

can reduce their chances of developing the disease, and that's why I have introduced House Resolution 369, the Osteoporosis Awareness and Prevention Act. Among the resolution's goals is to bring attention to the importance of building strong bones during childhood and adolescence. Up to 90 percent of peak bone mass or optimum bone strength is acquired by age 18 in girls and age 20 in boys, which makes childhood and adolescence the best time to invest in your bones.

This resolution also addresses the importance of eating a balanced diet rich in calcium and vitamin D, participating in weight-bearing exercises and choosing a lifestyle without smoking or alcohol consumption. Each year, as Chairman SCHAKOWSKY has already stated, there are more than 2 million osteoporotic fractures costing about \$19 billion a year.

I strongly urge my fellow citizens to visit their doctors, get screened for osteoporosis; and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and other pieces of legislation that are providing for bone density screening. Rather than cutting this important part of preventative care, we ought to be enhancing it, and I urge support of this resolution and others that affect the health and well-being of our fellow Americans.

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the support from the other side of the aisle, and I certainly appreciate the leadership of Congresswoman BERKLEY.

I, myself, a while ago was diagnosed with a pre-osteoporosis condition, and it's rewarding to find that if you take the medication and you do weight lifting kind of exercises that you can actually reverse the process. Now my screenings indicate that I no longer have those symptoms, although I continue to take the medication and do the exercises. So people should not see it as totally irreversible or untreatable in any way. But most of all, I think the emphasis on prevention is so very important.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 369, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, 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 of rule XX and the

Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

THE JUSTICE SYSTEM SHOULD FREE BORDER AGENTS IGNACIO RAMOS AND JOSE COMPEAN

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

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, border agents Ignacio Ramos and Jose Compean were the victims of an overzealous and media-hungry Federal prosecutor that seemed to be a political puppet of the Mexican government rather than seeking American justice.

While patrolling the border, Ramos and Compean shot an illegal trespasser and drug dealer who was smuggling \$1 million worth of dope across our border into Texas. Ironically, the two agents were tried for civil rights violations and sent to prison.

Last year, a Federal judge said that the prosecution overreacted in this case. Here is what occurred. The drug dealer was given immunity to testify against the agents, and the bought-and-paid-for witness's testimony, believability, and credibility, was the basis of the entire prosecution. But the prosecutor hid from the jury that the drug smuggler witness continued to bring in drugs into the United States while the trial was pending; and the U.S. attorney has now admitted the back-room-deal witness also lied.

Our justice system should free these two border agents because of the lying paid-for witness, and our government needs to get on the right side of the border war.

And that's just the way it is.

□ 1745

ENERGY PRICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CAS-TOR). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DAVID DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I'm here tonight to speak a little bit about energy process.

Unfortunately, some folks here in the Congress seem to think that we can tax our pick-up trucks and our cars from empty to full. Just recently, a congressman proposed a 50-cent tax increase on gasoline. You heard me correct, an extra 50 cents added to each gallon. Someone actually proposed that here in the House of Representatives.

I would say that 99 percent of my constituents don't want another 50 cents in taxes added to their gasoline prices. That 50-cent tax increase would put gas at around \$4.12 cents per gallon.

If you would like to effectively cripple the families and small businesses across the United States and back in my First District of Tennessee, a 50-cent tax increase would do just that. Madam Speaker, that just doesn't make any sense to me.

What we need is some east Tennessee commonsense, along with another lesson from the 8th grade civics class and economic classes. When demand is high, supply is low, then energy prices will be outrageous. That's exactly what we see today. How do you bring down energy prices?

Eighth grade economics: create a bigger supply. How do you create a bigger supply of energy? No more excuses. First, we need to stop making excuses. We need an energy policy that allows us to use American energy. We need to drill for oil in ANWR and off the Outer Continental Shelf. We need to use fuel sources in Colorado and North Dakota, just to name a few. We need to use our abundant coal supply through the use of clean coal technology. We need to create safe nuclear power plants and we need to build new refineries. No more excuses. And we need to expand our green energy initiatives like switchgrass, wind power, solar power and hydroelectric power.

We don't need an energy piece; we need an energy policy. You can't take one part of an energy policy and call it a policy. I'm all for green energy, but green energy will only get you to about 6 percent of our energy needs in America. That only leaves 94 percent. We need an energy policy.

Right now, there is a limited supply of oil being imported into the United States by countries who hate us and hate our freedoms. We're at the mercy of these countries. My family, your family, small businesses across America and the families in the First District of Tennessee are all at the mercy of countries who hate us and hate our freedoms.

A sound energy policy that explores new green initiatives, while investing in American energy sources, is what we need and we need it now. Not another tax increase, not another regulation, not another restriction that some people believe would help fill up our pick-up trucks and our automobiles. We need a common-sense energy policy. No more excuses.

THE ENEMY WITHIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, U.S. technology in the Nation's defense industry is unsurpassed anywhere in the world. Because of this, our enemies want to steal it, use it against us, or copy it. They want to do it for their own military operations.

Private American corporations are to be commended for their expertise in national defense technology development. However, fifth column individuals and businesses that sell this sensitive military equipment to our enemies are nothing more than modern-day Benedict Arnolds and should be treated as such.

Our troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, for example, use night-vision goggles and night-vision rifle scopes to search out and destroy our enemies, but this equipment is being stolen in record numbers by businesses and individuals that are selling out America for that filthy lucre, or money. I think these people need to be treated as the treasonous traitors that they are.

According to USA Today, more than 40 businesses or individuals have been charged with stealing or exporting night-vision technology to people who are our enemies. Some charged are alleged to have sent the equipment to Iran, to China and to al Qaeda affiliates. Nations such as China can use reverse technology and copy the highly sensitive equipment and use it for their own benefit.

This equipment is also very costly. Each pair of new, high-tech, night-vision goggles cost around \$4,500. These goggles help our troops in the desert of the sun and the valley of the gun in Iraq and Afghanistan.

USA Today further reports that ITT sent restricted product data to China and other countries with intent to outsource production of this sensitive equipment. It paid a \$100 million fine, and I commend the judge for not only ordering the fine but he ordered half of that fine to be spent in developing a new generation of night-vision technology.

However, just paying a fine for supplying our enemies with advanced defense technology is just the cost of doing business. Corporate executives should not be allowed to hide behind the corporate veil when it comes to supplying aid and comfort to our enemies.

Crooked execs should not be allowed to buy their way out of jail by paying a fine that they don't even pay for. Their corporation pays that fine.

If business executives that dealt with our enemies went to jail, maybe in Guantanamo Bay prison where we keep other enemies of the United States, they might be careful about selling out America for 30 pieces of silver.

And Congress, rather than investigate steroids in baseball, might need to investigate these businesses and individuals who keep buying and stealing American equipment and selling it to our enemies. We owe our troops this investigation.

And that's just the way it is.

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, well, here we are after nine months, today, May 19, and this body is yet to provide Admiral McConnell with the tools he's asked for in order to protect the American people from another cataclysmic attack against our Nation.

When the Director of National Intelligence, Admiral McConnell, first came to Congress for help, he was only given a 180-day authority to conduct surveillance, which he described at the time as necessary to close critical intelligence gaps. Of course, after a short 2-week extension, that authority, which we called the Protect America Act, actually expired on February 16 at 12:01 a.m.

So we're in day 95. Three months and 5 days later, 13 weeks later, 22,080 hours later, 136,800 minutes after the FISA fix which we gave to the intelligence community of our Nation, that fix expired. Unfortunately, the so-called RESTORE Act, passed as a substitute by the majority party, repealed core provisions requested by Admiral McConnell.

While the Senate passed a bipartisan 6-year extension of a new FISA bill based on the Protect America Act, thus responding to the real world concerns of our Director of National Intelligence, unfortunately the Members of this chamber were denied a clean up-or-down vote on it. The end result is that here we are, nine months from the time this process of fits and starts began, without an effective response to the most serious national security threat of our time.

Madam Speaker, are we supposed to believe that al Qaeda has somehow lost its determination to kill innocent Americans? Well, as recently as Friday, Osama bin Laden was issuing threats against both the little Satan and the big Satan. I don't know about you, but I think we should want to remove all obstacles to listening in on his conversations.

For there is no evidence, none whatsoever, that these homicidal extremists have any less desire to kill us and others perceived by their twisted psychotic logic to be legitimate targets. Yes, innocent men, women and children.

No, the evidence is unequivocal and clear. Since 2001, attacks actual and premeditated have been a constant across the globe: attacks in Bali, Indonesia, in 2002 and 2005; a planned attack on Barcelona 2003; a deadly attack in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia, in 2003; a foiled plot in Istanbul, Turkey, in 2003; a

deadly attack in Casablanca, Morocco, in 2003; a terrible attack in Madrid, Spain, in March 2004; attempted attacks in the Philippines 2004; a deadly London attack in July 2005; a plan to blow up airliners over the Atlantic in 2006; an attack in Algeria in 2006; an intended attack in Denmark in 2007; and a planned attack in Germany in 2007. Al Qaeda has also tried to overthrow the governments of Egypt in 2004, Jordan in 2005 and Saudi Arabia in 2007.

For we no longer live in a world where wishful thinking is permissible, if we wish to fulfill our obligation to those who sent us here to represent them and to protect them and future Americans, this is the first obligation of government, and we no longer have the option of pretending otherwise. Although, pretending otherwise seems to be in the air these days.

The President of the United States addressed a session of the Knesset in Israel. There, celebrating the 60th anniversary or birthday of the State of Israel, in the context of remarks made by the leader of Iran to wipe off the face of the earth Israel, in light of other comments made by others affiliated with terrorists that we should see the day soon where Israel will no longer exist, in the context of speaking to a country whose birth grew out of the terrible experiences of the Holocaust in Germany, the President of the United States referred to the failure to act at that time by America and other countries around the world, the failure to even admit that there was a serious problem of cataclysmic consequence.

And when the President merely quoted a senator from that era who happened, by the way, to be a Republican, to suggest in the words of this senator of that time that if he'd just had a chance to talk with Hitler perhaps the future of the world would have been different, when the President merely says that in the context of the celebration of the 60th anniversary of the State of Israel, at a time when there are those in this world crying for their destruction, and at a time when rockets are lobbed into Israel on almost a daily basis, the response by some in this country is to criticize the President for uttering those words, to suggest that he had no right to say that, and to suggest that somehow he was accusing others of appeasement, who he had not even named.

Was the President suggesting that terrible circumstances in the world, adding up to a threat against us and those who ally with us, are dismissed by some as insubstantial or inconsequential? I think the President did suggest that. I think the President thought or stated that people who hold that view are dangerous to themselves and others because they are not confronting the evil that is in the world today.