For example, the EPA was given authority to promulgate standards for States that did not have sufficient standards as compared to

those in the 1986 Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Bacteria. EPA was given further direction to continue to study the impacts of waterborne pollutants and bacteria to human health, and to revise the criteria every five years as needed.

Unfortunately, EPA failed to complete this task, as demonstrated by a lawsuit by advocates for safe beaches, and more recently, in a report of the Government Accountability Office ("GAO").

This GAO Report, entitled "Great Lakes: EPA and States Have Made Progress in Implementing the BEACH Act, but Additional Actions Could Improve Public Health Protection," established that more work could be done to ensure the safety of our beach waters.

Just this week, a Federal District Court judge in California ruled that EPA, again, violated its "non-discretionary duty" to complete required studies on revising coastal water quality criteria and standards. Even after losing a similar lawsuit in 2006, EPA continues to argue that the statute gives the Agency the discretion to "conduct the studies as it sees fit." This is contrary to the law, and has once again been dismissed by the Federal District Court judge.

Similarly, the Bush administration has failed to utilize the authorities and direction of the initial BEACH Act to ensure the public has the best, most accurate, and timely information on the condition of their favorite beaches. For example, the BEACH Act called for a creation of a "National List of Beaches" that would provide the public with information on which beaches had in place monitoring and notification programs, and which did not. EPA was given the direction to periodically revise this list, based on the availability of new information.

I can assure my colleagues that latest list, published in 2004, is not the most up-to-date assessment of the condition of the Nation's beaches. Again, the administration has failed to utilize the tools provided by Congress to ensure the protection of human health and safety.

Despite the current administration's track record, the BEACH Act is an important law for protecting the public from the presence of harmful pollutants and contaminants in the Nation's recreational waters.

The Beach Protection Act, under consideration today, will further enhance these authorities by working towards real-time, same-day information on the condition of local waters to safeguard against unintentional contact with contaminated waters.

Again, I strongly support the efforts of our colleagues in drafting this important piece of legislation, and urge its adoption.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey, who is the author of the bill.

Mr. PALLONE. I thank the subcommittee Chair, the gentlewoman from Texas.

Let me say I appreciate the bipartisan support that this legislation has, and certainly the efforts, not only of Mr. TIM BISHOP of New York, but of our chairman of the full committee, Mr. OBERSTAR, and the subcommittee Chair, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, for moving this legislation today.

Madam Chairman, our Nation's beaches are vital, not only to residents of our coastal States, but also for countless visitors who come to visit each year. America's beaches are a tremendous resource for those who come to enjoy them, and they are a huge economic engine for our coastal States.

In New Jersey alone, beaches are the primary driver of a tourism economy that provides nearly 500,000 jobs and generates nearly $36 billion in economic activities to the State each year. All summer long thousands of people flock to the beaches.

It's my intention to assure that these beachgoers that are there in New Jersey and elsewhere, that not only are they visiting clean beaches, but they are also swimming in safe waters.

Thanks to the BEACH Act, a law that I helped to author back in 2000, we have made major strides over the last 8 years. The BEACH Act of 2000 helped us improve water quality testing and monitoring of beaches across the country, which is critical to protecting the health of beachgoers.

The act has three provisions: one, requiring States to adopt certain EPA water quality criteria to protect beachgoers from getting sick; two, requiring the EPA to update these water quality criteria with new science and technologies to provide better, faster water testing; and, third, to provide grants to States to implement coastal water monitoring programs.

In New Jersey we used some of this grant money to become the first State in the Nation to launch a real-time Web site that notifies beachgoers of the state of our beaches. Essentially, this bill is a right-to-know piece of legislation.

Now, despite the actions New Jersey and other States have taken since the BEACH Act was signed earlier in the year 2000, this act must be improved. That's why I have introduced the Beach Protection Act of 2007.

This bill not only reauthorizes the grants to States for 2012 but adds to the annual grant levels from a total of $30 million to a new level of $40 million annually.

We also expand the scope of BEACH Act grants from water quality monitoring and notification to also include pollution source tracking efforts. The bill requires that beach water quality violations are disclosed not only to the public but all relevant State agencies with beach water quality authority.

I want to mention the rapid testing methods. This act calls for the use of rapid testing methods by requiring the EPA to approve the use of rapid testing methods that detect bathing water contamination in 6 hours or less. This is something that I have been advocating for the last couple of years.

Current water quality tests, like those used in New Jersey, only test for bacteria levels and take 24 to 48 hours to produce reliable results, during which time many beachgoers can be unknowingly exposed to harmful pathogens. More immediate results would prevent beaches from remaining open when high levels of bacteria are found.

The legislation also requires prompt communication with State environmental agencies by stating that all BEACH Act grant recipients make decisions about closures or advisories within 24 hours in order to ensure coordination in response to activities.

We are also requiring each State receiving grants to implement measures for tracking and IDing sources of pollution, creating a public online database for each beach with relevant pollution closure information posted, and ensuring the closures or advisories are issued shortly after the State finding that coastal waters are out of compliance, so, again, right to know, information to the public.

We are also holding States accountable by requiring the EPA administrator to do annual reviews of grantees' compliance with BEACH Act process requirements. The Beach Protection Act will strengthen current law by requiring States to use expedited testing.

This is a right to know for our beachgoers. It's very important, and I want to thank everyone on a bipartisan basis for supporting it.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my friend from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY).

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Chairman, things that we do in this Chamber have consequences, and the things we don't do in Chamber also have consequences. Quite frankly, there are a lot things that we are not doing that are having immense consequences, things like renewing the FISA bill, the war supplemental, long-term issues like Social Security and Medicaid. We had another one today, the Colombia Free Trade Agreement, which are things that will have consequences because we have not dealt with this on the floor.

The internal combustion engine will be used for a long time to power pleasure craft on our lakes and beaches and waterways. The public policy decisions that we are taking in here and have taken in here make that use of those boats and jet skis much more expensive.

Public policy decisions that are specifically aimed at increasing the energy costs to all Americans are things like raising taxes on energy companies so that they are no longer able to use that money to explore for and produce additional crude oil and natural gas, restrictions on where we can drill for these additional sources of crude oil and natural gas, and the gasoline that results from that to power our water crafts and jet ski, added regulations on the production of crude oil and natural gas, added regulations on the refining of crude oil and natural gas and the gasoline that can be used to power jet skis and motor boats and others, and even new regulations that are coming that will increase the cost of electricity to American consumers and American businesses.

□ 1430

All of these public policy decisions that we make in this House and have made in this House are specifically designed to raise the operating costs of all these vehicles to consumers in America. It is the elephant in the room that none of us want to talk about as we go forward with the energy policy that is put forth by the leadership of the current House. That is, they specifically want Americans paying higher gasoline prices because when you reduce supplies, as these policies do in the face of increasing demand, then the law of supply and demand works, in spite of our best efforts, and costs go up.

As we have seen, gasoline prices are at an all-time high. This weekend, which will be a wonderful weekend to be on our beaches and lakes, using those watercrafts, the gasoline that will be purchased to pay for that recreational use this weekend will be much higher than it otherwise would have been than if we had taken rational steps with respect to energy policy in this country.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation which would reauthorize the Beach Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health Act, or the BEACH Act.

My district has over 1,600 miles of beach frontage on the Great Lakes, and the BEACH Act has been instrumental in providing funding to protect beachgoers from bacteria and other dangerous pathogens.

Michigan residents rely on BEACH Act funding to protect them. In my district, residents on Sugar Island near Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, depended on this important funding to monitor water that had been contaminated with E. coli, coliform, and other bacteria. Without the support of BEACH Act grants, the Chippewa County Health Department would not have been able to determine that the pollution was originating from a wastewater treatment plant in Canada.

This legislation would improve the BEACH Act program to ensure a fairer distribution of funds. In July of 2007, the Government Accountability Office released a report at the request of myself and several other Great Lakes colleagues. This report found that the EPA was using a funding formula that prioritizes States with warmer climates, ignoring other important factors such as beach miles and beach use. This formula put Great Lakes States like Michigan at a distinct disadvantage, making it more difficult for these States to protect their beachgoers.

This legislation addresses this problem by instructing EPA to revise its funding formula to take factors such as beach miles and beach use into consideration.

While monitoring water quality and tracing the sources of pollution to its origin are important steps to keeping our beaches clean, knowledge is only half of the battle. The July 2007 GAO report also found that while the BEACH Act has helped protect beachgoers from polluted waters, States still do not have the resources they need to clean up the pollution and prevent future problems.

The latest survey by EPA has estimated that an additional $181 billion is needed nationwide for infrastructure projects eligible for funding under the State revolving fund. I look forward to working with Chairman OBERSTAR and the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee later this year to address our water and wastewater infrastructure needs and provide resources for the State revolving fund.

I appreciate the work of Mr. PALLONE and Mr. OBERSTAR on this important legislation, and look forward to working with them as we continue to address important Great Lakes issues.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Chairman, I rise to express my deep disappointment with today's debate in the House. With our Nation facing record high gas prices, the majority leadership in the House has chosen to debate legislation not on securing reliable and affordable energy, but on beaches.

I suggest a better use of our time and the American people's time would be to have a serious debate about energy. How are we going to make energy more affordable in the short term? How are we going to make energy more affordable as the Nation needs to be more independent in the long term? What will be our primary fuel source in the future, and how do we get there?

Instead, in recent months we have periodically debated shortsighted and fatally flawed legislation that purports to fix our energy problems simply by raising taxes by billions of dollars on domestic energy companies and hoping for the best. That is not an energy policy, that is a tax increase on every American family. Energy companies will inevitably pass on their additional costs to consumers at the pump.

We should be debating legislation to streamline the Federal permitting process that has stifled construction of new oil refineries. We haven't built one in 32 years. We could be talking about benefiting consumers by simplifying our Nation's fragmented gasoline supply. The number of regional boutique fuels restricts the movement of our fuel supply and raises costs on Americans at the pump.

We could be debating the merits of opening Alaska's Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, ANWR, and the Outer Continental Shelf for energy exploration. We know that combined these areas have nearly 100 billion barrels of oil. Previous Congresses, urged on by their radical environmentalist allies, made the decision to keep these vast reserves off-limits. As a result, we see oil now at $110 a barrel. It is time we revisit the very important issue of being able to go after resources we have available to us in Alaska and in the Outer Continental Shelf.

What about encouraging the construction of nuclear power plants? We began that process in 2005 with the passage of the Energy Policy Act. But as we stand here today, we haven't built a new plant in decades. European and Asian nations are building them by the dozens. India has nine new plants under construction. Japan is building five more. And China has plans to build 30 reactors. We in this country have plans for exactly zero on the way.

Let's talk about how we intend to compete with China, which is canvassing the globe in its quest to ensure a reliable supply of oil. Reports indicate that the Chinese are forming energy partnerships with rogue nations like Iran and Cuba. And Cuba is purportedly planning to allow the Chinese to drill for oil off the Florida Keys, off our Florida Keys.

Shouldn't we be talking about boosting domestic production simply so we wouldn't have to rely on the mood of Third World dictators like Hugo Chavez? Wouldn't it be nice if prices didn't spike at your neighborhood gas station when terrorists decide to blow up a pipeline half a world away, or when there is instability in Nigeria?

Some may argue, and they might well be right, that oil isn't the long-term answer. It is a finite resource that may be scarce in the near future as developing nations like China and India continue to expand and industrialize; maybe so. But shouldn't we consider boosting our oil and natural gas supplies, increasing our energy independence that might just buy us the time necessary to develop the next fuel source? Maybe hydrogen fuel cell technology will take us into the next century. Maybe it is some other renewable resource. It could be a combination, or maybe something we haven't even discovered yet. We don't know. We do know that America has substantial reserves of oil and natural gas that we have locked up, we have placed off-limits. These resources could be the bridge that allows America to cross over the choppy waters of OPEC and Third World dictators to the secure footing of affordable and secure energy sources of tomorrow. Let's talk about these important things. Let's not talk about beaches.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Beach Protection Act. This bill will increase protections for the Nation's beaches and the public health. I commend Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BISHOP, and the Transportation Committee leadership for bringing this important bill to the floor in a bipartisan way.

Despite having one of the most comprehensive beach water quality testing

programs of all the coastal States, my home State of California has by far the most beach closures and advisories of all of the States. The State reported over 4,600 closing and advisory days statewide in 2006.

This legislation builds on the progress made since the passage of the BEACH Act in 2000 to reduce the number of these closures which threaten public health.

First, the legislation increases the funds available to the States, and expands the uses of those funds to include tracking the sources of pollution that cause beach closures, and supporting pollution-prevention efforts.

It will also require the EPA to develop methods for rapid testing of beach water, so results are available in hours, not days.

Second, the legislation strengthens the requirement for public notification of health risks posed by water contamination. These measures will improve the public's awareness of health risks posed by contamination of coastal waters and create additional tools for addressing the sources of pollution that cause beach closures, including leaking or overflowing sewer systems and storm water runoff.

I know some of my colleagues are trying to make this debate into one of energy and our economy. This is a bill to help protect the health of our beaches and the health of our economies. Safe and healthy beaches are strongly tied to our local economies. So I urge my colleagues not to be distracted by extraneous arguments.

Clean water is an economic and public health necessity for California and for all coastal States. I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on H.R. 2537. Let's take good care of our beaches.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

(Mr. HALL of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALL of Texas. Madam Chairman, I am of course pleased to support H.R. 2537, the Beach Protection Act of 2007, and appreciate the efforts of Mr. PALLONE to advance this legislation.

It is my understanding that this bill will receive overwhelming bipartisan support. It is going to be a totally green board, which I applaud. But it seems to me that the House has other, more critical issues to consider, such as the rising cost of energy which affects the success or failures of the traveling public to even reach the beaches of the world.

Oil and gas prices are at an all-time high with national averages topping $3.25 a gallon. A year ago we feared a time when crude oil could reach $100 a barrel, and now oil has reached $110 a barrel for the first time in history.

Unfortunately, energy analysts are saying that prices at the pump are not likely to decrease any time soon, and could rise as high as $3.75, maybe $4 a gallon this year.

My constituents in the Fourth District of Texas, as well as all Americans, are very concerned about the ever-increasing cost of gasoline and diesel, combined with the escalating prices at the grocery store. It is costing them more to travel to work, and more to provide food for their families. They are looking to Congress for some immediate relief and some long-term solutions.

The Energy Security Act that the majority passed and the President signed into law has some good provisions; but, unfortunately, none that will provide Americans the relief they need from high energy costs. Not one barrel of oil was provided in that entire act. There was no mention in the Energy Act of an increase in domestic production, which is one way to help bring down energy costs.

This year marks the culmination of a research and development product which I have worked on and passed, I think four times as a Democrat and one time as a Republican, and it is the Ultra-deepwater and Unconventional Onshore Hydrocarbon Resources Act that was signed into law as part of the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

Nuclear energy has also seen a surge in recent years as people realize it is a clean and safe source of energy. But as with building a new refinery, the permitting and construction process is extremely expensive, and there are still significant risks to venture capitalists who would otherwise invest.

Congress needs to reduce uncertainty in the regulatory process for permitting and construction of new nuclear plants, as well as oil refineries, by streamlining the process and requiring the Environmental Protection Agency to issue its rulings within a realistic time frame.

America needs relief at the pump now more than ever. Congress needs to jump start efforts to bring down energy costs in the short term and build on comprehensive energy policies that recognize the importance of all energy sources in the long term. Providing Americans with affordable energy is an important issue.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KLEIN).

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. I thank the distinguished chairwoman of the Water Resources Subcommittee for yielding to me, and for her great work on the legislation, as well as the bill's sponsor, Mr. PALLONE.

Madam Chairman, I rise today to enthusiastically support the Beach Protection Act of 2007. With over 75 miles of shoreline along Florida's well-renowned Gold Coast on the Atlantic Ocean, my congressional district relies heavily on its beaches to support both our economy and our unparalleled quality of life.

But keeping our beaches open and thriving requires us to vigilantly fight pollution in our waters. According to the Natural Resources Defense Council, almost 2,700 beach advisory or closure dates were issued due to pollution for the State of Florida in 2006. Although the number was down from the previous 2 years, 2006 represents a record high for closing or posted warnings with over 25,000 such notices across our country.

Madam Chairman, the causes for beach pollution are well known. It often originates from contaminated storm water or inadequately treated sewage, and the effects can be wide ranging and devastating, ranging from ear infections and respiratory ailments, to hepatitis and dysentery. For senior citizens, small children and people with weak immune systems, the results can even be deadly.

That is why this act, the Beach Protection Act, is important. The legislation will reauthorize the BEACH Act of 2000 and increase annual funding from $30 million to $40 million, enabling more beaches to receive Federal grants to support State-monitoring efforts.

□ 1445

It will also allow States to use the funds to track and clean up the sources of beach water pollution so that we can prevent future closings and advisories from happening.

H.R. 2537 will also speed up notifications of water quality. The unfortunate truth is that many beach managers are using outdated testing methods that are incapable of providing immediate, same-day results of water quality. This means that beachgoers sometimes don't even find out until a day or two after they return from the beach that the water they were swimming in was hazardous.

This delay must stop. Our constituents have a right to know right away if the water is unsafe. And now that we have rapid test methods that can provide results in as little as 2 hours, the EPA must approve them and States must implement them, and this bill will require them to do that.

The Beach Protection Act is critically important for our coastal communities and the millions of Americans who enjoy and visit them each year.

I thank the chairwoman again for her work on it, and look forward to the passage of this bill.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the ranking member of the Energy and Air Quality Subcommittee, Mr. UPTON from Michigan.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Chairman, I must say, when I saw the whip notice this last week, I saw some good things and some bad things. One of the bad things that I didn't see was that we're not addressing what my constituents are talking about, and that is gas prices.

Yes, this is a good bill, beach nutrition. It has water monitoring there, Great Lakes are now part of it, and I want to thank particularly the Members from the Great Lakes area who

were able to include that, particularly my friend who represents the east side of Michigan, CANDICE MILLER, on that committee.

But as far as I know, this bill passed without dissent. Frankly, it could have been under suspension of the rules. I bet we would have passed it on a voice vote, two-thirds voting in favor of it. After the Flake amendment, maybe there are some that wish that it did come up under suspension so that they wouldn't deal with the Flake earmark amendment. We'll see.

But, you know, my constituents back home, they're complaining that we're doing things that aren't maybe on the top of their agenda. We're talking about steroids, we're talking about a whole number of things that don't impact the economy or, in fact, their pocketbook. They're talking about gas prices.

On Tuesday when I left to come back from Michigan, diesel prices were $4.11 a gallon. Gas prices, unleaded regular, $3.35 a gallon. I can hardly wait till I go back this week and see what they might have gone to.

What have we done on this? That is their question. What are we doing about supply and demand?

Well, I'll tell you some of the things we've done. We've raised taxes on them. Thank goodness we've got the Senate saying no so far because, of course, if you raise taxes on energy production here, those costs are just going to be passed along to the consumer and they'll go up even higher. Go talk to the French or the British and those folks. They tax gas a lot and they pay a lot more per gallon.

There's some things that we haven't done. I know some in this body have advocated for raising the gas tax by as much as 50 cents a gallon. We haven't done that. Maybe, certainly I believe that's a good thing.

But we've blocked using oil shale from Canada. You know, they've got a field up in the Northwest there that they think rivals the Saudis, that can actually heat up the sand and the oil comes out. They're actually taking 1½ million gallons.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BOOZMAN. I yield the gentleman an additional 20 seconds.

Mr. UPTON. We need to do more. We are now, by 2012, our domestic needs, we're going to be only producing 12 percent of our gas here. That's got to change.

Madam Speaker, let's not go to the beach and leave our work undone. Let's pass this bill, but let's deal with the real issue that Americans feel in their pocketbooks literally every day that they go to the pump.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I would like to inquire of my colleague, Mr. BOOZMAN, how many more speakers he has.

Mr. BOOZMAN. We have several, Madam Chairman, probably five or six.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I reserve my time.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Chairman, I wanted to read some quotes. This is a quote from Speaker NANCY PELOSI, 4/24/06: ''Democrats have a commonsense plan to help bring down skyrocketing gas prices.''

Another quote from Majority Leader HOYER: ''Democrats believe that we can do more for the American people who are struggling to deal with high gas prices.'' This was 10/4/05.

On 7/26/06, Mr. JIM CLYBURN, the Democratic Whip, said, ''House Democrats have a plan to help curb rising gas prices.''

We need to see those plans. We need to hear what those ideas are.

April 16, 2006, press release, Speaker PELOSI:

''The Republican Rubber Stamp Congress has passed two energy bills, costing taxpayers $12 billion for giveaways to big oil companies. But the Republican bills clearly have done nothing to lower gas prices, as the price of a barrel of oil has sailed over $70 a barrel,'' and I believe it closed over $110 today, ''the highest price in our history.''

''Democrats have a plan to lower gas prices, taking America in a new direction that works for everyone, not just a few. Our plan would empower the Federal Trade Commission to crack down on price gouging, to help bring down skyrocketing gas prices, increase production of alternative fuels, and rescind the billions of dollars in taxpayer subsidies, tax breaks and royalty relief given to the big oil companies.''

Madam Chairman, I'll say that we have not had any relief from gas prices. Gas prices are a dollar a gallon more today than they were when the new majority took over.

We have paid too much attention to windmills, bicycles and solar panels. We need to pay attention to domestic drilling. We need to pay attention to promoting alternative fuels.

We have been going in the wrong direction. And if you ask the American people right now, 78 percent of the people say this country is headed in the wrong direction.

And, Madam Chairman, I promise you, our gas prices are heading the wrong direction.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I would like to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

Mr. OBERSTAR. I'm surprised at the remarks, Madam Chairman, of the gentleman from Georgia, about bicycling. I think we need to pay more attention and do more work for bicycling. And we would all do better burning 86,000 calories a year on the seat of a bicycle than eight barrels of oil a year in our cars.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Chairman, on April 10, 2008, let the record show, oil is $110 and rising, natural gas is $10.56 and rising, gasoline and diesel prices at record levels in all our communities.

Folks back home are scared. They want us to help them. An amendment I will offer later will help, the NEED Act, to this bill because it will provide the ability to produce clean, green natural gas on out, out of sight, offshore. It will provide $20 billion to clean up the Chesapeake Bay and the beaches there, $20 billion to clean up the Great Lakes, $12 billion for San Francisco Bay clean-up, energy efficiency and renewables, $32 billion, carbon capture, the famous discussion in the Senate now, $32 billion. And it'll be mandated spending. The appropriators can't screw it up.

America's economic future is in trouble. Energy prices will prevent people from having a job, having an economy and being able to afford their vacations and go to the beautiful beaches that we have.

I think Roy Ennis says it best, chairman of the Congress of Racial Equality. Energy is the master resource, the foundation of everything else. Abundant, reliable, affordable electricity, natural gas and transportation fuels make our jobs, health and living standards possible. Energy is the great equalizer, the creator of economic opportunity and environmental justice. Push energy prices up, everybody suffers. When energy costs get too much, industry lays people off or just leaves. Jobs, income and tax revenues vanish. Government social programs wither. Town and leadership migrate to other cities, other countries. Social ills multiply. That's why I say the fight over energy is the critical civil rights battle of our era. Your utility bills, the price you pay at the pump, your job security are in danger, and not just because of the Middle East oil wars or competition from China and India. Our rights are being endangered because of what's happening right here at home.

This Congress is the cause of high energy prices. There's no action here to fix the ills of the past. We're locking up our energy supply. It's not even to be debated. It's not even a priority.

Congress is the reason America doesn't compete energywise. And, folks, in a period of time, we won't compete in the global economic economy, and we will not have jobs and a future for this country. We have the potential of being a second-rate nation because we, as Congress, have caused the energy crisis and are refusing to fix it.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I'd like to reserve.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Chairman, I yield a minute to the gentlewoman from Virginia (Mrs. DRAKE).

Mrs. DRAKE. I rise in support of the Beach Protection Act. And as the Member who represents the entire Atlantic Coast in Virginia and much of

the Chesapeake Bay, I recognize that our beaches are a treasure and must remain clean and safe. But we must lift the Federal moratorium on deep sea drilling of natural gas in the Outer Continental Shelf.

America has acted to make our energy consumption cleaner, and today we use much more natural gas for the generation of electricity. We have increased demand without increasing supply.

The U.S. is the only developed nation that does not capture natural gas from the Outer Continental Shelf. Canada has done it for years. We all know what Cuba's getting ready to do.

It's American families and American businesses that pay this extra cost, and it is driving American businesses overseas simply because of the cost of energy in America.

Coastal States should be able to decide if this activity takes place, and we should share in those royalties. In Virginia, we could use those dollars for transportation.

America expects our policies to meet our energy needs.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. I continue to reserve.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Oklahoma (Ms. FALLIN) for 1½ minutes.

Ms. FALLIN. Madam Chairman, I support the Beach Protection Act. However, while we are debating this legislation, millions of Americans are wondering why, in large parts of this country, they are having to pay $3.34 a gallon for gasoline, and even 70 cents more for diesel fuel. They're struggling to cover their costs of their daily commute, and they're wondering, why is Congress debating beach protection when I can hardly afford to drive my children to school and even to go to work?

American families and businesses are being hammered by the rising fuel costs, and it is clear that the inaction of this Congress will come at an expense to both drivers, small businesses and consumers.

The cost of our inaction was outlined yesterday when we had a hearing in our Small Business Committee about the rising cost of gasoline. We heard from five different businesses that testified how their businesses are being squeezed with the rising cost of fuel.

One business, in particular, was a trucking company who said that his fuel costs had tripled in the last several years, and he was really struggling to make ends meet.

Small businesses operate on razor thin margins and they are faced with dilemmas. Do they cut costs? Do they cut their business? Do they raise their prices, or do they just go out of business? Some of them are even having to cut the salaries of their employees.

Well, Madam Speaker, fuel costs that are on the rise are making small businesses feel the heat, and consumers are feeling the heat too. Today we need to address the issue of rising fuel costs and help our consumers and our small businesses. Either way, the American worker is suffering, small businesses are suffering, and this is a very important issue to our Nation.

Let's show the people of America that we care, and address this issue.

□ 1500

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I continue to reserve.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

As we come to the floor now and the Democrats talk about beaches, my constituents in the great State of New Jersey suffer. They are suffering from unrelenting increases in the price of gas, up almost a dollar now since the Democrats took control of this House. So as my constituents suffer from higher food costs, all related energy costs; as my constituents suffer from higher heating costs, all related to energy costs; as my constituents suffer from the higher cost of living in general, again, related to energy costs, all of them should be asking what is it that the Democrat Congress is doing to address this problem?

Well, the short answer is nothing really helpful. And the long answer is really potentially driving up the costs even higher.

Let me give you two quick points. First, the Democrats have voted four times now, four times, to raise taxes so to make sure the discovering and making sure that America's energy independence is that much harder. Secondly, they have voted now to lock up almost 85 percent of known specific energy resources in this country. What does that mean? What does that translate to the consumer? Again, the Democrats are making it harder for America to become energy independent from foreign oil.

Now is the time for all Americans everywhere across this country to ask what is its Democrat Congress doing. The short answer is nothing much. The long answer is potentially driving up the cost for fuel for all of them. Now is, therefore, the time for all of us to come to the floor to work together for a change and to make sure that America can, in fact, become energy independent. Now is the time for Democrats to be working not against the American consumer, but for him instead.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I continue to reserve.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Chairman, we don't have any additional speakers. I would urge support of H.R. 2537. I appreciate the hard work of the staffs on both sides in bringing this before Congress today. I appreciate the leadership of the individuals involved and would just urge that we adopt the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Beach Protection Act, and I salute Chairman OBERSTAR, Chairman JOHNSON, and Congressman PALLONE for their leadership.

The intent of the Beach Protection Act is to protect America's beautiful coastlines from water pollution. Yet big oil drilling interests have once again filed an amendment that puts our beaches and America's coastlines at risk.

New offshore oil and gas drilling represents a real hazard to the marine environment of the State of Florida, but all across the country, beaches, our coastal environment, our marine resources, the billion dollar tourism industry in Florida should not be sacrificed for a small amount of oil.

It would only take 24 hours after a petroleum spill in the eastern gulf for the oil to sully Florida's panhandle beaches. If the spill was swept up in the gulf's powerful loop current, the spill would pollute the Florida Keys, contaminate estuaries and beaches from the Everglades to Cape Canaveral.

We only have to look back to 2005 when we had three Category 5 hurricanes, Katrina, Rita, and Wilma, that caused massive oil spills and pollutants in the Gulf of Mexico. It destroyed 150 petroleum production platforms in the gulf and damaged 457 pipelines.

Drilling off of our beautiful beaches is the energy policy of the past. If President Bush and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle truly wanted to address high oil prices, you should have voted with the Democratic majority to take the huge tax breaks away from the big oil companies at a time that they are making record profits.

We are fighting for a new direction on energy policy, renewable sources of energy. We value our natural environment, and we value the public health of our communities.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the chairman of the full Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I have sat here patiently and listened to a litany of speakers come here and address the Committee of the Whole on subjects important to them but irrelevant to the subject matter at hand. And one or another, maybe several of them, said ''this Democratic Beach bill.''

I just want to remind the colleagues that this is the bill of the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY), who has labored for several years on behalf of this legislation. We finally move it through committee, bring it to the floor, and now it's laid on our doors to be the Democratic bill and why are we

wasting the House time. We bring it under an open rule, and then someone said, you should have brought it on suspension. If we had brought it on suspension, they would have complained because they didn't have an opportunity to offer the eight amendments that they're bringing to the floor. I am just perplexed by this tactic. It's unworthy of the legislation pending.

And we've worked hard to accommodate the gentleman from California who has a legitimate concern. I concur with his concern. We bring the bill out, and we do it in good faith, and we expect at least a good-faith response from the other side.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Chairman, while we debate a bill about beaches today, I am again appalled that the majority has once again missed an opportunity to address one of the biggest problems confronting our constituents, rising energy costs. It is reported today that gasoline prices reached a new all time high of $112 a barrel. Yet, we have let another week here pass without doing anything to confront this challenge.

Not a week goes by when I am not asked about rising energy prices. These increased costs affect everyone in our society. But none are more affected by these increased costs than some of our nation's most poor. On average, the nation's working poor spends approximately 13 to 30 percent of their yearly income on energy costs, and as prices rise so will the amount of their income spent on energy.

A large number of factors combine to put pressure on energy and gasoline prices, including peaked U.S. oil production, increased world demand for crude oil, and U.S. refinery capacity that is inadequate to supply gasoline to a recovering national economy. These are serious problems that will not go away with time, and they require real solutions that will restore American energy independence and help ease the pain of record price fill-ups. However, the majority in Congress has failed to do anything that would address any of these factors contributing to high prices.

When many are citing U.S. production numbers and refinery capacity as a reason for increased gas prices, the Majority has proposed additional taxes on these domestic energy suppliers. We have voted on several bills that would impose up to $15 billion in tax increases on domestic energy suppliers. These taxes will impede domestic oil and gas production, discourage investment in refinery capacity, and make it more expensive for domestic energy companies to operate in America than their foreign competitors, actually increasing America's dependence on foreign oil.

Let's make no mistake, an increased tax doesn't just hurt energy companies, it hurts every American—individual, farm, or company—that consumes energy. Increased taxes on energy companies are passed on to consumers. Every American will see these increased costs on their energy bill. This body shouldn't pass legislation that further raises energy prices for consumers. I have voted against these attempts to raise taxes, and luckily none of these bills have become law.

Unfortunately, too often in the 110th Congress, the majority's solution has been to place restrictions on the marketplace. Policies that increase supply, not those that place restrictions on the marketplace, are the solutions to today's energy concerns. For example the dramatic expansion of the Renewable Fuels Standard to require 36 billion is an artificially created government mandate. While I am supportive of renewable energy, we should develop a policy that is technology neutral and allows the market to develop new sources of renewable energy. The RFS provisions create an unrealistic mandate for advanced biofuels technology that doesn't yet exist and creates hurdles for the development of second generation biofuels. These restrictions will undoubtedly lead to a consumer tax to help bridge the gap in production.

However, there are many things we could actually do here in Congress that would help ease the prices at the pump. Many Americans don't know that the U.S. is the world's largest energy producer. Over the past 25 years we have pumped 67 billion barrels of oil, and strong reserves remain. The fact is the energy sources are there—in Alaska, the Rockies, and offshore—but political roadblocks keep it in the ground instead of in use in the economy.

We should also be focusing on the development of clean Coal-to-Liquid technologies. This is one of the most promising advancements in coal research and produces liquid transportation fuels synthesized from coal. Even using conservative estimates, our country has enough coal to last over 200 years. Coal is one of our nation's most abundant resources, yet the development of Coal-to-Liquid technologies has been completely ignored by this Congress. Producing liquid transportation fuels from coal will be a major catalyst in helping our country become energy independent.

Energy costs are affecting the daily life of all of our constituents. We must change the direction this Congress has been headed in addressing this issue. We must reject the politics that put restrictions on the marketplace and keep energy in the ground instead of in our gas tanks. Instead, we must develop a long-term strategy that allows us to access our traditional energy sources, while developing alternative and renewable energy sources that seek to increase energy supplies and encourage cleaner, more efficient energy use.

Mr. GENE GEEEN of Texas. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2537, the Beach Protection Act of 2008.

Texas is home to over 600 miles of spectacular beaches along the warm waters of the Gulf of Mexico.

This "Third Coast" includes some of the most beautiful and calming beaches in the Nation and is a huge contributor to our State economy.

Whether it's Galveston Island, Corpus Christi, Port Aransas, or South Padre Island, millions of Texans and tourists visit and swim in our waters, making it vital that we monitor these beaches to protect the health and safety of American families.

Just last July, a man who had an ulcer in his lower leg went swimming off the coast of Galveston County. Three days later he fell ill and was rushed to the hospital where he had three surgeries to save him from a rare bacterial infection. The bacteria entered his ulcer through the water and the infection spread to his blood.

While this is a rare case, Madam Chairman, it highlights the need to quickly detect water contamination and warn the public of possible health related threats.

The Beach Protection Act will provide much-needed grants to States along the coasts for State and local recreational water monitoring and notification programs.

It expands the grant program and allows States to use funding to pinpoint possible sources of water contamination and to track these pollutants.

Just as important, the bill strengthens public notification laws by requiring a 24-hour notification if water samples prove contaminated, and allows for public warnings on the possibility that water may be contaminated.

With more information, individuals and families can make the most informed choices when vacationing and visiting our public beaches.

I urge my colleagues to support the Beach Act to protect our waters and the health of our communities.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Chairman, on behalf of the residents of eastern Long Island, I would like to commend Chairwoman JOHNSON and Congressman PALLONE for their leadership and unwavering dedication to clean water issues. I would also like to thank the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee staff for their hard work and commitment to advancing this legislation to the full House today.

My district encompasses 300 miles of Eastern Long Island's coastline, which includes some of this country's most popular and beautiful beaches that I am very proud to represent. Maintaining coastal health is an integral objective not only in my district but to preserve our Nation's environment and to sustain the tourist economies of our States that rely on safe, clean beaches. Millions of beach-going Americans and their families who will flock to our Nation's shores in the summer months ahead deserve pristine waterways, and we should do all we can today to preserve them for future generations of Americans.

To that end, the water quality monitoring and notification grants established in the Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health (BEACH) Act have been absolutely vital to protecting the health of beachgoers and preserving the quality of our shores. However, it has become clear that further development of the BEACH Act is needed after recent reports marked progress but raised questions about its implementation.

Therefore, I commend Mr. PALLONE, the author of the original BEACH Act, for building on the program's success by updating the law and advancing improvements in this bill to meet the challenges involved with carrying out the program and to continue funding its grant programs.

Accordingly, this bipartisan legislation reauthorizes grants to states through 2012, but increases grant authorizations to $40 million annually; expands the scope of BEACH Act grants from water quality monitoring and notification to include pollution source tracking efforts; and strengthens environmental standards for water quality testing and communication. In addition, this bill requires that beach water quality violations are disclosed not only to the public but to all relevant state agencies with beach water pollution authority.

Furthermore, this bill requires the EPA to conduct annual reviews to make sure state and local governments that receive funding in the BEACH Act comply with its process requirements. Under this bill, grantees have one

year to comply with the new environmental standards. Otherwise, they will be required to pay at least a 50 percent match for their grant until they come back into compliance, in place of current law which allows the government to require a non-federal share of up to 50 percent.

For six years, the BEACH Act has given beachgoers the peace of mind that the beaches they visit are clean. Our legislation begins the process of strengthening this important law and reassures the American public that preserving healthy shores is a priority of our environmental agenda.

One in ten tourists is destined for the beach this summer—providing our travel and vacation industries with customers and business. I hope my colleagues agree that the BEACH Act is an excellent example of an effective government program that benefits communities in every region of the country and has yielded tremendous progress in restoring healthy shores.

Madam Chairman, with the leadership and support of this body, we can ensure that beach visitors throughout the country are assured that local governments have all the resources they need to monitor recreational waters and alert the public of potential health hazards.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill is considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and is considered read.

The text of the committee amendment is as follows:

H.R. 2537

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Beach Protection Act of 2007''.

SEC. 2. WATER POLLUTION SOURCE IDENTIFICATION.

(a) SOURCE TRACKING.—Section 406(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1346) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (4) and (5), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) SOURCE IDENTIFICATION PROGRAMS.—In carrying out a monitoring and notification program, a State or local government may develop and implement a coastal recreation waters pollution source identification and tracking program for coastal recreation waters adjacent to beaches or similar points of access that are used by the public and are not meeting applicable water quality standards for pathogens and pathogen indicators.''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 406(i) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1346(i)) is amended by striking ''$30,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2005'' and inserting ''$40,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2012''.

SEC. 3. FUNDING FOR BEACHES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND COASTAL HEALTH ACT.

Section 8 of the Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health Act of 2000 (114 Stat. 877) is amended by striking ''2005'' and inserting ''2012''.

SEC. 4. STATE REPORTS.

Section 406(b)(4)(A)(ii) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (as redesignated by section (2)(a)(1) of this Act) is amended by inserting ''and all environmental agencies of the State with authority to prevent or treat sources of pollution in coastal recreation waters'' after ''public''.

SEC. 5. USE OF RAPID TESTING METHODS.

(a) CONTENTS OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS.—Section 406(c)(4)(A) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1346(c)(4)(A)) is amended by inserting '', including rapid testing methods,'' after ''methods''.

(b) REVISED CRITERIA.—Section 304(a)(9) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1314(a)(9)) is amended by inserting ''and rapid testing methods'' after ''methods''.

(c) CRITERIA FOR USE OF RAPID TESTING METHODS.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and after providing notice and an opportunity for public comment, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall publish criteria for the use of rapid testing methods, at coastal recreation waters adjacent to beaches or similar points of access that are used by the public, that will enhance the protection of public health and safety through rapid public notification of any exceeding of applicable water quality standards. In developing such criteria, the Administrator shall prioritize the use of rapid testing methods at those beaches or similar points of access that have the highest use by the public.

(d) DEFINITION.—Section 502 of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1362) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(25) RAPID TESTING METHOD.—The term 'rapid testing method' means a method of testing the water quality of coastal recreation waters for which results are available as soon as practicable and not more than 6 hours after a water quality sample is received by the testing facility.''.

SEC. 6. NOTIFICATION OF FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL AGENCIES.

Section 406(c)(5) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1346(c)(5)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''prompt communication'' and inserting ''communication, within 24 hours of the receipt of the results of a water quality sample,'';

(2) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by inserting ''(i) in the case of any State in which the Administrator is administering the program under section 402,'' before ''the Administrator'' the first place it appears; and

(B) by inserting at the end the following:

''(ii) in the case of any State other than a State to which clause (i) applies, all agencies of the State government with authority to require the prevention or treatment of the sources of coastal recreation water pollution; and'';

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (6) and (7) as paragraphs (7) and (8), respectively; and

(4) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following:

''(6) measures for an annual report to the Administrator, in such form as the Administrator determines appropriate, on the occurrence, nature, location, pollutants involved, and extent of any exceeding of applicable water quality standards for pathogens and pathogen indicators;''.

SEC. 7. CONTENT OF STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS.

Section 406(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1346(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (7) (as redesignated by section 6(3) of this Act);

(2) by striking the period at the end of paragraph (8) (as redesignated by section 6(3) of this Act) and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(9) a publicly accessible and searchable global information system database with information updated within 24 hours of its availability, organized by beach or similar point of access and with defined standards, sampling plans, monitoring protocols, sampling results, and number and cause of closures and advisory days;

''(10) measures for the immediate posting of signs at beaches or similar points of access that are sufficient to give public notice following the results of any water quality sample that demonstrates an exceeding of applicable water quality standards for pathogens and pathogen indicators for the coastal recreation waters adjacent to such beaches or similar points of access; and

''(11) measures to ensure that closures or advisories are made or issued within 24 hours after the State government determines that any coastal recreation waters in the State are not meeting applicable water quality standards for pathogens and pathogen indicators.''.

SEC. 8. COMPLIANCE REVIEW.

Section 406(h) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1346(h)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively;

(2) by moving such subparagraphs 2 ems to the right;

(3) by striking ''In the'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In the''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) COMPLIANCE REVIEW.—On or before July 31 of each calendar year beginning after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Administrator shall—

''(A) prepare a written assessment of compliance with all statutory and regulatory requirements of this section for each State and local government and of compliance with conditions of each grant made under this section to a State or local government;

''(B) notify the State or local government of such assessment; and

''(C) make each of the assessments available to the public in a searchable database on or before December 31 of such calendar year.

''(3) CORRECTIVE ACTION.—Any State or local government that the Administrator notifies under paragraph (2) that it is not in compliance with any requirement or grant condition described in paragraph (2) shall take such action as may be necessary to comply with such requirement or condition within one year of the date of the notification. If the State or local government is not in compliance with such requirement or condition within one year of such date, any grants made under subsection (b) to the State or local government, after the last day of such one-year period and while the State or local government is not in compliance with all requirements and grant conditions described in paragraph (2), shall have a Federal share of not to exceed 50 percent.

''(4) GAO REVIEW.—Not later than December 31 of the third calendar year beginning after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Comptroller General shall conduct a review of the activities of the Administrator under paragraphs (2) and (3) during the first and second calendar years beginning after such date of enactment and submit to Congress a report on the results of such review.''.

SEC. 9. STUDY OF GRANT DISTRIBUTION FORMULA.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall commence a study of the formula for the distribution of grants under section 406 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1346) for the purpose of identifying potential revisions of such formula.

(b) CONTENTS.—In conducting the study, the Administrator shall consider the base cost to States of developing and maintaining water quality monitoring and notification programs, the States' varied beach monitoring and notification needs, including beach mileage, beach usage, and length of beach season, and other factors that the Administrator determines to be appropriate.

(c) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study, the Administrator shall consult with appropriate Federal, State, and local agencies.

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate a report on the results of the study, including any recommendation for revision of the distribution formula referred to in subsection (a).

SEC. 10. PUBLICATION OF COASTAL RECREATION WATERS PATHOGEN LIST.

Section 304(a)(9) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1314(a)(9)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(C) PUBLICATION OF PATHOGEN AND PATHOGEN INDICATOR LIST.—Upon publication of the new or revised water quality criteria under subparagraph (A), the Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register a list of all pathogens and pathogen indicators studied under section 104(v).''.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the committee amendment is in order except those printed in the portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD designated for that purpose before the beginning of consideration of the bill and pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate. Each amendment so printed may be offered only by the Member who caused it to be printed or his designee and shall be considered read.

Are there any amendments?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Madam Chairman, I deeply appreciate the recognition, and I do appreciate the chairman of the full committee and the subcommittee chairman, Mr. BOOZMAN, for the legislation we are discussing today; but I cannot sit idly by and listen to the people talk about the high cost of energy when there has been little action in this Congress, and I will say ''this Congress,'' the past Congresses and this present Congress about solving the high cost of energy to the American consumer, the $4 a gallon that they're going to have to pay.

The last time we passed any energy legislation on this floor was 1973. We passed the Trans-Alaska Pipeline. That's the last time. At that time, we were importing 38 percent of our fossil fuels. Today, we are importing 70 percent of our fossil fuels. Mr. and Mrs. America, keep in mind 50 percent of that fossil fuels is coming from countries that are not friendly to the United States of America. We are sending them over about $500 billion a year because this Congress, this Congress, has not acted to try to relieve the dependency on fossil fuel from abroad.

Now some people will say, and I listened to the young lady, we are going to take up alternate forms of energy, and I'll buy that. I'll put the little curlicue lightbulbs in. I'll do that. I'll save and turn down the thermostat. I'll do that. I'll, in fact, drive my automobile slower. Most people do not. But that doesn't solve the problem of the energy we need to move product.

The chairman knows full good and well, being the chairman of the Transportation Committee, our economy is based upon the ability to move product to and fro within this Nation.

The ship it brings us is driven by fossil fuels. The truck, the plane, the automobile, the train is driven by fossil fuels. And if we continue to become more dependent, which we apparently are going to do under the leadership of this Congress, we'll be in the point where we cannot move our product, ship them abroad which we produce, nor receive them. Seventy percent, again from foreign countries.

And yet we have a tremendous amount of fossil fuels, the United States of America, that's not being developed. It should be developed. Offshore. Chukchi Sea, there's more oil in Alaska than there is in the Gulf of Mexico at a relatively shallow depth. The coasts of California, the coast of Florida, the Rocky Mountains, the coasts of Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina has a tremendous amount of oil in the realm of about, I would suggest, 500 billion barrels of oil.

That's available to the American public. But we have a leadership now in this Congress that believes that the world is coming to an end, led by Al Gore, that the world is coming to an end if we burn fossil fuels.

I suggest respectfully, Mr. and Mrs. America, if we do not lower that price to the small business community and to the person who has to commute to their work site, we are in a dire shape in this Nation as a whole. We have to address this issue.

I ask my colleagues, please quit buying this concept that we are going to do it with windmills and with sun power. Yes, we could use those things. Yes, we ought to use nuclear, and yes, we ought to use hydro. The wheel of energy should be developed, and this Congress has not done it. Has not done it. We have this idea we are going to solve the problem. Look at the energy bill we passed this year through this leadership. It produced nothing. Period. Nothing. That's why the consumer today, in America, is going to that gas pump, and by the way, it's a tax to him. Every man, woman, and child is paying $2,000 a year to Saudi Arabia and countries such as because we sit idly on our hands doing nothing.

Madam Chairman, I suggest respectfully this Congress has to wake up. I listen to the political rhetoric of all of the presidential candidates, and nobody is addressing the energy issue other than the fact that we can't burn fossil fuels because we are losing the icecap and the polar bears are in danger.

Think about this for a moment. Think about the American public and the need for economy-based, fossil fuel driven because it moves an object. We must address this. I'm asking my colleagues to understand that. Quit pandering. Quit pandering to the interest groups that really are trying to socially structure our Nation through fear.

We have the fossil fuel. It is here. It should be developed. We should give the opportunity instead of restricting it, and that's what we've done in this Congress. In my state alone we have ANWR. It's passed this House 12 times. It passed the Senate once and Bill Clinton vetoed it. It's got about 36 billion barrels of oil available 74 miles away from an existing pipeline. And this Congress will not step forth and address that issue alone because they say it's going to hurt the environment, 74 miles away from the existing pipeline.

Madam Chairman, I suggest respectfully let's get off our duffs, and let's do the job we should for this nation.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate that, and I appreciate the opportunity to come to the floor today to talk about an issue that is of vital concern and importance to the American people. It may not have been what the majority party wanted to talk about today, but it's what the American people want to talk about and that's energy.

I don't know if anybody had an opportunity to walk outside the United States Capitol today, but you heard trucks with their horns blaring outside the Capitol, and they were doing so because they were objecting to the leadership in this Congress and the lack of action on energy prices and gas prices. That noise resonates across this land, Madam Chairman. Resonates across the land.

I had a group of high school students in my office today, and they wanted to know what we were doing about energy. They'd heard that this Congress had passed the Energy Efficiency Act. They wanted to know about the particulars of that act. And so we reviewed the particulars of that act, and I said, how much more gas do you think will get to the pumps in communities across this Nation if we increase the taxes on American oil companies? Well, these are bright high school kids. They said, well, not much more. And they're absolutely right, Madam Chairman, because the Energy Efficiency Act that this Congress passed in this session, in this term, will produce no energy. No new energy.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I'm pleased to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. NUNES. I was listening to your conversation on the floor. I want to reiterate what's going on outside. You made the point, but there are trucks driving through this Capitol right now trying to drive around to raise awareness to the people of the United States that the gas price is too high. And meanwhile today, we are debating a bill on beaches on the floor of the House while gas prices are soaring to $4 plus a gallon.

□ 1515

And so I thank the gentleman from Georgia for bringing this up and for yielding to me because this is something that we should be debating on the House floor. We should be talking about energy, not talking about how we're going to save the beaches.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate your comments.

And if you think about what has changed in the last 15 months in terms of leadership here in Washington, it's not the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. The only thing that's changed during the period of time when crude oil has gone from $56 a barrel to $112 a barrel, the only thing that's changed in terms of the leadership in Washington is the leadership in Congress. That's the only thing that's changed. There must be a cause and effect here somewhere, Madam Chairman, because gas prices are increasing, and the leadership has been woeful in not attempting to deal with this issue.

And so I would ask my colleagues to bring to the floor issues that are of paramount importance to the American people. The issue that's of paramount importance in my district is energy and gas prices. And this Congress is doing nothing about it, in spite of the proclamations and promises made during the previous election.

So, Madam Chairman, there are wonderful solutions out there, there are positive solutions. Conservation: We can do a whole lot more to incentivize individuals to conserve. Utilizing American resources for Americans, there's a novel thought, Madam Chairman. There are incredible resources that we have. And we've got the technology and the American ingenuity to do it in an environmentally sensitive way, and we ought to. We ought to. This leadership ought to allow that kind of issue to come to the floor.

And finally, alternative fuel. It's imperative that we have the kind of research and development and incentivizing alternative fuel formation in this Nation in ways that we've never done before, not pick winners and losers, which is what Washington tends to want to do, but to incentivize a system that would provide for wonderful, entrepreneurial, visionary, enthusiastic individuals all across this Nation who have the intelligence and the foresight and the desire to help America prevail in our energy independence.

So, Madam Chairman, I come to the floor today with a level of frustration by the inability of this leadership, apparently, to address the concerns of the American people, to address the concerns of those high school students that were in my office this morning, to address the concerns of those truckers, who continue out there outside the Capitol blaring their horns and saying, wake up. Wake up, Madam Speaker, wake up leadership in this Congress, wake up and address the issues that are of paramount importance to the American people. The paramount issue today is energy and gasoline prices, and we must, as a Congress, address that issue in a positive way.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. NUNES. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUNES. I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia for bringing this issue up. And I know that the bill here today is this beaches bill, but the concern that I have is that we're not addressing the needs of the American people.

When the Democrats took the majority, we were told that we were going to go back to 5-day workweeks. Last week, we were in 3 days; we did two votes each day. This week, we've only done a couple votes each day. And here we are doing a bill that now I'm being told we're not even going to finish the bill today, a bill regarding beaches, while we have truckers going around the Capitol honking their horns, trying to get the attention of the United States Congress, to get the attention of the Democrat majority to do something about lowering their fuel price.

And the answers that we've received from the other side of the aisle are always the same answers: We need to repeal the tax breaks to the oil companies. Well, if we want to repeal the tax breaks to the oil companies, that's not going to lower the fuel price. As the gentleman from Alaska stated and the gentleman from Georgia stated previously, the way that you lower the fuel price and the way that you stop buying fuel from foreign countries is you have to drill in America. We have to drill for oil in America.

I'm a big supporter of solar energy and wind energy, they're great renewable fields, but we get less than 1 percent of our energy from these sources. So if we want to talk about renewable sources of energy, we're going to have to look seriously at nuclear power. We're going to have to look at using the oil that we have in this country if we don't want to buy oil from foreign countries. These are the types of things that we're going to have to do in this Congress. But unfortunately, we've made this commitment, supposedly, to the American people that we're going to work 5 days a week, but instead we only work a few hours a day and end up working 3 days a week. Today we have to get out of here by 4, I'm told, because the Democrats don't want to stay in so that they can get on an airplane and fly home. We're not even going to finish a bill on beaches. And meanwhile, the American people are outside this Congress driving their trucks, honking their horn, asking for the attention of this Congress, and this Congress is not paying attention.

We've got to do something to lower these fuel prices, Madam Chairman. The Democrats are in control, they're in the majority. We need answers. My constituents need answers. They need their fuel price lowered. They need their electricity cost lowered. The only way we can do this is by building nuclear power plants, investing in wind and solar power, and drilling for oil in America.

And I would hope, as the gentleman from Alaska has stated over and over again, the last time we've gotten serious about drilling for oil in Alaska was 1973. 1973. And here we are, 35 years later, with no more oil production. Now we used to have at least half of our oil came from the United States, now we're less than 30 percent of our oil that comes from the United States.

And we send money to Venezuela, we send money to Saudi Arabia, and the other side of the aisle complains about it. But their only answer is that we need to repeal the tax cuts to the oil companies. So in their last energy bill, what did we repeal? We picked the American companies. We repealed the tax breaks on the American companies and we gave tax breaks to the Venezuela oil companies.

So I don't know what we're going to do in this Democrat majority to solve the country's problems. President Bush has said that he will sign a bill to drill for oil in America. He will sign any bill that promotes nuclear power. These are the answers that the American people need and they should demand from this Congress to have those answers.

And I would hope, Madam Chairman, that this Democrat majority listens to the truckers that are outside right now honking their horn trying to get this Congress' attention. And I am happy that at least on our side of the aisle, the Republican side of the aisle, we are taking this opportunity, during a bill that we're talking about beaches here, but we're trying to bring to the American people, to bring to the attention of this Congress that we need to lower the fuel price, and we need to do it today.

So with that, Madam Chairman, I will yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Chairman, you know, it's interesting that we came here to talk about a beach bill, and we're finally getting a chance to talk about some energy because most American families are not going to have the money to drive to the beach this year.

We look at the price of gasoline right now. And I earlier quoted some of the quotes from the Democratic leadership about how they were going to get a grip and get ahold of the gas prices and bring them down. Well, since they've been in the majority, they have actually gone up $1 per gallon, oil has gone up about 100 percent. And what are we

telling our people at home? I've got to go back and explain to the people of the Third District of Georgia that this week, rather than addressing the price of gas and our energy situation, that we did some beach restoration, which is a very worthy bill; we did some landscape conservation; we named some post offices; and we did some several other suspensions. But I've got to go back and tell them that, when they're standing there at the gas pump almost pumping $4 a gallon into their car, that they need to realize something, they need to realize what the majority plan for our future price of motor fuel is.

The chairman, who I have a great deal of respect for, on the Transportation Committee, Mr. OBERSTAR, who's been here a long time and is very wise, but he projected or at least proposed a 5 cents a gallon hike for our infrastructure and $1 per barrel on oil. The Energy and Commerce chairman is talking about a carbon tax. He's also talking about a 50 cent per gallon tax on fuel.

We're talking about taking away these tax breaks from Big Oil. You know, we can take away tax breaks from anybody, but I'm telling you, if you take a tax break away from a company that is manufacturing products in this country, they're not going to just absorb that loss, they're going to go up on the price of their product. So we're talking about maybe 55, 60 cents more a gallon.

So I've got to go back and tell my constituents, look, here's their plan: Their plan is to go up another 55 cents or so a gallon on your gas, another dollar on a barrel of oil, take away any tax breaks that the big oil companies have that hopefully they're passing on to you, and your Congress just spent $30,000 to buy 30 bicycles. So they've got a great plan.

And I guess this is the great plan that we've heard about in so many of these quotes about how they were going to fix the price of gas. We've bought 30 bicycles at a cost of $30,000; we're going to increase the price of gas 55 cents; we're going to take away the tax breaks for Big Oil so they can go up, increase the price on a barrel of oil. We're not going to do any domestic drilling. We're going to depend on changing light bulbs. We're going to depend on solar power. We're going to depend on windmills.

Now, Madam Chairman, I just don't know how much comfort that's going to give the people of the Third Congressional District of Georgia. In fact, I don't know that if I tell them that, that they're even going to believe that, that this body, this House, that is their answer to them paying $4 a gallon for gas. It's just going to be hard for me to sell it. But if they will pay attention to what's going on up here, then I think they'll be convinced that these are the only things that the majority has brought forth.

We need to concentrate on being less dependent on foreign oil. We need to look at our own future, our own lands, our own prospects of what we're doing. And as the gentleman from Alaska said, regardless of what you think about fossil fuels, we're going to be using it. And so we need to provide for ourselves.

And I think it's a shame that each and every one of us, and I know we're going to be through by 4 o'clock because, you know, we do need to get home, but we're not doing our job. We're not doing the business of the people when we constantly go home and people ask us, help us, help me, help me be able to put gas in my car to take my children to soccer practice, or go to school, or go to the beach.

So I'm going to go back and I'm going to say, I'll tell you what, we gave you some help. We're going to raise the price of gas and oil and we're buying bicycles.

Mr. TERRY. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TERRY. Madam Chairman, I, too, rise, sticking up for American families that are struggling with the high prices of many products right now, most of which I hear from my constituents in Nebraska is about the price of gasoline at the pump. I hear about the groceries as well. And of course then when I see a bill like this, the bill that we have up now about making sure that our beaches are clean and we have plans for that, unfortunately under the leadership of the House and Senate currently now, my first thought isn't well, that's absolutely right, we need to keep our beaches clean. My first thought is, is this another environmental tool to make sure that we can't get to drilling in places where we need to get?

Now, the frequently asked question about gasoline prices is, what are you going to do about it? Well, we have a couple of options that I think could alleviate some of the pressure. One is, we can take the 1970s actions done by the Nixon administration to simply set the price. We will set the price. We will freeze them; $3.30 at my home, we can freeze that. Well, what did that do? Created about a half mile line for gas. And then maybe if you pulled up to the pump, you might see that little white piece of paper that said ''out of gas.'' We can go back to that. But the gas prices would be stable. But running out of gas begs the question, the question is, what's causing this?

□ 1530

Now, obviously it's just simple high school economic supply and demand, folks. What we have is that oil that we have access to within the United States, whether it's ANWR or off the Continental Shelf or shale in Colorado or other pockets that have been made into public lands and thereby unaccessible, what we've done is adopt a policy in this country that we want to push the production or creation of fuel out of our country to foreign countries. That makes us reliant on foreign countries. In fact, about 60 some percent, about 63 percent, of our oil needs are imported. We use about 20 million barrels per day to meet our energy needs, and 14 million barrels per day are imported. So as other countries compete with us for that oil on the world market, prices increase. At the well head, just yesterday closing out the markets, sweet crude jumped $2.30, hitting a new record of $112.21, closing at the closing record of $110.87 per barrel.

Now, we can ask what the solution will be. Do we just simply raise taxes on oil production, or do we say that it's part of our plan to make sure that we can become energy independent and secure this Nation's future? And I think the long-term answer can be the type of issues that we're dealing with, with alternative and biofuels like cellulosic ethanol, like hydrogen, but let's admit that those are a generation away if we make the commitment today. So what we need to do in the meantime is either be honest with the American citizens and say that our policy is to limit supply in a competitive global market, therefore, get used to $4 and then $5 per gallon of gas, or we allow the drilling to take place where we can produce more of our own resources of oil. And we can do that.

I asked the question the other day, how much oil and natural gas do we have access to within 75 miles of our coastline? The answer is ''I don't know'' because we have been blocked from being able to explore that. We can't measure that. That's wrong.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 8 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

Page 3, after line 8, insert the following:

(c) PROHIBITION ON EARMARKS.—None of the funds appropriated pursuant to section 406(i) of such Act (33 U.S.C. 1346(i)) may be used for a Congressional earmark as defined in clause 9(d) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Chairman, the focus of the Beach Act is to ensure that citizens enjoy recreational activity in the coastal waters and that they can do that safely. That should be the focus of the bill, and that's where I think we should keep the focus of the bill.

The purpose of this amendment is to make sure that the purpose of the bill is not to protect vulnerable Members, vulnerable incumbents. And, unfortunately, that's been the case with a lot of legislation that we have passed in the past. It just simply becomes a magnet for earmarks, for Member earmarks, to protect vulnerable Members

or to reward Members or to go towards Members in leadership or in high positions on particular committees.

The Beach Act authorizes a formula-based grant program to help implement State and local beach monitoring, assessment, notification programs. What we don't want to see is money bled off from these formula-based programs to Member projects. Unfortunately, that has happened. And if we don't think that it will happen with this bill, then we have our heads in the sand.

The purpose of this amendment is simply to say that none of the moneys authorized in this legislation will go toward earmarks, that all of the money as it is now will go toward formula-based funding.

Now, some might say that the Beach Act has not been historically earmarked. That is true. That's how it should remain. The problem is some of the legislation that has not been historically earmarked is now earmarked. In fact, when we passed the Homeland Security bill, which we celebrated today 5 years after, we were told this will not be earmarked. This will be formula-based grants, it will be spread out, but it will not be earmarked. And for 4 years that remained true.

But last year the legislation to fund the Department of Homeland Security had a boatload of earmarks in it. According to Taxpayers For Common Sense, the 2008 omnibus bill contained 128 earmarks worth more than $400 million in Homeland Security funding. According to a story by the Hill, 115 new earmarks worth $117 million were airdropped at the last moment. These were earmarks that we said we weren't going to do anyway in a bill that we said we were not going to earmark. These were, obviously, to assist vulnerable Members.

Many were earmarks in the funding for FEMA's Predisaster Mitigation Program. This was a program intended to ''save lives and reduce property damage'' by providing funds for ''hazard mitigation planning, acquisition, and relocation of structures out of the floodplain.'' In 2007 this program received $101 million to fund competitively awarded projects with no earmarks. According to Taxpayers for Common Sense, in 2008 this program received a boost in funding to $114 million, but nearly half of the amount, $51.3 million, was tied to 96 earmarked projects, including earmarks for projects that should not have qualified for funding under the program.

So we could have earmarks in this beach program for projects that aren't even eligible under the formula-based funding that's currently here, and that's what we should all fear. This body has gone far too far over the past several years, under Republicans and Democrats, in bleeding off necessary funding for particular programs just to protect vulnerable incumbents during re-election or just to reward particular Members.

Some people will say, well, we know in Congress better than those faceless bureaucrats in some department. Well, if that is the case, then we should have parameters. We should provide oversight. That's what this body is supposed to do. There is a process called authorization, appropriation, and oversight. And that's the process we need to follow, not circumventing that process by earmarking.

That's the purpose of this amendment. I hope that we can all agree that this is needed to ensure that this program is not earmarked in the future.

With that, Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBERSTAR. In the 109th Congress, we considered the reauthorization of the Appalachian Regional Commission. During consideration of the bill in committee, I proposed language to prohibit earmarks, which have been done time and again in the appropriation process, prohibit earmarks in the Appalachian Regional Commission appropriation process. The gentleman from Arizona supported my initiative, and I appreciated his support. It was the right thing to do.

Unfortunately, the committee did not include that language. When the bill came to the floor, I worked to defeat the bill because it did not have that prohibition on earmarks, and the gentleman from Arizona supported my initiative.

In the BEACH bill, or the Beach Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health Act, proposed by the gentleman from California, with whom I worked on this matter for a period of 6 or 7 years, both in his previous seating in Congress and during the time he was out of service in the Congress and when he returned, it's a good bill. The initial BEACH Act authorized $30 million. About $10 million has been appropriated each year. And the money goes out by formula to the States. There have never been earmarks. In the Appropriations Committee nor on the House floor have there ever been attempts to suballocate the funds. Each State receives a portion of annual appropriations based on a calculation of each State's varied beach monitoring and notification efforts.

Now, we know very well that $10 million is insufficient, and because money is insufficient for a bill, that's often why, Madam Chairman, Members come with a proposal for an earmark to designate money so they are sure that their State or their beach or their city gets their, at least, perceived fair share of funding.

But it's never been done on this legislation, and we don't need any such limitation language. I think we have a fair formula, a specific focus on the base cost of the States of developing, maintaining water quality monitoring, notification programs, the mileage of the beach, beach use, the length of the season, and other factors that the administrator of the agency determines to be appropriate. That is fair, and I think Members of this body and of the other body recognize that it's fair; so they haven't attempted to tinker with it, and we shouldn't do that in this bill. This is a good piece of legislation, a fair piece of legislation.

Look, we bring this bill to the House floor under an open rule. It's one advocated by a Member from the other side, a Member for whom I have the highest personal regard, and then we have a succession of Members standing here complaining that we bring a bill to the floor under an open rule that should have been brought under suspension. If we had brought it under suspension, I suspect the same people would come to the floor, Madam Chairman, and complain that we didn't have an open rule.

So we're trying to the do the right thing on the right piece of legislation, and we ought not to gimmick it with this proposal that is totally unnecessary for a limitation on earmarks. We ought not to adopt this amendment.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Madam Chairman, I want to thank the chairman for bringing that up because I think every bill needs to be brought to the floor like this, an open rule, so we can have debate. This is a breath of fresh air to have an open rule. I can't remember the last time we had one. So this is a great thing that we have this. This is our republican action in letting people, our constituents, hear our different views on these bills rather than just having it jammed down our throats. So I agree with the chairman on this, and I hope more of these can be brought under an open rule.

Madam Chairman, I would like to yield to my good friend from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

And I want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota, Madam Chairman. I could not agree more with virtually everything he has said. This is an important bill. It was brought here, and it has not been historically earmarked. That is great. We need to keep it that way. We need to keep, as he so aptly put it, Members from meddling in this. That's the purpose of this amendment, to keep Members from meddling with the formula-based program in the bill.

It was mentioned that it's unnecessary because it hasn't been historically earmarked. I suppose the same would have been said had I brought the same amendment last year to the Department of Homeland Security authorization bill or the appropriation bill because it hadn't historically been earmarked. We promised not to do that. But yet we have earmarked between $500 million and $1 billion, hundreds of

earmarks air-dropped at the last minute, never debated on the House floor, never debated, never an opportunity to amend them out. And that's what we are trying to do here is to protect this important legislation from the same fate.

It was mentioned that we have increased the authorization for money in this legislation. That is true. We did that in the FEMA grants in Homeland Security and then earmarked it. We increased it by a little and then earmarked it by a lot. It doesn't take conspiracy theorists to say that this might be happening here, that maybe this is what is going to be attempted here, to start earmarking this legislation, to get these programs that are funded by formula to instead fund Members who need protection in their re-election or who need to be rewarded in some other way. That's not how we should do business.

The purpose of this amendment is recognizing the importance of this legislation and making sure that Members don't meddle in it.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

□ 1545

Mr. WESTMORELAND. And I want to thank the gentleman for bringing this amendment because a little ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. And so I think what we are doing, like he said, is just making sure that we are perfectly clear to anybody on the conference committee, or any other process that this bill goes through, that we're not to air-drop these earmarks that we never get a chance to discuss. It is very seldom that we get to discuss anything on the floor in the manner that we are being able to talk about this beach restoration bill as we are today. And so I think it is a great thing that we are having this open discussion.

Again, I want to comment that I hope that one day my constituents from Georgia's Third Congressional District, which is not that far away from the beach, will be able to have the money that won't pinch their budget to be able to drive to the beach. Right now in Georgia you're paying $3.29 per gallon, which is $1 more a gallon than we paid when the 110th Congress started. And we had all the empty promises and the smoke-and-mirror gadgets that came from the majority that they were going to somehow, that they had some kind of miraculous plan to lower gas prices.

We have yet to see that plan. We've talked about raising the fuel tax. We've talked about raising the price of a barrel of oil. We've actually purchased bicycles. And we have done a lot of different things. But the price of gas and oil continues to go up.

We had a bailout that caused our dollar to deflate. And that, itself, probably caused the price of a barrel of oil to go up. So I am waiting on that magic wand. I am waiting on that secret that Speaker PELOSI and Leader HOYER and the whip, Mr. CLYBURN, all talked about prior to getting in charge.

It almost reminds me of a dog inside a fence that is really barking and yelping and wanting to get out and wanting to convince its master that it can go out and do the things that it wants to show that it can do. And then once it gets out of the gate, it just kind of lays down under a tree and scratches its ear or something.

So I am ready for some action. I think the American people are ready for action. Bring out this magic plan. Unveil it. Let's see it.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Chairman, this amendment is a proposed solution in search of a problem. The Beaches Environmental Assessment and Coastal Health Act, or the BEACH Act, which this legislation amends, was introduced to limit and prevent human exposure to polluted coastal recreation waters, including those along the Great Lakes.

The initial BEACH Act authorized $30 million annually to assist States and local governments to implement beach monitoring, assessment and public notification programs.

Funds authorized under the initial BEACH Act and under the legislation we consider today go either to the Environmental Protection Agency or are distributed to individual States on a formula basis.

Each State receives a portion of annual appropriations which have hovered around $10 million based upon a calculation of the State's variant beach monitoring and notification needs.

The committee is aware of the concerns that the current formula utilized by EPA for the distribution of grant funds may not provide for an equitable allocation of funds among States at current appropriation levels.

Section 9 of this legislation requires EPA to conduct a study of potential revisions to the formula with a specific focus on base costs to States of developing and maintaining water quality monitoring and notification programs, the State's varied beach monitoring and notification needs, including beach mileage, beach usage and length of beach season and other factors that the administrator determines to be appropriate.

None of the funds appropriated under this legislation go out to the States or local communities under a ''congressional earmark.''

This amendment has no bearing on the authorities under the BEACH Act or EPA's beach program.

Madam Chairman, I yield back.

Mr. PENCE. I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. PENCE. I rise in strong support of the Flake amendment because the American people need taxpayer protection more than we need beach protection. Now I understand this is important legislation that Congress is considering today. And I do not rise to trivialize this bill. It has its moorings in and its heritage in bipartisan foundations. I rise, rather, to say that the time has come for this Congress to get serious in large ways and in small ways about the epidemic of earmarking that has taken hold of the Federal budget process.

In fiscal year 2008, according to one estimate, legislation that passed in one catch-all omnibus bill included some 11,610 earmarks in all of those different appropriations bills in the course of the year costing taxpayers some $17.2 billion. It was the second highest number of earmarks any Congress has ever approved. It represented a 337 percent increase above fiscal year 2007.

What the Flake amendment says, in effect, is that none of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section may be used for a congressional earmark as defined by the House rules. Now, this is part and parcel of an effort by many of us that I believe, while it is being led by Republicans, I believe there are many in the other party who understand that earmarks is a cancer in the belly of the Federal budget. And we must address it.

The Flake amendment seizes this opportunity and this moment of this legislation that says that should the Beach Protection Act of 2007 be signed into law, that at no point in the future may it be used as a vehicle for earmarking. And as the author of this amendment has suggested, we have been assured in the past before that those things pertaining to homeland security, the Department of Homeland Security, would not become vehicles for earmarking, and they have.

And for my part, let me say this is not an issue that I am interested in demagoguing, Madam Chairman. For my part, through the course of my career up until very recently, I have requested earmarks and special projects for my district. But I must tell you, having negotiated when Republicans were in charge for earmark reform, having supported Democrat efforts for earmark reform, at the end of last year when I saw a catchall omnibus bill come to the floor of this Congress with hundreds of unexamined earmarks dropped in at the last minute in the dead of night that hadn't been subject to the scrutiny the American people demand, I knew it was time for a change. And so I had to tell the people of my district that I could no longer be a part of this flawed system. And I commend the gentleman from Arizona for his extraordinary leadership on this issue.

I want to challenge my colleagues to support the Flake amendment. But

let's just begin there. Let's support a moratorium on earmarking in this Congress. The American people know there is something fundamentally wrong with the way we spend the people's money, especially when it comes to earmarks.

Frankly, I used an analogy not long ago, Madam Chairman, of an airplane. When you're flying an airplane through the air, and the meters on the control panel tell you that something is wrong with the engine, the first thing you do is put the plane on the ground and get the hood open and find out what is wrong. Well, many of us who are advocating an earmark moratorium believe the time has come for us to put the plane on the ground in a bipartisan way, embrace an earmark moratorium and reform this system in the way that Congressmen FRANK WOLF and JACK KINGSTON have suggested in their commission format.

And let me say, as I close in strong support of the Flake amendment, that there is enough blame to go around on this earmarking business. I recognize earmarking came of age under Republican control of the Congress. And I am not rising here to point fingers. I am, however, rising to say that we need to change the way we spend the people's money. The only way we will do that is by embracing the bold leadership that Congressman JEFF FLAKE has brought to this Congress in connection with the Beach Protection Act, but it also means embracing a moratorium and coming together, Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives, and saying we are going to push away from the table, and we are going to bring fundamental earmark reform to the American people. And that's my hope.

And I urge support for the amendment as a first step in that direction.

I yield back.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOOZMAN. I agree with Mr. FLAKE and Mr. PENCE about the situation of needing to earmark responsibly. And certainly earmarking to protect vulnerable Members, in fact, anything of that certainly is not for the good of the country and the good of Congress or whatever.

I guess what I question is that in this particular amendment, in this particular bill, I think it is inappropriate. This program is a formula-based grants program that has not been earmarked in the past and there's no plans to earmark it in the future.

We are not talking about beach restoration. We are not talking about beach reclamation. We are talking about a bill that allows States, allows beaches, to monitor pathogens so that when a family from Arkansas goes to Florida or goes to South Carolina, wherever they go, and they pull up, that they can, with safety, get out and swim in the waters without it being a cesspool. I wish that more people would sneak an earmark in the night to protect their beach. Again, that is not going to happen with this bill. It is not the purpose of the bill.

So I would ask that we vote against this, and yet again I feel very strongly that what Mr. PENCE is saying, what Mr. FLAKE is trying to do with his amendment is appropriate, but not in this particular vehicle. I don't think that it pertains at all.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOOZMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. OBERSTAR. I thank the gentleman for his very thoughtful comments, which I fully concur. But I also would like to take this opportunity to compliment the gentleman from Indiana for a very thoughtful, reasoned, balanced and principled statement that adhered to the purpose of the amendment and stuck to the principle that the underlying amendment addresses. Though I disagree with the outcome of his reasoning, it was a very thoughtful and a principled statement, more of the kind of discussion we ought to have on this floor.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BOOZMAN. I yield back.

Mr. CONAWAY. I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONAWAY. I, too, want to congratulate the majority party for bringing an open rule bill to the floor. It is a rare event. And hopefully our side won't wear out its welcome so poorly that this is the last open rule bill that is brought. I know it has to happen on appropriations bills, but we are not too excited about those coming later this year.

I rise in support of the Flake amendment. It is a pretty straightforward amendment that, to quote an often poorly used phrase, the opponent doth protest too much. I have not heard anything really as to why it is inappropriate for this to be attached to the legislation, how this would cripple the legislation, how this would prevent the monitoring processes, how this would prevent the grant-based programming from functioning. I have just heard arguments that ''let's don't do it because we have never done it that way before.''

And I am persuaded that under the Department of Homeland Security example, this idea of ''let's just, because we have not done it before, we won't do it in the future.'' And I would prefer to have a straightforward statement in this important legislation.

We had an event this past year where a young man, although this legislation won't affect this because it happened in one of the lakes in Texas, where a young man had an amoeba-borne illness get into his brain, and it killed him. It was a freak and tragic accident. And obviously this legislation is aimed at trying to prevent similar type of occurrences on our beaches, coastal beaches I guess, but the idea that somehow because we have been pure in the past we will remain pure in the future. And our history here with respect to earmarks is anything but that.

So as we look at the Flake amendment and why it is important, I hope that someone can rise to say, here is a mechanical reason why it is inappropriate to have this earmark restriction, this statement, flatout statement that I think both sides can agree on. Because while earmarking doesn't really fix the overall spending pattern and the overall spending problem that we have in this Congress, because everybody knows that the annual budget is set, and every one of those nickels that get allocated to the Appropriations Committee will get spent, and most all of this earmark churn happens within that number. And so to the extent that we do away with all earmarks, it really won't impact the total amount spent.

□ 1600

My grandchildren, of whom I have seven, have a $53 trillion debt staring them in the face because we have made $53 trillion in unfunded promises to each other, issues that we think are important to my generation and my parents' generation, but we are taking their money to pay for it.

So anything that we can do to begin the process of restricting spending on issues like earmarks in this instance, on a bill that clearly works best on a grant-based formula, where the mileage of the beaches are assessed in each State and the money is parceled out that way as fairly as it can be, we can argue how much that money ought to be from time to time, but to expose it to the earmarking process I think is inappropriate.

I hope, like I said, that the Members who oppose the mechanics of this can help those of us who don't understand the mechanics understand why an earmark restriction that the Flake amendment would put in place cripples and hamstrings this otherwise good legislation, because all of us want safe water to swim in and to play in, but we also want my grandchildren to be able to afford to address the issues they have in front of them some 50 years from now with their money. Quite frankly, it is going to take a Herculean effort among all of us here and everybody listening today to rein in that $53 trillion in unfunded promises.

This House, as important as this legislation is, continues to ignore major problems facing this country, problems like the FISA reauthorization, problems like the war supplemental, problems like Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid. We continue to simply let those slide, and those failed actions have consequences.

We are going to add another one today, the Colombia Free Trade Agreement. By refusing to take action on the Colombia Free Trade Agreement, we have left more work undone as we

go about all this business. All of that has consequences. As many of my colleagues have said, it has consequences on energy policy, it has consequences on the fiscal policy of this country.

I think this is a simple step on a simple bill that would allow the fiscal operations of this process to go forward in an appropriate and in a correct manner. So, I urge my colleagues to support the Flake amendment, should we get a vote on that.

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, I come to the floor also to speak in support of the Flake amendment. I was in my office almost a half-hour ago now when I saw the debate on the floor and my friend and colleague Mr. FLAKE was here speaking about his amendment, and I thought I would come down to hear his closing remarks and hear the other side then say that they agreed to the amendment, because I thought, in essence, this was an amendment that both sides of the aisle could reach across and find unanimity and agreement with, if we believed the rhetoric that we heard last year and if we believe the rhetoric we hear oftentimes from the other side of the aisle about their desires to rein in spending, to address the earmark situation problem and to work with Republicans to try to deal with it, as we heard during their campaign to come to the majority, as they have, and now on the floor as well.

To my surprise, and perhaps I should not be surprised to find that as of this time, a half-hour later into the debate on a simple amendment to say that we should not be having earmarks in this bill, a bill that never had earmarks before, the other side of the aisle, the Democrat side of the aisle, cannot agree to it.

Earlier, when the general debate on this bill was on the floor, I came to the floor and said that in light of all the issues that we are discussing right now, it is amazing we are about to go into the weekend break discussing beaches as opposed to some other fundamentally important issue striking at the hearts and the wallets of the American taxpayers and the citizens of the State of New Jersey as well, one principally which was the high cost of oil.

The Democrats have been in charge of this House now for almost a year and a quarter, and during that time we have seen the price of gas at the local gasoline stations go up by almost a buck. You would think that would be something first and foremost that they would be addressing. But, no, they are addressing a spending bill and beaches, as we have before us. Again, maybe I should not be surprised, because wasn't it HILLARY CLINTON who said that she has more ideas on spending than there are dollars in D.C.?

Well, in light of the fact that the other side of the aisle, the Democrat majority, will not even consider to support the Flake amendment, which would try to rein in some of that wasteful, wanton abuse that we see in earmarks here, apparently the Democrat House leadership is taking a page from HILLARY CLINTON's playbook. They too have more ideas on spending than there are dollars in D.C. to spend.

It was just indicated a moment ago, well, this is not the purpose of the bill, to do earmarks. Well, if it is not the purpose of the bill, then it should be an easy lift to support this amendment to eliminate earmarks from the bill.

Secondly, someone suggested from the other side, well, if we are going to do it in this one, we should do it in all other bills like this. I agree, and I am sure Mr. FLAKE would come to the floor as well and say he would put this in any bill coming to the floor, to say we should not have earmarks, and I think he just rose to that point.

Finally, the point was made, I think from this side of the aisle, well, it hasn't been done in bills like this before. What a better time than right now? And I commend the gentleman, Mr. FLAKE for bringing it to the floor. If not now, then when? If both sides of the aisle are as adamantly opposed to abuses of earmarks as both sides of the aisle say they are, why shouldn't they support the amendment by Mr. FLAKE?

Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I believe that soon after this we are going to have a vote on this legislation. Again, this amendment is simply to preserve the bill as it is, to make sure that Members don't meddle in it. It is there to protect the waters and the beaches, not protect incumbents for reelection. That is what this is about.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Madam Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 263, noes 117, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 55, as follows:

[Roll No. 182]

AYES—263

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Arcuri
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Becerra
Biggert
Bilirakis
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyda (KS)
Brady (TX)
Braley (IA)
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Castor
Chabot
Clay
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellsworth
Emerson
English (PA)
Eshoo
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Graves
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Hill
Hodes
Hoekstra
Honda
Hoyer
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jefferson
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lampson
Langevin
Latham
Latta
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
Meek (FL)
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Myrick
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Ross
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Solis
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stearns
Sullivan
Sutton
Tancredo
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Walberg
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waxman
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NOES—117

Abercrombie
Baldwin
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Boozman
Bordallo
Boyd (FL)
Brady (PA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capuano
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (IL)
Delahunt
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Ellison
Engel
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Higgins
Hinchey
Hirono
Hobson
Holt
Hooley
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)

Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
LaTourette
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Mahoney (FL)
Markey
Matsui
McDermott
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Mollohan
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Price (NC)
Rahall
Reyes
Richardson
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Serrano
Sherman
Simpson
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Stupak
Tanner
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Wexler
Wynn
Young (AK)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Obey

NOT VOTING—55

Ackerman
Andrews
Baca
Barton (TX)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Boehner
Boren
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Buyer
Calvert
Cardoza
Cubin
Davis (AL)
Doyle
Emanuel
Ferguson
Fortuño
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Gilchrest
Granger
Grijalva
Hinojosa
Holden
Hulshof
Johnson (IL)
Jones (OH)
LaHood
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Marchant
McNulty
Musgrave
Payne
Pryce (OH)
Ramstad
Rangel
Rogers (AL)
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Scott (GA)
Sessions
Sires
Skelton
Stark
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Walden (OR)
Waters
Weller
Wilson (NM)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. JACKSON of Illinois) (during the vote). Members are advised there are approximately 2 minutes remaining in the vote.

□ 1632

Messrs. WEINER, MURTHA, INSLEE, CROWLEY, ABERCROMBIE, Ms. WATSON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. CLARKE changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Messrs. MITCHELL, BRADY of Texas, TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, SPRATT, HALL of New York, and MCINTYRE changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall 182, I was unable to vote because of pressing business with my constituents in my home district. Had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, on Thursday, April 10, 2008, I missed three rollcall recorded votes due to unforeseen circumstances. Had I been present, the RECORD would reflect the following votes:

Rollcall vote No. 178—"yea"; rollcall vote No. 179—Rule providing for consideration of H.R. 2537—Beach Protection Act of 2007—"yea"; rollcall vote No. 180—Recognizing the fifth anniversary of the Department of Homeland Security and honoring the Department's employees for their extraordinary efforts and contributions to protect and secure our Nation—"yea"; rollcall vote No. 182—imposes a no earmark limitation on a formula driven EPA grant authority for State beach water quality monitoring and notification programs—"no."

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas) having assumed the chair, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2537) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relating to beach monitoring, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. BLUNT. Madam Speaker, I yield to my friend, the majority leader from Maryland, for the purpose of inquiring about next week's schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend, the Republican whip.

On Monday, the House will meet at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. On Tuesday, the House will meet at 10:30 a.m. for morning hour and 12 p.m. for legislative business. On Wednesday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for legislative business. And on Thursday, the House will meet at 8:30 a.m. and recess immediately to allow for the Former Members Association annual meeting, and will reconvene at approximately 10 a.m. for legislative business after the meeting is concluded.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The final list will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

On Friday, no votes are expected.

We will consider H.R. 2634, the Jubilee Act for Responsible Lending and Expanded Debt Cancellation of 2007; H.R. 5719, Taxpayer Assistance and Simplification Act of 2008; and H.R. 5715, Ensuring Continued Access to Student Loan Act of 2008.

In addition, we intend to consider at some point next week the bill we started today, H.R. 2537, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act relating to beach monitoring. We will consider that to its conclusion.

Mr. BLUNT. I would ask my friend on the last bill you mentioned, the Ensuring Continued Access to Student Loan Act of 2008, H.R. 5715, is that the bill that was introduced this week?

Mr. HOYER. I am not sure when it was introduced, very frankly. It was marked up this week and reported out of committee. Whether it was introduced this week or not, I do not know.

As you know, Secretary Spelling has indicated this is a very severe challenge confronting student loans. Obviously we want to get ready for September in particular so families have some confidence they will be able to secure loans for their children, or for young people going to college, securing the loans themselves.

Mr. BLUNT. That is a problem, and part of what I used to do before I came here involved that. I am anxious to see what the bill looks like. It is clearly a major problem out there.

On the vote we took earlier today, the rule vote on Colombia trade, if you listened to the debate, you heard two very different views of that debate. The view of my side was that this likely ends this discussion for this year, and the view I heard from the other side was not quite there at all. I am wondering if as the majority leader you have a sense of this bill, this agreement, whether it can come back to the floor this year or not.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman would yield, I would agree with the observation on our side. I say that, and it is obviously not humorous except to me.

The fact of the matter is I believe that what was said on this side of the aisle and what the Speaker has indicated was that this was sent down we believed contrary to normal practice not with agreement of the leadership and the administration on how this would be considered. The Speaker believed, and obviously the House did as well, that additional time was needed. This was not, the Speaker has indicated that, an attempt to kill this agreement. It still could come up. There still is going to be discussion between the administration and ourselves. We want to resolve some outstanding issues and discuss what we might reach agreement on with the President and the administration.

As you know, we began those conversations yesterday. You and I were down there at the White House together. We hope to continue and hope for positive movement. Regarding other agreements that are pending, we have not discussed nor ruled out the possibility that future trade agreements may be considered by this Congress.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman. That was going to be my second question. There are two other negotiated agreements, and I believe what you just said was that this vote today was about the Colombia agreement only and those other agreements should not be prejudiced by the vote we took today, and perhaps the Colombia vote will not be either.

I felt strongly about this. I still do, but I hope my friend's comments are correct and there is some way to now actively pursue whatever discussions need to be had on Colombia.

But on the final two if I heard you right, the two that have been negotiated and have not been sent up yet, I think I am hearing you say this does not establish any new way of doing this, and I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I don't think this was intended necessarily to be precedent-setting. The precedent, of course, has

been that administrations, Republican and Democratic, have discussed with Republican and Democratic Congresses the timing and conditions under which these would be sent forward. We did not believe that had been accomplished this time. The administration's perspective was that there had not been response to their attempts to do so. Whatever the reasons, the answer to your question is we do not believe at this point in time that this is precedent for the two pending agreements.

But I don't want to by that response represent, if we were confronted with the same set of conditions, that is, that we did not reach agreement on how those agreements were moving forward, that this might not be again something that might be considered. But it is not precedent.

Mr. BLUNT. I hear your answer and the explanation of your answer, and I understand that.

On the supplemental defense budget that we talked about last week, it would seem that during this period of time between now and the work period at home during Memorial Day, that the supplemental budget will move. I think last week it was your anticipation that it might move in committee as early as this week. That didn't happen. I also read this week that following the Petraeus-Crocker testimony, that a number of Members, including the chairman of the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, indicated that they thought that this supplemental would have not only extraneous spending, but also some restrictive language. Have you had any further discussions about either timing or whether this supplemental will get, in my opinion, bogged down and held back by any restrictive language?

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, let me say that last week, and I would reiterate the comment, I don't think I spoke to when the committee would move on it. What I did say was that hopefully the supplemental would be on the floor either the last week in April or the first week in May. I don't think that I referenced the committee consideration of that. I still believe that is the case.

With respect to your second question as to what might be on the supplemental, obviously it has not been marked up in committee. There are discussions, as have been reported in the public press, with respect to either language that might be appended to that by the committee or by the House itself. I would not want to preclude that effort.

I want to say that it is my understanding that the President has made a comment today again that what I sent you and the dollar I sent you, not a penny more will I sign.

I will tell my friend, I don't think that is particularly useful. It continues to say from the President of the United States to the Congress of the United States, which is, after all, the policymaking body of this country under the Constitution, ''What I propose you take, or we'll leave it. We'll not do anything other.''

I would hope to have discussions on this. As you know, the economy is in crisis. It is very nice to give money to Iraq. As you know, I support funding our troops. Having said that, we have people in crisis in housing, we have people in crisis in jobs, we have people in crisis without health care, and we have people in crisis with their educational expenses. We have a lot of people in this country who are in trouble.

We think that they need to know that the Congress of the United States is responding to their issues as well as to the issues that the President brings up with respect to Iraq.

So I don't want to commit us to simply doing exactly what the President asks, or apparently thinks he can tell us to do. We don't think that is the process.

□ 1645

Mr. BLUNT. Well, I thank the gentleman for that. I would say that my sense of that is that the troop supplemental should be that, and that we should be willing to work together on these other issues, as we did the stimulus package earlier this year. That's a package that the tax provisions are already beginning to have some impact. The rebate provisions will begin to have impact when people get their money in May, June and July.

But I think we proved, with that effort to work together, that when both sides decide we want to make something happen, we don't have to use the troop funding or any other issue. We just have to get together and make something happen. I think that would be, generally, the view on this side of the House about how to move forward on those two issues, and we can and will probably debate this for some time.

One of the issues that puts people in crisis, we saw a discussion on the floor today, a bill out of transportation that dealt with beach nutrition. Many of our Members thought that the Transportation Committee and the Energy Committee would be better spending their time focused on gasoline prices, which are $1 higher today, per gallon, on the average, than they were a year ago today. And I wonder if the gentleman has any sense of when we might see some legislation on the floor that would deal with gasoline prices.

Mr. HOYER. Well, of course, as you know, we have passed legislation that's still pending in the Senate. In addition to that, as you know, gas prices in January 2001 were $1.46, on average, in this country. They're now, on average, $3.30, so they've more than doubled during the last 87 months of this administration. We're concerned about that, as I know you are as well. The public would like to have $1.46 gas, I'm sure, back. And we are concerned about that.

We're concerned about energy independence. We all know that it's going to be very tough in the short term on both sides, it's recognized in the short term, to do something on gas prices, given where we are today from that $1.46 where we were in January of 2001.

Having said that, this bill that was on the floor today was an important bill. It was an important bill to a Member on your side of the aisle, and you and I had the opportunity to talk to him about it. It was a bipartisan bill. It's a bill that we thought had merit. And, as a matter of fact, my expectation is that overwhelming numbers of the House are going to vote for it when it comes up for final passage.

But, clearly, gasoline prices, gasoline, energy independence, which is a critical component of why we are in the position of having to pay such high prices, because we don't have great alternatives, getting more efficient automobiles, using alternative energy sources, providing for renewable fuels, as you know, I think you and I, I know you and I were both down when we presented the President with a bill that was signed by him at the Energy Department. We in a bipartisan way moved towards that last year on bills that we passed in a bipartisan way.

Mr. BLUNT. The debate today, I thought, was important and, you know, certainly, the numbers you cited about what's happened in the last 7 years, I don't fault those numbers at all. But we took a lot of responsibility for all of that when we were in the majority. And I haven't seen anything coming from this majority that would have stopped that $1 increase we've seen since the majority changed. I just hope we can work together to do that. And some of it's shorter term rather than longer.

Our long-term energy needs are clearly going to be met with some long-term solutions. But things that encourage more production here, more and better use of the fuel sources we have as we develop alternatives, I think, are part of that solution. I hope that the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Transportation Committee both are encouraged by both sides of the aisle to get some legislation to the floor that would let us deal with that. And I hope that happens sooner rather than later.

Actually, the debate today may have related more to the committee than it did the bill, but I thought it was a debate that the American people want to see us have on the floor of the House.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, APRIL 14, 2008

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Monday next for morning-hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON THURSDAY, APRIL 17, 2008

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Wednesday, April 16, 2008, it adjourn to meet at 8:30 a.m. on Thursday, April 17.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON THURSDAY, APRIL 17, 2008, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Thursday, April 17, for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair for the purpose of receiving in this Chamber former Members of Congress.

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

There was no objection.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MORRIS BLACK AND SONS

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

Mr. DENT. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the 100th anniversary of the Morris Black and Sons, a renowned interior design business located within my district.

Founded in 1908 by company namesake Morris Black, the business began as a horse and wagon team supplying contractors with construction needs including pipe, bricks, sand, cement and other masonry products. The company quickly grew as the Lehigh Valley became an industrial center, and by 1928, operated warehouses in Allentown and Bethlehem.

In the 1930s, Morris was joined by his sons, Benjamin and Samuel in running the family business. Under this leadership, Morris Black continued to develop, and in 1943, became one of the first companies in the Nation to incorporate an insulation subcontracting business.

A third generation of the Black family became associated with the company in the 1970s when Morris Black and Sons entered a period of rapid change. In the mid 1970s the company saw a growing interest in do-it-yourself remodeling and design. With the do-it-yourself trend on the horizon, Morris Black and Sons opened one of the first home design centers that marketed building products directly to active homeowners in 1976.

Over time, the company has continued to expand, opening its first satellite location in 1999 and the second in 2000, and has developed a strong reputation for quality throughout eastern Pennsylvania.

This Saturday the family marks its 100th anniversary. I wish the entire Morris Black family and company a healthy congratulations.

CONGRATULATING ISRAEL ON ITS 60TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to rise in celebration of the coming 60th anniversary of the creation of the Nation of Israel next month. I have long been a supporter of Israel, and I am proud of the strong bonds that unite Israel with our own Nation.

Not only is Israel one of our foremost allies in the current fight against terrorism, but they have been a long partner in peace, in commerce and in the values of liberty. Israel, like America, rose to prominence through the hard work of immigrants, and Israel remains the best model of democracy, religious freedom and peaceful coexistence in a very hostile location in the world. The contributions of Israeli ingenuity and Israeli technology are making an impact in the Middle East and throughout the world.

And today, with Iran threatening to destroy Israel and developing nuclear technologies and ballistic missile technologies, it's more important than ever that people of good will, Jews, Christians and of all faiths rise up in support of Israel and acknowledge Israel's coming 60 birthday.

Mazel Tov, Israel.

WHAT IS AT STAKE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, yesterday, General David Petraeus and Ambassador Ryan Crocker presented their reports to Congress. Their testimonies were professional, fact-driven accounts, and I am extremely grateful for their service.

During the hearing, I summarized al Qaeda spokesman Zawahiri, who has outlined his plan for Iraq. The first stage, expel the Americans from Iraq. The second stage, establish authority in Iraq. The third stage, extend the jihad wave to the secular nations neighboring Iraq. And the fourth stage, the clash with Israel and extermination of the people of Israel.

Ambassador Crocker acknowledged these goals, but said al Qaeda may not follow this timeline. They may try to attack America as soon as possible.

The Ambassador also agreed al Qaeda would not be satisfied with simply the destruction of the people of Israel.

We should remember what is at stake in Iraq. A failure in Iraq, a defeat at the hands of these extremists, would mean a failed state, a breeding ground for extremists. It is the scenario we saw in Afghanistan prior to 9/11.

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

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

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

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Madam Speaker, I rise today to call on the House of Representatives to pass a permanent research and development tax credit. We are the strongest Nation on Earth, in large part because of the innovation inspired through research and development.

Throughout our history, America has led the way thanks to our innovators and entrepreneurs. Their contributions to our society have led us to a new era, but we cannot rest on these laurels.

Even now, people in Nebraska and throughout our country are looking beyond the horizon for new ways to strengthen and grow our small, rural communities. We owe it to them to do everything in our power to foster these new ideas.

We live in a world with unlimited innovation, and I look forward to seeing what the future will bring from further research and development.

I urge the House leadership to bring H.R. 2138, the Investment in America Act, to the floor as soon as possible.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

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

Mr. SALI. Madam Speaker, continuing on with the remarks that were just made, many U.S. companies are making plans of where they will spend their research and development budgets for the next 3 to 5 years. Unfortunately, this Congress has made it increasingly difficult for these companies to invest those R&D dollars with the kind of careful planning their needs demand.

High-tech companies are sending their R&D jobs abroad to countries that recognize that permanent R&D

tax incentives induce businesses to locate research activities there. Canada provides a 20 percent flat credit for R&D. Ireland offers a 20 percent credit, as well as a full deduction, a low corporate tax rate, advanced infrastructure and a skilled, English-speaking workforce, all factors that appeal to many multi-national companies.

Madam Speaker, these jobs sent overseas are permanently lost when a company starts a new R&D project. We must keep these jobs here. The R&D credit has already lapsed. The clock is ticking. Congress must extend the R&D tax credit today, and we must also foster R&D at home by making this important tax credit permanent.

CELEBRATING THE 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF ISRAEL

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

Mr. CANTOR. Madam Speaker, 60 years ago, outnumbered and underequipped, the Jews of Palestine beat back five invading Arab armies to win a miraculous victory. Thus, the 2,000-year-old dream of reestablishing a state in the Jewish ancestral homeland was realized.

Since then, Israel has wrought out of barren desert and swamp a vibrant and flourishing state. It has harnessed its ingenuity to join the world's ranks of leaders in science, technology and cancer research. Israel remains a vital ally in the globe's most dangerous region.

And in a post-9/11 world, it is an encouraging reminder that a Democrat state can maintain its humane principles in the face of unrelenting terrorism.

So today, as Hamas rockets continue to rain on Israeli communities, and former U.S. Presidents are used by Hamas as props in their propaganda war, we, in this Congress, stand to reaffirm the enduring 60-year friendship we have had with Israel.

□ 1700

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

THE REAL BENCHMARK IN THE IRAQ POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, yesterday as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I participated in one of the Petraeus-Crocker hearings. Sadly, it was just more of the same. We heard doubletalk and nuanced excuse.

The American people and the Congress demand more. This is not the punchline on some late night comedy news show. This is the blood and treasure of our Nation. And now the Administration has its hand out for another blank check, over $1 billion rumor has it. This Congress should remain firm in its opposition to an open-ended occupation which is neither making America safer nor providing any real hope for the Iraqi people.

Just a few months ago, Madam Speaker, our esteemed Appropriations Chairman, Mr. OBEY, introduced, and this House passed, a bill that clearly stated the position of a majority of Americans.

With bipartisan support, the bill stated, the primary 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.

A line has been drawn in the sand. The bar was raised, and we will not step back from this.

From so-called blue states to red states, from east coast to west, from the deep south to the midwest, on to the great plain states, people are fed up. They overwhelmingly, time after time, demand that we end our occupation of Iraq, bring our troops home and that we also bring military contractors home and reaffirm our support of the Iraqi people by funding reconstruction and reconciliation efforts.

Our assistance should come through diplomacy. Actually through a handshake, not at the point of a gun. What is the best way to help the Iraqi people? By occupying their land or by lending a hand? As I said many, many times, I represent the most beautiful and most progressive congressional district. Every day my constituents make me proud to represent such amazing people. My own community has collected supplies for the troops, has donated to aid agencies and has gone the extra distance by giving straight from the heart.

One such example is Dominican University in Marin County. They've offered free schooling to Iraqi refugees. As part of the Iraqi Student Project, they will receive tuition and fee waivers. It may not seem like much to some, but I can tell you, this generous gift will change lives.

Our communities can make these small but priceless gestures. But the real work lies here under the Dome. We have the support of the American people, the Iraqis, and the world community. We can't wait until next year. We can't wait until the next decade or the next century.

So as this spending bill comes together, Americans want to know that their voices are being heard and, most importantly, heeded.

We must stand strong. We must steel our spines. In November, the House of Representatives said that the primary purpose of all of those Federal dollars was a safe and orderly redeployment. The administration disagreed saying it won't back down.

We will consider spending over $1 billion on the Iraq occupation in the coming weeks, Madam Speaker. I, for one, welcome the debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CONGRATULATING CLAYTON W. WILLIAMS, JR., ON HIS RECEIPT OF THE CONSERVATION CHAMPION AWARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONAWAY. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Clayton W. Williams, Jr., on his receipt of the Conservation Champion Award from the Texas Parks & Wildlife Foundation.

Claytie, as he is affectionately known, is a favorite son of Texas, not only for his business acumen, but also for his unending generosity and tireless volunteerism. The Conservation Champion Award is but the most recent in a long list of honors that have been bestowed upon him for his philanthropic activities.

Throughout his life, Claytie has been at the forefront of the conservation movement. Recently, Claytie and his wife, Modesta, granted one of the largest conservation easements in Texas history: 60,000 acres spread across two ranches. By doing so, they have set aside this land for future development and preserved the land's unspoiled character, picturesque vistas, and natural habitat forever.

Madam Speaker, I congratulate Claytie today, and my words are recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is my wish that this small statement about his service will last as long as the gift he has given to Texas. I hope that in the distant future when we are all long passed away, someone finds these words and realizes that there was not always a movement to preserve open space and there was not always 60,000 acres in southwest Texas kept as pristine as they were 100 years ago.

The gift Claytie has given the people of Texas will last as long as our Union. We should remember this man of extraordinary vision and foresight for at least that long.

Through his leadership and actions, the State of Texas, and indeed, all of America, is more conscious of its natural heritage, more thoughtful of the land on which we live, and more interested in preserving all of it for the coming generations.

On behalf of my constituents of the 11th District of Texas, I want to express my thanks to Clayton and his wife, Modesta, for his lifetime of generosity, and to congratulate him on the

receipt of the Conservation Champion Award.

TRADE POLICY IS CREATING A CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Madam Speaker, today, for the first time in 4 decades, the House of Representatives stood up against yet another bad trade agreement. Our trade policy is creating a crisis. It's eroding the incomes of the middle class. We're losing our manufacturing base in this country. We're borrowing $2 billion a day from overseas making us vulnerable to countries like China and others who do not have our best interests in mind as they amount huge piles of our dollars because of the trade deficit.

Now, all the pointy-headed economists out there, they have a theory. The theory is when your dollar or your currency declines, at some point you kind of get to a point where your idled capacity ramps up, your goods become less expensive, and the world begins to buy your goods and your trade deficit goes away.

I confronted an economist over that vision a couple of years ago, and I said, well, that was an interesting theory, you know, 50 years ago. Maybe it even worked.

But what I said to him was what happens to the country that doesn't make anything anymore? Doesn't that mean, in fact, as your currency drops, you're still addicted to buying the goods made overseas or you're just not going to have those goods because you don't make them in the U.S. anymore?

There is no idle capacity to ramp up. Our companies of wholesale exported their manufacturing capacity to Mexico and China in the chase for ever cheaper, more exploitable labor around the world which has been encouraged by our trade agreements. Every other nation on earth has a trade policy to take care of the people of their own country. The United States has a trade policy to take care of the corporate elite in the United States of America and to heck with the rest of our country or even national security.

So why do I come to the floor today to talk about this? Two things: One is because we finally stood up against the free trade agreement and the fast-track gimmick that has jammed those things through time and time and time again. The President negotiated it in secret. You, Congress, you can't mess that up. We will lose respect around the world. You're just gonna take it. You can't amend it. And we'll fix it later. And later never comes.

But the second reason I come to the floor is because today, to the great surprise of those pointy-headed economists, our trade deficit got bigger even though we're in a recession and the dollar is dropping like a rock toward the value of a rupee, which it will soon achieve if we don't do something to turn the tide.

So our trade deficit grew 5.7 percent to $62.3 billion. We could be headed for a record trade deficit. Now why's that? Because those same goods that we don't make here anymore are more expensive now because we're still buying them with a depreciated dollar.

Of course, the nightmare scenario is the day when oil becomes denominated in somebody else's currency and countries refuse to take our currency and refuse to continue to lend us $2 billion a day. And that day of reckoning may not be far off.

It's time for a new trade policy in America, one that brings and keeps high-value jobs here at home and gives us a future as a great power and a manufacturing power, not as a has-been.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MAJOR ISSUES AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE DEMANDING CONGRESS ADDRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, it is now 5:10 p.m. on a Thursday afternoon. And for most individuals across this Nation, this is about the end of the fourth working day of the week. For the House, we've just completed less than two full days of work, but if you stretch it, it's really a little over two. Where's the House now? They've gone home. Where was the House on Monday? Home. Now, that's important because there are important things to do at home. But Madam Speaker, it's important to appreciate that there are major issues that the American people are demanding that Congress address.

We heard about one of them this afternoon: Gas prices. Gas prices significantly increased over the last 12 to 15 months, and this Congress has done nothing except raise taxes on American oil producers.

But the reason I want to bring focus to the issue of Congress going home is that we are now 55 days into a unilateral disarmament for our Nation. That is right, Madam Speaker. Fifty-five days ago, this House, the leadership in the House, chose to allow some amendments to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act to expire. Now, what did those amendments do? Those amendments which were adopted shortly after 9/11 allowed, e-d, past tense, allowed our intelligence community to listen or surveil or intercept phone or electronic communication between, Madam Speaker, between a foreign individual in a foreign land talking or communicating to a foreign individual in a foreign land. That is right, Madam Speaker. If an individual who wishes to do our Nation harm is speaking to another individual who wishes to do us harm, up until 55 days ago, we had an opportunity in this Nation to determine to listen to, to know what kind of communication that was. But 55 days ago, this leadership in this House chose to let that expire.

Now why did they choose to let that expire? Well, what they believe is that American trial lawyers ought to have the ability to sue communications companies who share that information with the United States government, with our intelligence community, the folks trying to keep us safe.

Madam Speaker, back in my district, the Sixth District of Georgia, the people don't understand the kind of leadership that would have the mentality to not allow our intelligence community to listen to a potential terrorist talking to another potential terrorist outside the United States. Not to an American, but to somebody who is not an American citizen. Consequently, Madam Speaker, we are now utilizing the same rules that we had in effect on September 10, 2001.

Madam Speaker, you hear a lot of talk about crises across this Nation, and our friends on the other side of the aisle talk about the crisis in this and the crisis in that. I'll tell you what we've got a crisis of in this Congress, Madam Speaker, and that is a Congress of irresponsibility, a crisis of irresponsibility and a leadership that refuses to allow this Congress to do its number one job, which is to protect our citizens and our constituents.

□ 1715

Madam Speaker, I call on the Speaker and I call on the majority leader and I call on the majority party in the House of Representatives to bring the Protect America Act to the floor. It's a bill that has bipartisan support. A majority of individuals in the House have said they will support it. It would pass if it were brought up today. But what were we talking about today? Bills that didn't have to do with the security of the United States.

I urge the Speaker and the majority leader to bring that bill to the floor, allow it to pass as it has in the Senate, in a bipartisan way, so that we can return home and tell our constituents that we acted positively to assist in protecting them and their families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SANCTUARY CITY SAN FRANCISCO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TANCREDO. Madam Speaker, some in the most radical elements of the pro-illegal immigration groups advocate something called ''Reconquista,'' or that is to say, they want to have that part of the United States that was ceded to the United States by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. They want to have it voided, and either that chunk of America returned to Mexico or become a second nation. I mean, it's pretty bizarre, but that's what they push for.

Sometimes I hear some of the things said by some of the officials in San Francisco. And I would suggest that if advocates for this Reconquista would agree to take San Francisco first, I might be sympathetic to their particular point of view. Because some of the things that are done, some of the statements that are made are quite bizarre, to say the least, and would indicate a lack of willingness on the part of its citizens, or at least expressed by some of its public officials, a lack of willingness to adhere to the laws of this United States of America.

The San Francisco Chronicle reported recently that Mayor Gavin Newsom announced a new initiative advertising his city as a sanctuary for illegal aliens. According to this report, San Francisco plans to spend $83,000 to print brochures in half a dozen languages reassuring illegal aliens that they are welcome to stay and access public services. He went on to declare that, we don't care what your status is, we want you to participate in the life of our city.

It goes without saying that this is dangerous policy, and it makes no sense in a post 9/11 environment. It's also a flagrant violation of Federal law. In 1996, Congress passed and President Clinton signed immigration enforcement legislation making policies like San Francisco's that provide sanctuary to illegal aliens and potential terrorists by refusing to report them to Federal authorities, making that action illegal, as I say. But unfortunately for America, the Bush Administration doesn't seem to care.

Dozens of major cities have enacted these kinds of reckless policies, barring law enforcement personnel from cooperation with Federal immigration enforcement efforts, and with disastrous results I might add. In Denver, a sanctuary city, a police officer was shot and killed and a second officer critically wounded on Mother's Day of 2005 by an illegal alien who was later arrested. He had been stopped twice for driving without a license and had to appear in municipal court twice. In April, less than one month before the shooting, the man was in court with a Mexican driver's license, yet no one asked him about his immigration status because of Denver's sanctuary city policy. If the perpetrator had been deported in April, that police officer might still be alive.

This tragic case is just one example, and there are countless others. These policies are responsible for thousands of major crimes around our country, and could have been prevented. These irresponsible city leaders gamble not only with the safety of their own residents, but with the residents of neighboring communities and the entire United States as well.

Madam Speaker, the American people have demanded an end to these dangerous policies, and Congress has responded by passing legislation to outlaw them. So the question is, will President Bush allow this rogue mayor to put the rest of the country at risk, or will he finally live up to his oath of office and enforce the law?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCHENRY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ENGLISH AS THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BROUN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I love America, and I cherish the values and principles that America represents. Those values are increasingly threatened today by an erosion of one of the primary bonds that keeps us together, a common language.

Large scale legal and illegal immigration threatens our societal cohesion and America's shared values when arrivals are unwilling to learn English. The current policies of our Federal Government actually enable this erosion when it provides official documents in multiple languages. This eliminates any incentive to learn English. America's genius as a melting-pot Nation has always been promoted by assimilation to a common language, and that language is English.

Today, I am introducing legislation that declares English to be the official language of the United States Government. Under the English As the Official Language Act of 2008, no person has an entitlement to receive Federal documents and services in languages other than English unless required by law. If the U.S. government is generous enough to make an exception, the exception does not create a legal entitlement or precedent to additional services in any other language other than English. This essential legislation will significantly reduce costs to our Federal Government and will encourage new legal immigrants to quickly adopt America's native tongue.

Learning English has always been and will continue to be a key step in achieving the American Dream. I applaud my fellow colleague in the other House, Senator JIM INHOFE, for introducing identical legislation in the Senate, and for his continued leadership on this critically important issue.

Making English the official language of our great land is not just about preserving our culture and heritage. Learning English is an essential step for our Nation's newest potential citizens that they must take if they want to achieve the American Dream. I plead with my colleagues to strengthen America by supporting English As the Official Language Act of 2008.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SCHIFF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PENCE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WE CANNOT SAY WE DID NOT KNOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. In his first speech in the British Parliament in 1789 describing the slave trade, William Wilberforce concluded telling his colleagues this, he said, ''Having heard all of this, you may choose to look the other way, but you can never again say you did not know.''

Not one Member of the 110th Congress can say they do not know about the Nation's long-term financial outlook which former Comptroller General David Walker said will ''result in a tsunami of spending and debt that could swamp our ship of state.''

According to the Government Accountability Office, America is $5.3 trillion deep in publicly held debt and has estimated $54.3 trillion in unfunded promised benefits if we don't change our current course. And that is trillions with a ''T.''

The Social Security Medicare Trustees Report recently issued only reinforces the dire condition of our fiscal health. The Medicare Trustees Report concluded that consideration of reforms to ensure the financial security of Medicare must occur, stating, ''the sooner the solutions are enacted, the more flexible and gradual they can be.'' The Social Security report echoes this sense of urgency, saying, ''The projected trust fund deficits should be addressed in a timely manner. Making adjustments sooner will allow them to be spread over more generations.''

And if those dire projections are not enough to raise the warning flags, couple those with the fact that the value of the dollar is falling through the floor. What more evidence do we need to realize that our children and grandchildren cannot afford to have their leaders choose to look the other way?

I was so disappointed that Treasury Secretary Paulson's focus is not on this issue. I told him today when he testified before the State and Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee that I believe he is one of the most qualified Treasury Secretaries our Nation has had. He has a brilliant mind, but his attention isn't on the most fundamental of all issues, the economic future of America.

I was also disappointed that he didn't answer my question about the projections credible rating agencies, such as Moody's Investment Service, are making about the U.S. triple-A bond rating being at risk as early as year 2012. I also asked Secretary Paulson what the ramifications of this loss would be. He didn't answer that question either.

Just last week, Congressman JIM COOPER and I sat in on a roundtable discussion held by Maya MacGuineas and the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, and they have done a great job. It was just such a diverse group from the business, finance and policy communities, former CBO directors, former OMB directors, think tanks, political views across the spectrum, the Heritage Foundation and the Brookings Institution included. Almost everyone expressed concern about the entitlement crisis we are facing. This is not only an economic issue, it is also generational and a moral issue.

You may have read Pete Peterson's editorial in Newsweek this week. He ended by quoting Dietrich Bonhoeffer, the German pastor who was instrumental in the resistance movement against fascist Germany. He said, ''The ultimate test of a moral society is the kind of world it leaves to its children.''

I cannot help but wonder what sort of future today's partisan Washington is leaving to generations to come. If we can come together, both sides of the aisle, we can ensure that our children and our grandchildren have all the opportunity that you and I have had. JIM COOPER and I are working together on the Cooper-Wolf SAFE Commission, with over 80 bipartisan cosponsors.

If anyone has another viable plan to address our entitlement tsunami, we're anxious to hear it. But we cannot continue the status quo. Doing nothing is not acceptable.

Wilberforce's admonition rings as true today as it did in 1789. ''Having heard all this, you may choose to look the other way, but you can never again say that you do not know.''

We know, and it's on our watch. Let's fix it.

SUNSET MEMORIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, I stand once again before this House with yet another Sunset Memorial.

It is April 10, 2008, in the land of the free and the home of the brave, and before the sun set today in America, almost 4,000 more defenseless unborn children were killed by abortion on demand. That's just today, Madam Speaker. That's more than the number of innocent lives lost on September 11 in this country, only it happens every day.

It has now been exactly 12,862 days since the tragedy called Roe v. Wade was first handed down. Since then, the very foundation of this Nation has been stained by the blood of almost 50 million of its own children. Some of them, Madam Speaker, died and screamed as they did so, but because it was amniotic fluid passing over the vocal cords instead of air, no one could hear them.

And all of them had at least four things in common. First, they were each just little babies who had done nothing wrong to anyone, and each one of them died a nameless and lonely death. And each one of their mothers, whether she realizes it or not, will never be quite the same. And all the gifts that these children might have brought to humanity are now lost forever. Yet even in the glare of such tragedy, this generation still clings to a blind, invincible ignorance while history repeats itself and our own silent genocide mercilessly annihilates the most helpless of all victims, those yet unborn.

Madam Speaker, perhaps it's time for those of us in this Chamber to remind ourselves of why we are really all here. Thomas Jefferson said, ''The care of human life and its happiness and not its destruction is the chief and only object of good government.'' The phrase in the 14th Amendment capsulizes our entire Constitution, it says, ''No State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law.'' Madam Speaker, protecting the lives of our innocent citizens and their constitutional rights is why we are all here.

The bedrock foundation of this Republic is the clarion declaration of the self-evident truth that all human beings are created equal and endowed by their Creator with the unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Every conflict and battle our Nation has ever faced can be traced to our commitment to this core, self-evident truth.

□ 1730

It has made us the beacon of hope for the entire world. Madam Speaker, it is who we are.

And yet today another day has passed, and we in this body have failed again to honor that foundational commitment. We have failed our sworn oath and our God-given responsibility as we broke faith with nearly 4,000 more innocent American babies who died today without the protection we should have given them. And it seems too sad to me, Madam Speaker, that this Sunset Memorial may be the only acknowledgement or remembrance these children who died today will ever have in this Chamber.

So as a small gesture, I would ask those in the Chamber who are inclined to join me for a moment of silent memorial to these lost little Americans.

Madam Speaker, let me conclude in the hope that perhaps someone new who heard this Sunset Memorial tonight will finally embrace the truth that abortion really does kill little babies; that it hurts mothers in ways that we can never express; and that 12,862 days spent killing nearly 50 million unborn children in America is enough; and that the America that rejected human slavery and marched into Europe to arrest the Nazi Holocaust is still courageous and compassionate enough to find a better way for mothers and their unborn babies than abortion on demand.

So tonight, Madam Speaker, may we each remind ourselves that our own days in this sunshine of life are also numbered and that all too soon each one of us will walk from these Chambers for the very last time.

And if it should be that this Congress is allowed to convene on yet another day to come, may that be the day when we finally hear the cries of innocent unborn children. May that be the day when we find the humanity, the courage, and the will to embrace together our human and our constitutional duty to protect these, the least of our tiny, little American brothers and sisters from this murderous scourge upon our Nation called abortion on demand.

It is April 10, 2008, 12,862 days since Roe versus Wade first stained the foundation of this Nation with the blood of its own children, this in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

PEAK OIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BARTLETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Speaker, I believe that this is the 41st

time that I have come to the floor since 3 years ago, the 14th day of March, to talk about energy, specifically about oil.

Here is a copy of the Washington Times today. The main headline: ''Global Food Riots Turn Deadly.'' And then if I turn to the front page ''promoing'' what's inside, Business, Gas Hits Record: ''The upward trend in energy prices showed no sign of abating yesterday as gasoline set another record at the pump and crude oil topped $112 a barrel for the first time in the futures market.''

If I go back to the lead article, it says clashes likely to persist with soaring prices. ''Anger over spiraling world food prices is becoming increasingly violent.'' This is a quote from the head of the Rome-based U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization: ''World food prices have risen 45 percent in the last 9 months, and there are serious shortages,'' serious shortages, ''of rice, wheat, and corn. U.N. Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon issued a personal appeal for calm in Haiti yesterday. At least five people have been reported killed in disturbances since last week after the cost of rice doubled and gas prices rose a third time since February.''

This could have been predicted 28 years ago. I will explain in a few moments why I use 28 years ago. It was an absolute certainty that at some point in time, roughly this time, that we would be here talking about this crisis.

This first chart is an interesting one. The motorist is looking at today $3 and 30 some cents a gallon for gasoline, and he says, ''Just why is gas so expensive?'' He has a tiny little supply there and a huge, big demand in his SUV. And, Madam Speaker, that's why gas prices are high. There is more demand for gas than there is gas available, and the marketplace demands that the price of gasoline go up.

This saga started 52 years ago, the 8th day of March, in San Antonio, Texas, when what I believe will be recognized shortly as the most important speech given in the last century was delivered to a group of oil scientists and engineers and executives in San Antonio, Texas.

The next chart shows the prediction that was made in 1956 by M. King Hubbert, who was this oil geologist. He was talking to a group of people representing the country, our country, which was then king of oil, producing more oil, consuming more oil, exporting more oil than any other country in the world. And he told them that in just 14 years, no matter what we did before or after that, that oil production would reach a maximum in our country and after that it would go down, down, down. What he said was audacious and disbelieved, but 14 years later, in 1970, right on schedule, we peaked in oil production.

And this is a chart which shows that peaking. It shows Texas producing a third or so of the oil at that time and the rest of the United States. Natural gas liquids added to that. And then it shows the enormous discovery of oil in Alaska, and I have been there to Prudhoe Bay, Dead Horse, and I have seen the beginning of that 4 foot pipeline through which for a number of years now a full fourth of our domestic production of oil flowed. That is now tapering off.

The yellow there are the fabled discoveries of oil in the Gulf of Mexico. You notice that in his prediction that we would reach a peak in 1970, there was just a blip in the downward slope produced by the huge discovery in Alaska. He had not included Alaska and the Gulf of Mexico in his prediction. It was just the lower 48. And notice there was hardly a ripple of those famed discoveries in the Gulf of Mexico.

The next chart shows another depiction of the Hubbert Peak. And I show this one because this is used by a group, CERA, Cambridge Energy Research Associates, to try to convince you that you should not be alarmed by M. King Hubbert's prediction, that the world would be doing now about the same thing the United States did in 1970 because he was wrong about the United States in 1970. They said, you see, his prediction of what the production of oil would be are these yellow triangles and the actual production were the green squares and he missed it.

Well, maybe a statistician could give you an analysis which could say he had missed it, but I think to the average citizen, those two curves look pretty darn similar, don't they? And I think the average citizen would say I think he probably got it. We did peak in 1970, and in spite of what we have done then, in the lower 48, we pretty much followed that curve.

And then this is the red now. That includes the total production which includes Alaska and the Gulf of Mexico.

In 1979 M. King Hubbert predicted that the world would reach its maximum oil production about now. And the next chart is a very insightful one. If you had only one chart to use to discuss this subject, this would be the chart that you would use. It shows the discoveries of oil. We discovered a whole lot of it back in the 1940s. I actually remember those times very well. My first car was a 1936 Ford, made just 10 years after I was born. Then lots of discoveries in 1950 and the 1960s and 1970s. And notice what has happened, 1970s, 1980s, 1990s, 2000, down, down, down in discovery. And that's in spite of ever better techniques for finding oil. 3–D seismic and computer modeling and, boy, we've mapped the world, and we know pretty much where oil is likely to be found because it's found in only very unique geologic formations and we know what they are and we know where they likely exist.

Now, the solid black line here is our consumption of oil, and it's also our production because we haven't been storing huge amounts of it anywhere. We have a small strategic reserve in our country, small in terms of the oil that we use in a year, really small. So we aren't storing it anywhere; so what we have consumed is what we have produced. And you see that that shows an ever-increasing slope here.

Up through the Carter years, every decade, we used as much oil as we had used in all of previous history. I want you to reflect on that for just a moment. What that meant was, of course, if we had kept on that trend, when we had used half of the world's oil, and it is finite, and when we used half of the world's oil, we would have just 10 years of oil left at that rate of usage.

Now, in the 1970s, late 1970s, we had the oil price spike hikes as a result of the Arab oil embargo, and that caused a worldwide recession. You see here that the use of oil actually dropped off. It caused a worldwide recession and we woke up. We said we can get things done more efficiently. So now with an increasing economy, greatly increased economy, we are now using oil at an ever less increasing rate. This slope, it's very much less than this slope, and that reflects the increased efficiencies that we have built in. Your air conditioner today is maybe three times as efficient as it was in the 1970s. Your refrigerator is two or three times as efficient as it was then.

Notice that ever since 1982 or so, we have been using more oil than we found. And we were able to do that because we had these huge reserves back here. So what we have been doing ever since the early 1980s is dipping into these reserves and using some of this oil that we found and didn't need because the area under this curve represents the oil that we have used. And, obviously, if you add up all these bars, it represents the oil we found, and you could put a curve over those, and the area under that curve would then represent the oil that we found. So we now have used this area here in terms of our reserves, and we used about this much reserves probably; so we have a whole bunch left.

So what will the future look like? Now, M. King Hubbert predicted that the world would be reaching its maximum oil production about now. And this chart you see at about 2008, 2010, it shows it peaking. Now, you can within limits make the future look reasonably whatever way you want it to look like, but you cannot pump what is not there. If you are really aggressive and build a whole lot of wells and flood them with live steam and pump CO_2 down there and flood them with seawater, which is what they do in Saudi Arabia, you can get the oil out quicker.

□ 1745

But what you use now will not be there to use tomorrow. How much more will we find? Well, they have shown a smooth discovery curve getting ever less and less. It won't be smooth like that. It will be up and

down. But if I were drawing a line and projecting it out, I wouldn't have drawn it quite that high. And I don't think you would either. You would draw it somewhere below that. I think that is maybe an optimistic assessment of what we will find in the future if what we have discovered in the past is any measure of what we will discover in the future.

The next chart is a chart which M. King Hubbert anticipated. This is an interesting one because it represents data from the two best organizations in the world for tracking the production and consumption of oil. Because as I said before, we use what we found pretty quickly. We haul it across the ocean, refine it and use it. This is the EIA, the Energy Information Administration, a part of our Department of Energy, and the IEA, the International Energy Association. That one most people are familiar with because El Baradei is the head of that. And they have been kind of monitoring what is going on in Iran. You see them frequently in the newspaper.

Notice that for the last 3 years roughly they show the production of oil as constant. There have been several appeals. You will read about them in the newspaper: Saudi Arabia, OPEC, won't you please produce some more oil? What OPEC says is, we think we are producing enough oil. I think that the correct answer really is, we can't produce oil any faster than we are producing it. I think that they have probably reached their maximum production of oil. The little blue line here shows what has happened to price, and notice in the last year or so what has happen to price, up, up, up.

The first time I came to the floor here, as I said, was a bit more than 3 years ago and oil was, what, 50 and a couple of dollars a barrel. Now today it was $112 a barrel.

The production of oil has remained constant. The demand for oil has gone up. That is really a simple relationship. When the demand for a product is greater than the supply of the product, people bid it up. It is like at an auction. If two or three people want something, and there is only one of the thing they want, they bid it up to ridiculously high levels. And that is what is happening with oil. To get it, you have to outbid the other guy. And so now it is $112 a barrel.

The next chart is a schematic chart. And it shows the same curve we have been looking at. And by the way, it is obvious that we can make this curve really sharp by simply expanding the ordinate and compressing the abscissa. Here it is spread out. But in any event, this follows a roughly 2 percent increase in use. That doesn't sound like much, does it? As a matter of fact, our stock market gets really jittery when our growth is only 2 percent. It is going to have to get over that, Madam Speaker, because we can't continue 2 percent growth forever. With 2 percent growth, it doubles in 35 years. It is four times bigger in 70 years. It is 8 times bigger in 105 years. And it is 16 times bigger in 140 years.

Now, when your only perspective is the next quarterly report or getting yourself through the next election, this 2 percent growth, which in 140 years from now will be 16 times bigger, makes whatever is growing at 2 percent, 16 times bigger may not seem very important to you. But I have ten kids and 16 grandkids and two great grandkids. And I would sure like them to live in a world as comfortable as the world I live in and to have the opportunities that I've had.

This yellow here represents a growing gap. If, in fact, we are at this point, and the charts that we have just seen would indicate that we probably are, then the increasing demand is going to result in a deficit which will be reflected in higher oil prices and higher gas prices at the pump. The big focus that most people are talking about is, gee, how are we going to fill that gap? Let me suggest, Madam Speaker, that we are not going to fill that gap. There are no readily available substitutes for oil out there. A little bit of this and a little of that, if you sum them all up, they are still far short of the amount of oil we are now using.

Now we are going to continue to have oil. We are not running out of oil. What we are doing is running out of our ability to produce oil as fast as we would like to use it. There will be oil, gas and coal around for another 150 years, ever less and less, harder and harder to get, at higher and higher costs.

The next chart is really a quote from what I think will shortly be recognized perhaps as the most insightful speech given in the last century, given 51 years ago, the 14th day of this May. Hyman Rickover, the father of our nuclear submarine, gave this speech to a group of physicians in Saint Paul, Minnesota. You can find that. There is a link in our Website to it, or you can simply do a Google search for ''Rickover energy speech,'' and it will pop up. It was a really insightful speech.

In the 8,000 years from the beginning of history to the year 2000 AD, world population will have grown from 10 million to 4 billion. He kind of missed that. World population is about 7 billion people now. With 90 percent of that growth taking place during the last 5 percent of that period, with way more than 90 percent of that growth taking place in the last 5 percent of that period. It took the first 3,000 years of recorded history to account the first doubling of population, 100 years from the last doubling, but the next doubling will require only 50 years. As a matter of fact, it required considerably less than 50 years.

The next chart is not a chart of population growth, but it could just as well have been. This is a chart showing the increase in energy availability, our consumption of energy. And if I superimpose on this a chart of population growth, it would follow this almost exactly. Our world population has grown from half a billion or so to 7 billion people, and most of it, as Hyman Rickover pointed, in the last little while. And look, I don't go back 8,000 years. I only go back 400 years, but if I went back the rest of the 8,000 years, it would still be pretty much down near zero.

The Industrial Revolution began with wood. And then we found coal. And boy, did it take off when we found gas and oil. Now here we see that discontinuity in the 1970s, what we have done here, of course, is to expand the ordinate and compress the abscissa so that we have a very sharp curve. That is the same curve we have seen several times before. But it looks different depending on the scale you have in the ordinate and in the abscissa.

The next chart is some data in Hyman Rickover's speech. And it is even more so today. With high energy consumption goes a high standard of living, he said. Thus, the enormous fossil fuel which we in this country control feeds machines which make each of us a master of an army of mechanical slaves. This was 51 years ago. What he said then is true even more so today. He said that we represent, I have seen data a little more than this, roughly 35 watts of energy, sleeping and waking. Standing here and talking here, I am more like a 70-watt bulb. That is not very much, is it? As a matter of fact, if you look at the amount of food which you eat in a day, if you dried it, if you burned it and made a fire of it, it would hardly warm your fingers on a cold day. Just look at the C Rations that our military uses and how compact they are. You put water in them and they swell up. They look like a lot. But the actual dry material there is not much. In fact, he said 51 years ago, the household appliances that make life so comfortable for the family represented the work output of 33 men. He said that the machines which make our cars and refrigerators and so forth represent 244 men. Two thousand men push your automobile down the road. The energy it takes to move your car down the road is the energy of 2,000 men working. One hundred thousand men push the locomotive down the road. And 700,000 men push the jet plane through the sky.

When I first saw the data that said that one barrel of oil represented 25,000 man hours of effort, the work output of 12 people working all year, I said to myself, gee, that can't be. But then I thought, I have a Prius car. I bought the first one in Congress and the first one in Maryland. And a gallon of gasoline is still cheaper than water in the grocery store, by the way, if you buy it in the little bottles. I thought about how far that gallon of gasoline takes my car and how long it would take me to pull it those 47 miles that the gallon of gasoline takes my car. I said, gee, it is probably true that one barrel of oil represents the work output of 12 people working all year. Now we are the beneficiaries of an incredible quality of life

which is the result, the direct result of our access to all of this energy.

The next chart is another quote from Hyman Rickover, whether this Golden Age, and it is a golden age. Nobles of old lived nowhere near as well as we live today. The poorest in our country, maybe it's not quite true in other countries, live better than nobles of yesteryear because of the incredible access that we have to this energy. Whether this Golden Age will continue depends entirely upon our ability to keep energy supplies in balance with the needs of our growing population. Now we haven't done that or we wouldn't have headlines like this today: ''Global food riots turn deadly.''

In a few moments, I will discuss the relationship between those global food riots and this other headline: ''Gas hits a record.''

Possession of surplus energy is, of course, a requisite for any kind of civilization. For if man possesses merely the energy of his own muscles, he must expend all his strength, mental and physical, to obtain the bare necessities of life.

This article on food notes that in much of the third world, 50 to 60 percent of the income of the family goes to food. Do you know what that is in our country? It is less than 10 percent. Food doubling in price in our country doesn't mean much. But if you're paying 50 percent of your income to buy food, and it doubles in price, then it takes 100 percent of your income to buy that food. So it really, really is important to the poor of the world.

A reduction of per capita energy consumption has always, in the past, led to a decline in civilization and a reversion to a more primitive way of life.

The next is another quote in from Hyman Rickover. By the way, Madam Speaker, I am going through these quotes, and then I am going to use quotes from four studies that our government has paid for with our taxpayers' money and then ignored. And what I am going to be asking is, with this history, with this great speech given by Hyman Rickover 51 years ago, and with the warnings in these four studies released over the last several years, why aren't you hearing more about a meaningful program to address this energy challenge that we face?

There is nothing man can do to rebuild exhausted fossil fuel reserve. They were created by solar energy a long time ago, he says 500 million years ago, it took eons to grow to their present volume. In the face of the basic fact that fossil fuel reserves are finite, that's a great statement. Just reflect on this.

The exact length of time that these reserves will last is important in only one respect.

Now he didn't know how long they were going to last because he didn't know how long this Golden Age will last. But we now know pretty much. It will be, Madam Speaker, about 300 years long. We are about 150 years into it. We are now at the pinnacle of the Golden Age. Will it be in another 150 years as these fossil fuels become less and less available at higher and higher costs?

The exact length of time that these reserves will last is important in only one respect. The longer they last, the more time that we have to invent ways of living off renewable or substitute energy sources and to adjust our economy to the vast changes which we can expect from such a shift. Fifty-one years ago. Really prophetic.

Madam Speaker, with this kind of insightful advice 51 years ago, with headlines like this in the paper, with these four reports paid for by our government, why haven't we done something? Why aren't we doing something?

□ 1800

''Fossil fuels resemble capital in the bank.''

I love this statement. ''A prudent and responsible parent will use his capital sparingly in order to pass on to his children as much as possible of his inheritance. A selfish and irresponsible parent will squander it in riotous living, and care not one whit how his offspring will fare.''

With the shortages in oil, which have driven up the price of gasoline, they want me to vote to drill in ANWR and offshore. I have got 10 kids, 16 grandkids and two great-grandkids, and I ask them, if you can drill in ANWR tomorrow, what would you do the day after tomorrow? And there will be a day after tomorrow.

We are leaving our kids a horrendous debt, growing by leaps and bounds. Not with my vote, if you will check the record, but we are leaving them that debt. And I ask those who would like me to vote to drill in ANWR and offshore, wouldn't it be nice if I left my kids and my grand-kids and my great grandkids a little energy to deal with this horrendous debt?

The next is a quote also from Hyman Rickover. You can see why I believe this will be shortly recognized as perhaps the most insightful speech given in the last century. ''I suggest this is a good time to think soberly about our responsibility to our descendants.'' Wow, 51 years ago, and there are very few who are thinking soberly at all about this today.

''I suggest this is a good time to think soberly about our responsibilities to our descendants, those who will ring out the fossil fuel age. We must give a break to these youngsters by cutting fuel and metal consumption.''

Wow. 51 years ago. And what we have done since then, with no more responsibility than the kids who found the cookie jar or the hog who found the feed room door open, we just have been pigging out on energy, as if it were forever, as if there was an endless supply. It is obviously finite. The moon isn't made out of green cheese and the Earth isn't made out of oil. I see chairs and trees and grass and sticks and stones out there. Obviously it isn't all oil, and it is not going to last forever.

''So as to provide a safer margin for the necessary adjustments which eventually will be made in a world without fossil fuel.''

A year ago, Christmas-New Year's break, I led a codel of nine to China to talk about energy. They began their discussion of energy by talking about post-oil. In an environment where it is hard for us to see beyond the next quarterly report or the next election, they are looking generations and centuries down the road. There will be a post-oil world. It is not going to be totally post-oil for about another 150 years, but increasingly there is going to be less and less, higher and higher costs, more and more difficult to get.

The next chart is just kind of a repeat of the wise advice he has been giving. ''High energy consumption has always been a prerequisite of political power. Ultimately the nation which controls the largest energy resources will become dominant.''

I am going to show a chart a little later that shows that China is buying up energy oil all over the world. They kind of understand that. ''If we act wisely and in time to conserve what we have and prepare well for necessary future changes, we shall ensure this dominant position for our own country.''

I will show a chart in a few moments that shows we have 2 percent of the oil, we use 25 percent of the world's oil, and import almost two-thirds of what we use. We don't even come close to following the wise advice that he gave 51 years ago.

Now, four studies, and here they are. The Hirsch Report, February 2005. This is a big study done by SAIC, Science Applications International Corporation, a big prestigious international corporation, paid for by our Department of Energy.

Here is a second report paid for by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, paid for by the Army, done by the Corps: ''Energy Trends and Their Implications for U.S. Army Installations.'' It could have been U.S. or world, because our army is a microcosm of the U.S. and world.

A second Hirsch Report, ''Peaking of World Oil Production, Recent Forecasts.''

Then the third of these reports, which your government has asked for and paid for, as a matter of fact, this one I asked for as a senior member of the Science Committee, this is done by GAO. ''Crude Oil. Uncertainty About Future Oil Supply Makes It Important To Develop a Strategy for Addressing a Peak and Decline in Oil Production.'' Where have you heard anybody talking about this strategy? Where have you read about this strategy in the newspaper? This is a GAO report, February 2007.

The last of the studies. ''Hard Truths. Facing the Hard Truths About Energy. Comprehensive View to 2030 of Global Oil and Natural Gas,'' done by the National Petroleum Council.

I have quotes from all but the last of these. This is the newest one, and I will get some quotes to include. They are saying essentially the same thing as these others.

The next chart and the first few charts will be quotes from the Hirsch Report. I am going to spend a lot of time this evening going over the information that has been available to all of us, to our leaders, and I am going to keep asking the questions, how come it has been ignored?

The Hirsch Report: ''World oil peaking is going to happen. World production of conventional oil will reach a maximum and decline thereafter. That maximum is called the peak. A number of competent forecasters project peaking within a decade.'' This was several years ago. Others contend it will occur later.

Prediction of the peaking is extremely difficult. In fact, you only know it has peaked after you look back and say gee, it was the highest back then. No matter what we do, we can't get more. So you will know it has peaked only in retrospect when you look back to see that it has peaked.

Oil peaking presents a unique challenge. The world has never faced a problem like this. There is no precedent in history to guide you. There is nothing that has happened in the past which will help you through this. The world has never faced a problem like this. ''Without massive mitigation,'' more than a decade before the fact, the chart you saw a little earlier, remember, EIA, IEA, 3 years, flat plateau, looks like we peaked now. He says ''Without massive mitigation,'' more than a decade before the fact, ''the problem will be pervasive and will not be temporary. Previous energy transitions, wood-to-coal and coal-to-oil were gradual, and evolutionary oil peaking will be abrupt and revolutionary.''

The next chart, additional quotes from this report. ''The peaking of world oil production presents the U.S. and the world with an unprecedented risk-management problem. The world has never faced a problem like this. As peaking is approached, liquid fuel prices and price volatility will increase dramatically,'' $112 a barrel, ''and, without timely mitigation, the economic, social and political costs will be unprecedented. Food riots. People killed.''

Well, we will talk in just a few moments about the relationship between oil and food so that you will see why the crisis in energy is reflected in this crisis in food availability.

The next chart is another one from the Hirsch Report. ''We cannot conceive of any affordable government-sponsored crash program to accelerate normal replacement schedules.'' This is going to be a new world. We are going to have to think differently. We are going to have to use energy differently.

As far as fossil fuels are concerned, I think the Hirsch Report is exactly right. I am more sanguine about electricity. More nuclear, wind, solar, with appropriate storage for those two because they are intermittent, more hydro, true geothermal. We can in some parts of our country tap the molten core of the Earth, as they do for all of their energy in Iceland. I think we can make reasonably as much electricity as we ought to be using. I am not at all sure that is true about liquid fuels. The substitutes for oil are just few and difficult, as we will see.

The next chart is an interesting one from the Hirsch Study. Most of the world's experts believe that we have found about 2 trillion barrels of recoverable oil. There is a lot more out there, but it is locked in tiny little droplets in between grains of sand and shale and so forth, and with present technology we are likely not going to get it. And the cost of ever getting it may exceed its value when you get it, so it is maybe not practically recoverable.

Well, there are some people who believe that we are going to find as much more oil as all the reserves that we now know exist. And this is an interesting chart, because instead of talking about roughly 2 trillion barrels, they are talking about 3 trillion barrels of oil. Even if that is true, this is the same curve we saw before, remember, the stutter in the seventies with the worldwide recession, slower growth now, peaking now if we don't find any more. They say if we find as much more oil as all the oil we now know exists which is recoverable, it will extend the peak only to 2016. Wow. That is the power of compound growth.

After the discovery of nuclear energy, Albert Einstein was asked, ''Dr. Einstein, what will be the next big energy force in the world?'' He said, ''The most powerful force in the world is the power of compound interest, compound growth.'' Poorly understood. But that is what we are seeing here.

So if we found, which we are not going to, a little, vanishing small possibility that we are going to do that, but if we found as much more oil as all the oil which now is known to be recoverable, it would push the peak out only to 2016. And this curve shows what would happen if you use heroic techniques and enhanced oil recovery and get it out of the ground quicker. Then you fall off a cliff. You can't pump what you have not found.

The next chart is an interesting chart that shows the projections of our EIA, the Energy Information Administration. I don't have time to go into the strange use of statistics here, but somehow they went from a frequency mode to a probability mode, and they somehow have reached a conclusion that a 50 percent probability is more probable than a 95 percent probability.

So they were projecting that this green is where we were going with the discovery of oil. This is the 95 percent probability. This is the 5 percent probability. And, as one would expect, 95 percent is more probable than 50 percent. So the actual discoveries in red here have been following the 95 percent probability. So I would be very suspicious of projections using USGS data, which is where this comes from, of future oil production.

The next chart addresses this, and this is Jean Laherrere, one of the world's giants in this area. It says, ''The USGS estimate implies a five-fold increase in discovery and reserve addition, for which no evidence is presented. Such an improvement in performance is in fact utterly implausible, given the great technological achievements of the industry over the past 20 years, the worldwide search, and the deliberate efforts to find the largest remaining prospects.''

I think he is right. I think there is little probability that we are going to find huge amounts of additional oil. As a matter of fact, most of the world's experts believe we have probably found about 95 percent of all that we will ever find.

The next chart, and now we have a series of charts we will go through quickly from the Corps of Engineers study, this was the second one done. ''Oil is the most important form of energy in the world today. Historically, no other energy source equals oil's intrinsic qualities of extractability, transportability, versatility and cost.''

It is incredible, the energy density of oil and all the things that you can do with it. We live in a plastic world, a huge petrochemical industry. All of that starts with gas and oil, and some coal. Because once you have this long hydrocarbon chain, whether it is gas or coal or oil, the chemist can do with it about what he wishes.

□ 1815

The qualities that enabled oil to take over from coal as the front line energy source for the industrialized world in the middle of the 20th century are as relevant today as they were then.

The next chart is a really interesting one. This is a study done by very knowledgeable people. The current price of oil is in the $45 to $57 per barrel range and it's expected to stay in that range for several years. It is $112 a barrel today.

They all missed it, friends. M. King Hubbert was right. The United States peaked in 1970. I use 28 years that we have blown. That's because by 1980, 28 years ago, we absolutely knew, looking back that M. King Hubbert was right about 1970. We did peak in 1970.

In 1979 he made the prediction the world would be peaking and, let me ask you, if M. King Hubbert was right about the United States and if, in spite of drilling more oil wells than all the rest of the world put together, why should we not be concerned about his prediction that the world would be peaking in oil about now?

Don't you think that someone might have said, gee, M. King Hubbert was right about the United States? Isn't the United States a microcosm in the

world? Mightn't he be right about the world and shouldn't we be doing something about that?

Oil prices may go significantly higher. They have, indeed, and some have predicted prices ranging up to $180 a barrel in a few years. Goldman Sachs says that oil may very well be $150 to $200 a barrel by the end of this year.

The next chart, another one from the Corps of Engineers, petroleum expert Colin Campbell, Jean Laherrere, Bryan Fleay, Roger Blanchard, Richard Duncan, Walter Younquist and Albert Bartlett, no relative of mine, I wish I had some of his genes. He has given his speech on energy, I think, over 1,600 times.

Do a Google search for Albert Bartlett and energy. It will be the most 1-hour lecture you have ever listened to. Using various methodologies, all estimated that a peak in conventional oil production will occur in 2005. It's 2008, I think it probably has occurred.

The corporate executive officers of these several companies also published estimates of a peak in 2005. The next chart from the GAO, and now I move to the third of the GAO studies, this shows this large number of experts, of sources, and when they thought peak would occur. Now, some of them are pretty indecisive.

It could be now, it could be a long, long time from now. But notice that a great many of them thought they would be occurring about now. There is a general consensus, and this was published 2, 3 years ago, general consensus, that peaking would be occurring about now.

Another chart from GAO, and this kind of puts things in perspective, the little bar on the right shows the top 10 oil and gas companies on the basis of oil reserves. Who has the oil, and 98 percent of that is resident in countries where the oil is owned by the country. Luke Oil, which is kind of not owned by the government, represents only 2 percent.

The left, and this is the top 10 oil and gas companies on the basis of production. This is how much they have, this is how much they produced. The giants that you read about every day making $40 billion a year profits, and, by the way, it's not their fault. It's not because they are gouging you. It's not because they are schemers. It's simply they are simply happy recipients of a windfall that results when you want to use more oil than there is, and that drives the prices up.

I wouldn't be critical of the profits. I would really be critical if they didn't use the profits properly.

Our giants, ExxonMobil, Royal Dutch, BP, produce only 22 percent of the world's oil and 78 percent of the world's oil is produced by these country-owned companies.

The next chart shows essentially the same thing in another form. Here we see the OPEC oils, Saudi Arabia and OPEC and the remainder.

The next chart, now, I like this one because if a picture is worth 1,000 words, this is worth a few thousand words. This shows you the same thing as those last couple of charts.

But, boy, is this dramatic. This shows you what the world would look like if the size of the country was relative to how much oil it had. Look at Saudi Arabia. It dominates the landscape and, indeed, in the oil world, it dominates the landscape. It has 22 percent of all the known reserves of oil in the world.

Little Kuwait, Saddam Hussein thought it looked like a little corner province in Iraq. Iran, first, second, third, fourth, northern Africa, our neighbor to the south, Venezuela, Hugo Chavez, dwarfs us, what, three, four, five times as much oil?

Here we are, the United States, using a fourth of all the oil in the world, and we have 2 percent of the known reserves of oil in the world. The two countries from which we get our most oil, that changed a couple of days ago. By the way, it used to be Canada and then Mexico. I think it's Canada, Saudi Arabia and then Mexico now. That has because the second largest oil field in the world, the Cantarell oil field in Mexico, is in rapid decline, so they cannot produce at the rates they produced before.

Kind of keep this map in your mind. Look at China and India over there. Here they are. Look at Russia, huge compared to China and India. China and India together have no more oil than we, and they have, what, a third of the world's population, rapidly-growing demand for oil. In some parts of Beijing, bicycles are now banned. There isn't room for them on the roads because there are so many automobiles there.

The next chart simply shows some numbers that I have been using. Two percent of the world's reserves consume 25 percent of the world's oil, import almost two-thirds of what we use. Less than 5 percent of the world's population, one person in 22, produce 8 percent of the world's oil from only 2 percent.

What that means is we are pumping our wells four times faster than the average, right. So we now have only 2 percent of the reserves. We are pumping on down really fast, we are really good at that. We have more oil wells that I mentioned than all the rest of the world put together.

The next chart is a really interesting one. This shows what China has been doing. They are going around the world. You see the big symbols there for China going around the world and buying oil. They almost bought Unocal in our country. They are buying oil everywhere. In today's economy that doesn't make much sense because whoever has the dollars gets the oil. So why are they buying oil?

At the same time they are buying oil, they are also aggressively building the largest blue-water Navy in the world. Might the time come that the Chinese tell us, gee, I am sorry, the oil is ours? We have 1.3 billion people. They have got to have oil. I'm sorry, we can't share it. If they are going to make that a reality, they have to have a Navy big enough to control the world's shipping lanes.

Talking about geopolitical consequences, a statement by our Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice, ''We do have to do something about the energy problem.'' Boy, this was 2006, 2 years ago. What have we done about the energy problem in the last 2 years? We do have to do something about the energy problem.

I can tell that you nothing has really taken me aback more than the Secretary of State about the way of the politics of energy. I will use the word ''warping'' diplomacy around the world. We have simply got to do something about the warping now of diplomatic effort for the all-out rush for energy supply.

She recognized that 2 years ago this month. What have you seen your country doing about that in the last 2 years? Why this gross denial? I think the evidence is clear to a third grader.

The next chart, a very recent one, January 22 of this year, ''By the year 2100, the world's energy system will be radically different from today. The world's current predicament limits our maneuvering room. We are experiencing a step change in the rate of growth energy demand.''

Shell estimates that after 2015 easy-to-supply that easy access to oil and gas will no longer be able to keep up with demand. It may be sooner that than that, but that is not very far away. As a result, society has no choice but to add other sources of energy.

We have only a few minutes remaining. Let's put the next the chart up. This chart addresses some of those other sources of energy.

I will tell you that we are very much like the young people whose grandparents have died and left them a big inheritance. They now have established a lavish lifestyle where 85 percent of all the money they spend comes from their grandparents' inheritance, and only 15 percent of that money are they earning. And they look at how old they are, and the size of the inheritance, and it's going to run out long before they retire.

Obviously, they have got to do something. They either have to earn more or spend less. That's precisely where we are with energy. Eighty-five percent of the energy that we are using, coal, petroleum and natural gas, comes from fossil fuels, the grandparents' inheritance. It's finite, it will run out.

Only 15 percent of that is from other sources, generally referred to as renewable sources. A bit more than half of that comes from nuclear. We produce 8 percent of our total energy from nuclear, that's 20 percent of our electricity.

We have the largest nuclear electricity production in the world, but not

the biggest percentage. France produces about 75, 80 percent of their electricity from nuclear.

Then the 7 percent, now this is 2000, things have changed a little since then. Solar, 1 percent; wind, 1 percent, that's the .07 percent, so it has increased four-fold, 2.8 percent, big deal, .28 percent, ¼ of 1 percent? I am a big fan of nuclear.

I have an off-grid home, and I use solar panels, I use wind machines. I am a big fan of wind and solar. But they are now tiny contributors to our total energy supply.

Wood, that's not the mountain family, that's the paper industry and the timber industry wisely using a waste product. Waste, that looks huge, and it's not a bad idea to turn your waste into electricity. You can do that. We have a great plant up here in northern Montgomery County.

But that waste stream is not a solution to our problem, because what that waste stream represents, just go to the county dump and look at it. What that waste stream represents is a profligate use of fossil fuels. In a fossil fuel deficient world it's not going to be there. It's an expedient for the moment. It doesn't even come close to offering a rational solution to our problem.

Conventional hydro, we probably peaked out in conventional hydro. We can do a lot of microhydro. There are some really good microturbines now.

Alcohol, let me come back now, I only have a couple of minutes remaining. I want to make the tie between our food problems and the gas prices.

We have a program of converting corn to ethanol. The National Academy of Sciences have said that if we used all of our corn for ethanol, all of it, and discounted for fossil fuel input, it would displace 2.4 percent of our gasoline. They said that if you tuned up your car and put air in the tires, you would save as much.

Now, corn doubled in price because we were doing that. Farmers diverted land from soybeans and wheat to corn. So now we have doubled the price of corn, roughly doubled the price of soybeans. Since these commodities moved together, the price of rice has doubled.

Now we have global food riots turned deadly. What one U.N. official said was what we did innocently, we just hadn't thought it through, that what we did was a crime against humanity.

Our trifling contribution to displacing oil has doubled the price of corn, nearly doubled the price of soybeans and rice. There are people who spend 50 to 60 percent of their income on food. If the food price doubles, they are spending 100 percent of their income on food. No wonder they are rioting.

Well, this was an unintended consequence. The last chart, we have only a couple of minutes remaining, and I just want to say that I find this challenge really exhilarating. There is no exhilaration like the exhilaration of meeting and overcoming a big challenge.

We are the most creative innovative society in the world. We are up to this with proper leadership. I am looking for that leadership. We are up to this.

We need a program that has a total commitment of World War II. I lived through that war. I know what it was. Everybody raised a victory garden. No cars were made in 1943, 1944 and 1945. We needed the technology focus of putting a man on the moon, and we needed the urgency of the Manhattan project.

□ 1830

We can lead the world in moving from fossil fuel dependency to renewables. We are creative and innovative. We need leadership to do this.

I want to show you that we can do it. We can live very happily on less. On this chart, here we are, using more energy than anybody else in the world. And there are 24 countries using considerably less energy than we who feel better. This is how good you feel about your station in life, they feel better about their station in life than we.

The very last chart, in the very few seconds remaining, this shows you that Californians use only about 65 percent as much electricity as the rest of us in the United States. Challenge any Californian to admit that they live less well than we live.

We don't have to use the amounts of energy that we are using today to be comfortable, to feel good about life.

I really feel challenged by this. We are the most creative, innovative society in the world. We can do this. We can once again become a manufacturing country. We can lead the world in this.

Madam Speaker, I am 82 years old on my next birthday; and there is nothing in my life, and I have seen more of life than every other Member of this Congress except RALPH HALL who is 3 years older than I, and I have seen nothing in my life that is so challenging, so exhilarating as this.

We are up to this. We need the leadership; where is it?

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2739. An act to authorize certain programs and activities in the Department of the Interior, the Forest Service, and the Department of Energy, to implement further the Act approving the Covenant to Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America, to amend the Compact of Free Association Amendments Act of 2003, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BISHOP of New York (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after 11 a.m. on account of business in district.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today after 2 p.m. on account of a family medical emergency.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEFAZIO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PRICE of Georgia) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, April 17.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, April 17.

Mr. BROUN of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, for 5 minutes, today.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reports that on April 7, 2008, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill.

H.R. 1593. To reauthorize the grant program for reentry of offenders into the community in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, to improve reentry planning and implementation, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 14, 2008, at 12:30 p.m., for morning-hour debate.

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 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 of which I am about to enter. So held 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:

JACKIE SPEIER, California, Twelfth.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Neil Abercrombie, Gary L. Ackerman, Robert B. Aderholt, W. Todd Akin, Rodney Alexander, Thomas H. Allen, Jason Altmire, Robert E. Andrews, Michael A. Arcuri, Joe Baca, Michele Bachmann, Spencer Bachus, Brian Baird, Richard H. Baker, Tammy Baldwin, J. Gresham Barrett, John Barrow, Roscoe G. Bartlett, Joe Barton, Melissa L. Bean, Xavier Becerra, Shelley Berkley, Howard L. Berman, Marion Berry, Judy Biggert, Brian P. Bilbray, Gus M. Bilirakis, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Timothy H. Bishop, Marsha Blackburn, Earl Blumenauer, Roy Blunt, John A. Boehner, Jo Bonner, Mary Bono, John Boozman, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Dan Boren, Leonard L. Boswell, Rick Boucher, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Allen Boyd, Nancy E. Boyda, Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Bruce L. Braley, Paul C. Broun, Corrine Brown, Henry E. Brown, Jr., Ginny Brown-Waite, Vern Buchanan, Michael C. Burgess, Dan Burton, G. K. Butterfield, Steve Buyer, Ken Calvert, Dave Camp, John Campbell, Chris Cannon, Eric Cantor, Shelley Moore Capito, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Dennis A. Cardoza, Russ Carnahan, Christopher P. Carney, André Carson, Julia Carson, John R. Carter, Michael N. Castle, Kathy Castor, Steve Chabot, Ben Chandler, Donna M. Christensen, Yvette D. Clarke, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Howard Coble, Steve Cohen, Tom Cole, K. Michael Conaway, John Conyers, Jr., Jim Cooper, Jim Costa, Jerry F. Costello, Joe Courtney, Robert E. (Bud) Cramer, Jr., Ander Crenshaw, Joseph Crowley, Barbara Cubin, Henry Cuellar, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Artur Davis, Danny K. Davis, David Davis, Geoff Davis, Jo Ann Davis, Lincoln Davis, Susan A. Davis, Tom Davis, Nathan Deal, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, William D. Delahunt, Rosa L. DeLauro, Charles W. Dent, Lincoln Diaz-Balart, Mario Diaz-Balart, Norman D. Dicks, John D. Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Joe Donnelly, John T. Doolittle, Michael F. Doyle, Thelma D. Drake, David Dreier, John J. Duncan, Jr., Chet Edwards, Vernon J. Ehlers, Keith Ellison, Brad Ellsworth, Rahm Emanuel, Jo Ann Emerson, Eliot L. Engel, Phil English, Anna G. Eshoo, Bob Etheridge, Terry Everett, Eni F. H. Faleomavaega, Mary Fallin, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Tom Feeney, Mike Ferguson, Bob Filner, Jeff Flake, J. Randy Forbes, Jeff Fortenberry, Luis G. Fortuño, Vito Fossella, Bill Foster, Virginia Foxx, Barney Frank, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Elton Gallegly, Scott Garrett, Jim Gerlach, Gabrielle Giffords, Wayne T. Gilchrest, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Paul E. Gillmor, Phil Gingrey, Louie Gohmert, Charles A. Gonzalez, Virgil H. Goode, Jr., Bob Goodlatte, Bart Gordon, Kay Granger, Sam Graves, Al Green, Gene Green, Raúl M. Grijalva, Luis V. Gutierrez, John J. Hall, Ralph M. Hall, Phil Hare, Jane Harman, J. Dennis Hastert, Alcee L. Hastings, Doc Hastings, Robin Hayes, Dean Heller, Jeb Hensarling, Wally Herger, Stephanie Herseth, Brian Higgins, Baron P. Hill, Maurice D. Hinchey, Ruben Hinojosa, Mazie K. Hirono, David L. Hobson, Paul W. Hodes, Peter Hoekstra, Tim Holden, Rush D. Holt, Michael M. Honda, Darlene Hooley, Steny H. Hoyer, Kenny C. Hulshof, Duncan Hunter, Bob Inglis, Jay Inslee, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Jesse L. Jackson, Jr., Sheila Jackson-Lee, William J. Jefferson, Bobby Jindal, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry C. ''Hank'' Johnson, Jr., Sam Johnson, Timothy V. Johnson, Stephanie Tubbs Jones, Walter B. Jones, Jim Jordan, Steve Kagen, Paul E. Kanjorski, Marcy Kaptur, Ric Keller, Patrick J. Kennedy, Dale E. Kildee, Carolyn C. Kilpatrick, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Steve King, Jack Kingston, Mark Steven Kirk, Ron Klein, John Kline, Joe Knollenberg, John R. ''Randy'' Kuhl, Jr., Ray LaHood, Doug Lamborn, Nick Lampson, James R. Langevin, Tom Lantos, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Tom Latham, Steven C. LaTourette, Robert E. Latta, Barbara Lee, Sander M. Levin, Jerry Lewis, John Lewis, Ron Lewis, John Linder, Daniel Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, David Loebsack, Zoe Lofgren, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Daniel E. Lungren, Stephen F. Lynch, Carolyn McCarthy, Kevin McCarthy, Michael T. McCaul, Betty McCollum, Thaddeus G. McCotter, Jim McCrery, James P. McGovern, Patrick T. McHenry, John M. McHugh, Mike McIntyre, Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Jerry McNerney, Michael R. McNulty, Connie Mack, Tim Mahoney, Carolyn B. Maloney, Donald A. Manzullo, Kenny Marchant, Edward J. Markey, Jim Marshall, Jim Matheson, Doris O. Matsui, Martin T. Meehan, Kendrick B. Meek, Gregory W. Meeks, Charlie Melancon, John L. Mica, Michael H. Michaud, Juanita Millender-McDonald, Brad Miller, Candice S. Miller, Gary G. Miller, Jeff Miller, Harry E. Mitchell, Alan B. Mollohan, Dennis Moore, Gwen Moore, James P. Moran, Jerry Moran, Christopher S. Murphy, Patrick J. Murphy, Tim Murphy, John P. Murtha, Marilyn N. Musgrave, Sue Wilkins Myrick, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Randy Neugebauer, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Charlie Norwood, Devin Nunes, James L. Oberstar, David R. Obey, John W. Olver, Solomon P. Ortiz, Frank Pallone, Jr., Bill Pascrell, Jr., Ed Pastor, Ron Paul, Donald M. Payne, Stevan Pearce, Nancy Pelosi, Mike Pence, Ed Perlmutter, Collin C. Peterson, John E. Peterson, Thomas E. Petri, Charles W. ''Chip'' Pickering, Joseph R. Pitts, Todd Russell Platts, Ted Poe, Earl Pomeroy, Jon C. Porter, David E. Price, Tom Price, Deborah Pryce, Adam H. Putnam, George Radanovich, Nick J. Rahall II, Jim Ramstad, Charles B. Rangel, Ralph Regula, Dennis R. Rehberg, David G. Reichert, Rick Renzi, Silvestre Reyes, Thomas M. Reynolds, Laura Richardson, Ciro D. Rodriguez, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers, Mike Rogers, Dana Rohrabacher, Peter J. Roskam, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Mike Ross, Steven R. Rothman, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward R. Royce, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush, Paul Ryan, Tim Ryan, John T. Salazar, Bill Sali, Linda T. Sánchez, Loretta Sanchez, John P. Sarbanes, Jim Saxton, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Jean Schmidt, Allyson Y. Schwartz, David Scott, Robert C. ''Bobby'' Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, Joe Sestak, John B. Shadegg, Christopher Shays, Carol Shea-Porter, Brad Sherman, John Shimkus, Heath Shuler, Bill Shuster, Michael K. Simpson, Albio Sires, Ike Skelton, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Adrian Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Lamar Smith, Vic Snyder, Hilda L. Solis, Mark E. Souder, Zachary T. Space, John M. Spratt, Jr., Jackie Speier, Cliff Stearns, Bart Stupak, John Sullivan, Betty Sutton, Thomas G. Tancredo, John S. Tanner, Ellen O. Tauscher, Gene Taylor, Lee Terry, Bennie G. Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, Todd Tiahrt, Patrick J. Tiberi, John F. Tierney, Edolphus Towns, Niki Tsongas, Michael R. Turner, Mark Udall, Tom Udall, Fred Upton, Chris Van Hollen, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Tim Walberg, Greg Walden, James T. Walsh, Timothy J. Walz, Zach Wamp, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Maxine Waters, Diane E. Watson, Melvin L. Watt, Henry A. Waxman, Anthony D. Weiner, Peter Welch, Dave Weldon, Jerry Weller, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Robert Wexler, Ed Whitfield, Roger F. Wicker, Charles A. Wilson, Heather Wilson, Joe Wilson, Robert J. Wittman, Frank R. Wolf, Lynn C. Woolsey, David Wu, Albert Russell Wynn, John A. Yarmuth, C. W. Bill Young, Don Young.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5983. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the Army, Case Number 05-05, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

5984. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5985. A letter from the General Deputy Assistant Secretary for Community Planning and Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's second annual Homeless Assessment Report; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5986. A letter from the Director, Office of Thrift Supervision, Department of Treasury, transmitting a letter on the details of the Office's 2008 compensation plan, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 18336; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5987. A letter from the Chairman and President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a report on transactions involving U.S. exports to Turkey pursuant to Section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5988. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Thirtieth Annual Report to Congress consistent with Section 815 of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1692m; to the Committee on Financial Services.

5989. A letter from the Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's proposal to accept a 160-acre donation from the Wilderness Land Trust, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1131-1136; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5990. A letter from the Certification Officer, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tribal Energy Resource Agreements under the Indian Tribal Energy Development and Self-

Determination Act (RIN: 1076-AE80) received March 13, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5991. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the 2007 report on the Apportionment of Membership on the Regional Fishery Management Councils pursuant to section 302(b) of the Magnuson Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

5992. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the third annual report to Congress on victims' rights, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 3771; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5993. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting notification that the Commission recently appointed members to the Texas Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5994. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting notification that the Commission recently appointed members to the Vermont Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5995. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting notification that the Commission recently appointed members to the Rhode Island Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5996. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting notification that the Commission recently appointed members to the New Jersey Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5997. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting notification that the Commission recently appointed members to the Ohio Advisory Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5998. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Justice Assistance, Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report of the Office of Justice Programs' Bureau of Justice Assistance for Fiscal Year 2005, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3712(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5999. A letter from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting a copy of the proposed ''Federal Courts Jurisdiction and Venue Clarification Act of 2008''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6000. A letter from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting a copy of two court improvement proposals adopted in September 2007; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6001. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 707 Airplanes and Model 720 and 720B Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28828; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-010-AD; Amendment 39-15258; AD 2007-23-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6002. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Learjet Model 45 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-25174; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-007-AD; Amendment 39-15328; AD 2008-01-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6003. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model ERJ 170 and ERJ 190 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0082; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-219-AD; Amendment 39-15332; AD 2008-02-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6004. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Model BAE 146 and Avro 146-RJ Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0044; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-126-AD; Amendment 39-15320; AD 2007-26-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6005. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; EMBRAER Model EMB-135BJ Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0129; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-099-AD; Amendment 39-15331; AD 2008-02-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6006. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0171; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-220-AD; Amendment 39-15330; AD 2008-01-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6007. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; EMBRAER Model EMB-120, -120ER, -120FC, -120QC, and -120RT Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28855; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-098-AD; Amendment 39-15323; AD 2007-26-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6008. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Limited Model PC-12, PC-12/45, and PC-12/47 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0116 Directorate Identifier 2007-CE-082-AD; Amendment 39-15333; AD 2008-02-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6009. A letter from the Chairman, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — DECISION SIMPLIFIED STANDARDS FOR RAIL RATE CASES [STB Ex Parte No. 646 (Sub-No. 1)] received March 27, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6010. A letter from the Chairman, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — DECISION METHODOLOGY TO BE EMPLOYED IN DETERMINING THE RAILROAD INDUSTRY'S COST OF CAPITAL [STB Ex Parte No. 664] received March 27, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6011. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation Seaway Regulations and Rules: Periodic Update, Various Categories [Docket No. SLSDC 2007-0005] (RIN: 2135-AA27) received February 21, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6012. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eclipse Aviation Corporation Model EA500 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-29316; Directorate Identifier 2007-CE-078-AD; Amendment 39-15334; AD 2008-02-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6013. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; GARMIN International GSM 85 Servo Gearbox Units [Docket No. FAA-2007-28730; Directorate Identifier 2007-CE-063-AD; Amendment 39-15336; AD 2008-02-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6014. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 777-200 and -300 Series Airplanes Equipped with Rolls-Royce RB211-TRENT 800 Series Engines [Docket No. FAA-2006-25609; Directorate Identifier 2005-NM-263-AD; Amendment 39-15335; AD 2008-02-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6015. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 Airplanes; and Model A300 B4-600, B4-600R, and F4-600R Series Airplanes, and Model C4-605R Variant F Airplanes (Collectively Called A300-600 Series Airplanes) [Docket No. FAA-2007-27926; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-050-AD; Amendment 39-15316; AD 2007-26-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6016. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CF6-50, -80A1/A3, and -80C2A Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. FAA-2007-0053; Directorate Identifier 98-ANE-54-AD; Amendment 39-15347; AD 2008-02-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6017. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767-200 and 767-300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28375; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-015-AD; Amendment 39-15346; AD 2008-02-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6018. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319 and A320 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-29170; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-075-AD; Amendment 39-15345; AD 2008-02-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6019. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company 172 and 182 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-29317; Directorate Identifier 2007-CE-079-AD; Amendment 39-15348; AD 2008-02-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6020. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting

the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model 717-200 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-29329; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-205-AD; Amendment 39-15342; AD 2008-02-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6021. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 727 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28884; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-116-AD; Amendment 39-15343; AD 2008-02-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6022. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-400, -400D, and -400F Series Airplanes; Boeing Model 757 Airplanes; and Boeing Model 767 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28973; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-118-AD; Amendment 39-15344; AD 2008-02-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 3, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6023. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Aircraft Industries, a.s. (Type Certificate No. G24EU formerly held by LETECKE ZAVODY a.s. and LET Aeronautical Works) Model L-13 Blanik Gliders [Docket No. FAA-2007-28980 Directorate Identifier 2007-CE-071-AD; Amendment 39-15282; AD 2007-25-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6024. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-11, MD-11F, DC-10-30 and DC-10-30F (KC-10A and KDC-10), DC-10-40, DC-10-40F, and MD-10-30F Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28351; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-074-AD; Amendment 39-15192; AD 2007-19-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6025. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0269; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-158-AD; Amendment 39-15287; AD 2007-25-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6026. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F27 Mark 050 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0268; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-129-AD; Amendment 39-15286; AD 2007-25-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6027. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Augusta S.p.A. Model AB139 and AW139 Helicopters [Docket No. FAA-2007-0285; Directorate Identifier 2007-SW-15-AD; Amendment 39-15296; AD 2007-25-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6028. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-400 and 747-400D Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0301; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-069-AD; Amendment 39-15300; AD 2007-25-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6029. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Limited Model 206A and 206B Helicopters [Docket No. FAA-2007-28690; Directorate Identifier 2006-SW-21-AD; Amendment 39-15289; AD 2007-25-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6030. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model SA-365 N1, AS-365N2, AS 365 N3, SA-366G1, EC 155B, and EC155B1 Helicopters [Docket No. FAA-2007-28448; Directorate Identifier 2006-SW-24-AD; Amendment 39-15290; AD 2007-25-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6031. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-400 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0302; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-161-AD; Amendment 39-15301; AD 2007-25-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6032. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 Series Airplanes and Model A300-600 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-27257; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-131-AD; Amendment 39-15297; AD 2007-25-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6033. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28996; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-217-AD; Amendment 39-15283; AD 2007-25-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6034. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-600, -700, -700C, -800, and -900 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-29031; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-130-AD; Amendment 39-15284; AD 2007-25-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6035. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 Series Airplanes, Model A300-600 Series Airplanes, and Model A310 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-27982; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-009-AD; Amendment 39-15288; AD 2007-25-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6036. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-29117; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-114-AD; Amendment 39-15291; AD 2007-25-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6037. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Model Mystere-Falcom 50, Mystere-Falcom 900, Falcon 900EX, Falcom 2000, and Falcome 2000EX Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-29175; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-134-AD; Amendment 39-15292; AD 2007-25-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6038. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F.28 Mark 0070 and 0100 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-29256; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-137-AD; Amendment 39-15293; AD 2007-25-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6039. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A318, A319, A320, and A321 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-29249; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-112-AD; Amendment 39-15294; AD 2007-25-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6040. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767-300F Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28943; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-011-AD; Amendment 39-15295; AD 2007-25-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6041. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-81 (MD-81) and DC-9-82 (MD-82) Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-29226; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-256-AD; Amendment 39-15298; AD 2007-25-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6042. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-100, 747-100B, 747-100B SUD, 747-200B, 747-200C, 747-200F, 747-300, 747SR, and 747SP Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28620; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-090-AD; Amendment 39-15299; AD 2007-25-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6043. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-10-10, DC-10-10F, DC-10-15, DC-10-30 and DC-10-30F (KC-10A and KDC-10) Airplanes; Model DC-10-40 and DC-10-40F Airplanes; and Model MD-11 and MD-11F Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2005-21470; Directorate Identifier 2003-NM-45-AD; Amendment 39-15302; AD 2007-25-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received April 1, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6044. A letter from the Board of Trustees, Federal Old-Age And Survivors Insurance And Federal Disability Insurance Trust Funds, transmitting the 2008 Annual Report

of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Funds, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 401(c)(2), 1395i(b)(2), and 1395t(b)(2); (H. Doc. No. 100–104); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered tot he Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 2634. A bill to provide for greater responsibility in lending and expanded cancellation of debts owed to the United States and the international financial institutions by low-income countries, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110–575). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GORDON: Committee on Science and Technology. H.R. 5161. A bill to provide for the establishment of Green Transportation Infrastructure Research and Technology Transfer Centers, and for other purpose; with an amendment (Rept. 110–576 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1777. A bill to amend the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 to make permanent the favorable treatment of need-based educational aid under the antitrust laws (Rept. 110–577). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House of the State of the Union.

Mr. WAXMAN: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 4881. A bill to prohibit the awarding of a contract or grant in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold unless the prospective contractor or grantee certifies in writing to the agency awarding the contract or grant that the contractor or grantee has no seriously delinquent tax debts, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110–578). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 3965. A bill to extend the Mark-to-Market program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 110–579). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KIND (for himself, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. COOPER, Mr. GILCHREST, Ms. BEAN, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota):

H.R. 5755. A bill to establish the Bipartisan Earmark Reform Commission; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, 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. KIND (for himself and Mr. GILCHREST):

H.R. 5756. A bill to reauthorize the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. DEAL of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. GINGREY):

H.R. 5757. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require asset verification through access to information held by financial institutions, to reduce fraud and abuse in State Medicaid programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 5758. A bill to prohibit authorized lenders of home equity conversion mortgages from requiring seniors to purchase an annuity with the proceeds of a reverse mortgage, and to provide other consumer protections to reverse mortgage borrowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BROUN of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. AKIN, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GOODE, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. LINDER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. WAMP, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. COBLE, Ms. FOXX, Mr. POE, and Mrs. MYRICK):

H.R. 5759. A bill to amend title 4, United States Code, to declare English as the national language of the Government of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida (for herself, Mr. POE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. LAMPSON):

H.R. 5760. A bill to reauthorize the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASTLE (for himself and Mr. DENT):

H.R. 5761. A bill to withhold Federal financial assistance from each country that denies or unreasonably delays the acceptance of nationals of such country who have been ordered removed from the United States and to prohibit the issuance of visas to nationals of such country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Rules, 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. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. FARR, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. WELCH of Vermont):

H.R. 5762. A bill to prohibit the use of non-ambulatory livestock for human food and to require the Secretary of Agriculture to publish the names of retailers and school districts that have purchased meat, poultry, or egg products subject to voluntary recall; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota):

H.R. 5763. A bill to temporarily delay application of proposed changes to the Departmental Appeals Board within the Department of Health and Human Services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and Labor, 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. EMANUEL (for himself and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H.R. 5764. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a continuous levy on payments to Medicaid providers and suppliers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. TANNER, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, and Mr. LINDER):

H.R. 5765. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to cover remote patient management services for certain chronic health conditions under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ETHERIDGE (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. COHEN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. HARE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 5766. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish in the Department of Homeland Security the Office of National School Preparedness and Response, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself and Mr. PAUL):

H.R. 5767. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System from proposing, prescribing, or implementing any regulation under subchapter IV of chapter 53 of title 31, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 5768. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to provide the Commodity Futures Trading Commission authority over off-exchange retail foreign currency transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Financial 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. GINGREY (for himself, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. AKIN, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. FOXX, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LINDER, Mr. MCCOTTER, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 5769. A bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to revise the Telemarketing Sales Rule to explicitly prohibit the sending of a text message containing an unsolicited advertisement to a cellular telephone number listed on the national do-not-call registry; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HALL of New York (for himself, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 5770. A bill to provide for a study by the National Academy of Sciences of potential impacts of climate change on water resources and water quality; to the Committee on Science and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. MCCAUL of Texas (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. ISSA, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KIRK, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. LATTA, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. SALI, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. FOXX, Mr. POE, and Mr. MACK):

H.R. 5771. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds for a project or program named for an individual then serving as a Member, Delegate, Resident Commissioner, or Senator of the United States Congress; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut (for himself and Mrs. BIGGERT):

H.R. 5772. A bill to amend section 811 of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act to improve the program under such section for supportive housing for persons with disabilities; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself and Mr. CLAY):

H.R. 5773. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a long-term ground lease for the operation and maintenance of Rock Creek, Langston, and East Potomac as golf courses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California (for herself, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. WELCH of Vermont):

H.R. 5774. A bill to provide effective employment, training, and career and technical education programs and to address barriers that result from family responsibilities, and to encourage and support individuals to enter nontraditional occupational fields; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. KING of Iowa, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. ISSA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. FLAKE):

H.R. 5775. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act to provide for specified civil penalties for violations of that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SHADEGG (for himself, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. GOHMERT, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. AKIN, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. HOEKSTRA):

H.R. 5776. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income certain distributions from qualified retirement plans used for mortgage payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TANCREDO:

H.R. 5777. A bill to impose certain restrictions on trade with and investment in the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, the Judiciary, and Financial 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. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia):

H.R. 5778. A bill to preserve the independence of the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. WEXLER:

H.R. 5779. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a tax on the amount of wages in excess of the contribution and benefit base, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico (for herself, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico):

H.R. 5780. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of clinical pharmacist practitioner services under part B of the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H. Res. 1097. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the month of April 2008, as National Child Abuse Prevention Month to provide attention to the tragic circumstances that face some of our Nation's children on a daily basis and to underscore our commitment to preventing child abuse and neglect so that all children can live in safety and security; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FILNER (for himself and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H. Res. 1098. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the Year of the American Veteran; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas):

H. Res. 1099. A resolution honoring the life of Arbella Perkins Ewings; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. LOEBSACK (for himself, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. KING of Iowa):

H. Res. 1100. A resolution congratulating the University of Iowa Hawkeyes Wrestling Team on Winning the 2008 NCAA Division I National Wrestling Championships; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 1101. A resolution honoring and commending The George Washington University in Washington, D.C., for hosting the 2008 Science Olympiad National Tournament; 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. 81: Mr. SALI.

H.R. 303: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 333: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 406: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. GINGREY, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. PICKERING.

H.R. 552: Mr. NADLER, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 616: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 618: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 768: Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 769: Mr. LINDER.

H.R. 821: Mr. WU.

H.R. 1108: Mr. YARMUTH and Mr. DREIER.

H.R. 1117: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 1223: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 1232: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1256: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 1343: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 1363: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 1395: Mr. LAMPSON.

H.R. 1440: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1552: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1584: Mr. HARE.

H.R. 1589: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, and Ms. HARMAN.

H.R. 1609: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 1610: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.

H.R. 1621: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 1643: Mr. RAMSTAD and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.

H.R. 1738: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas.

H.R. 1767: Mr. CUELLAR and Mr. KIRK.

H.R. 1829: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 1927: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 2091: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 2138: Mr. KENNEDY and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 2221: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 2280: Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 2352: Ms. HARMAN.

H.R. 2353: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 2357: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 2370: Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. HARE.

H.R. 2593: Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 2609: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 2634: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 2702: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 2712: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 2734: Mr. UPTON, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. LATTA, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H.R. 2860: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 2864: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 2897: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 2923: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 2941: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 3036: Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 3047: Mr. KUHL of New York.

H.R. 3054: Ms. LEE and Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 3212: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 3229: Mr. BACA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. REYES, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 3232: Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 3234: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. AKIN, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3363: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 3368: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 3391: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H.R. 3404: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
H.R. 3700: Mr. KENNEDY.
H.R. 3769: Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 3817: Mr. LATHAM.
H.R. 3886: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3934: Mr. MEEK of Florida and Ms. CLARKE.
H.R. 3968: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 4105: Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 4133: Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 4138: Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 4296: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
H.R. 4310: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 4318: Mr. BOOZMAN.
H.R. 4335: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 4449: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. DELAHUNT.
H.R. 4460: Mr. STEARNS.
H.R. 4464: Mr. MCCARTHY of California.
H.R. 4611: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 4688: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 4833: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 4883: Ms. SUTTON, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. HALL of New York, Ms. LEE, and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.
H.R. 4884: Ms. SUTTON, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. HALL of New York, Ms. LEE, and Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.
H.R. 4926: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 4927: Mr. SALAZAR and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 4930: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 5057: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 5058: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 5131: Mr. CARTER, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, and Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 5180: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 5233: Mr. PITTS.
H.R. 5268: Mr. SPACE, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 5315: Mr. PASTOR.
H.R. 5405: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
H.R. 5426: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 5440: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. CONAWAY.
H.R. 5447: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 5448: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. COHEN, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. HILL, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN and Mr. HAYS.
H.R. 5450: Mr. CARNEY and Mr. PORTER.
H.R. 5477: Mr. NUNES, Mr. FILNER, Mr. DREIER, Mr. STARK, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 5488: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 5498: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 5515: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 5519: Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 5524: Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.
H.R. 5534: Ms. BERKLEY and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 5540: Mrs. DRAKE.
H.R. 5542: Mr. SHADEGG.
H.R. 5545: Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H.R. 5546: Mr. SHULER and Mr. WHITFIELD. of Kentucky.
H.R. 5567: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 5590: Mr. MCNULTY.
H.R. 5595: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. BERRY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. TAYLOR, Ms. HARMAN, and Mr. WELCH of Vermont.
H.R. 5602: Ms. KILPATRICK.
H.R. 5604: Mr. ARCURI and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
H.R. 5609: Mr. HARE.
H.R. 5611: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 5613: Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BARROW, Mr. HODES, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 5636: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 5641: Mr. KIRK.
H.R. 5643: Mr. PAUL and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 5656: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. TERRY, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BLUNT.
H.R. 5668: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 5674: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
H.R. 5684: Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 5686: Mr. WOLF, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 5696: Mrs. CUBIN.
H.R. 5697: Ms. SUTTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. CLARKE, and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 5711: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 5715: Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee, Mr. KELLER, Mr. OLVER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. FORTUÑO, and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 5723: Mr. SESTAK, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GORDON, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 5739: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 5740: Mr. KIRK, Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ISRAEL, and Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 5750: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 5752: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. STEARNS.
H. Con. Res. 163: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. TANCREDO.
H. Con. Res. 315: Mr. SHAYS, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. MICA.
H. Con. Res. 317: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. WATERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. WATSON, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. SOUDER, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H. Con. Res. 318: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, and Mr. JEFFERSON.
H. Con. Res. 322: Mr. GORDON, Ms. FOXX, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WYNN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HODES, Mr. KIRK, Mr. COBLE, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SUTTON, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. ANDREWS.
H. Res. 102: Mr. WALBERG.
H. Res. 111: Mr. SALI.
H. Res. 248: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H. Res. 373: Ms. SOLIS.
H. Res. 424: Mr. SPACE.
H. Res. 834: Mr. HODES.
H. Res. 858: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. CAMP of Michigan.
H.. Res. 896: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H. Res. 925: Mr. SOUDER.
H. Res. 939: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H. Res. 987: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. ARCURI, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. WU, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CARNEY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. BERRY, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. MCNULTY.
H. Res. 1008: Mr. CALVERT.
H. Res. 1011: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. CLARKE, and Mr. DELAHUNT.
H. Res. 1026: Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 1029: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. SHULER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. DREIER, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. COSTA.
H. Res. 1052: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H. Res. 1058: Mr. PAUL.
H. Res. 1063: Ms. BERKLEY.
H. Res. 1064: Mr. SOUDER.
H. Res. 1073: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.
H. Res. 1076: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. SALI, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. DREIER.
H. Res. 1079: Mr. BACA, Ms. CLARKE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H. Res. 1086: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FILNER, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. UPTON, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. STARK.
H. Res. 1091: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. REGULA, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. POE, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HAYES, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. HELLER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CARTER, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. RENZI, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BACA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. UPTON, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. ELLSWORTH, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. WU, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SHULER, Mr. KELLER, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 6 by Mr. BOUSTANY, Jr. on House Resolution 1025: Ralph M. Hall, Tom Davis, John Kline, Wally Herger, Phil English, Jim McCrery, and Todd Russell Platts.

Petition 5 by Mrs. DRAKE on the bill H.R. 4088: Mike Rogers.

The following Member's name was withdrawn from the following discharge petition:

Petition 6 by Mr. BOUSTANY, Jr. on House Resolution 1025: James T. Walsh.