

[Roll No. 859]

YEAS—333

Abercrombie Engel
Ackerman English (PA)
Aderholt Eshoo
Alexander Etheridge
Allen Everett
Altmire Fallin
Arcuri Farr
Baca Fattah
Bachmann Ferguson
Baird Filner
Baldwin Forbes
Barrow Fortenberry
Bartlett (MD) Frank (MA)
Bean Frelinghuysen
Becerra Gallegly
Berkley Gerlach
Berman Giffords
Berry Gilchrest
Biggert Gillibrand
Bilbray Gingrey
Bilirakis Gonzalez
Bishop (GA) Gordon
Bishop (NY) Graves
Bishop (UT) Green, Al
Blumenauer Green, Gene
Blunt Grijalva
Bonner Gutierrez
Bono Hall (NY)
Boozman Hare
Boren Harman
Boswell Hastings (WA)
Boucher Hayes
Boustany Herseth Sandlin
Boyd (FL) Higgins
Boyd (KS) Hill
Brady (PA) Hinchey
Brady (TX) Hinojosa
Braley (IA) Hirono
Brown, Corrine Hobson
Buchanan Hodes
Butterfield Holden
Calvert Holt
Camp (MI) Honda
Capito Hoyer
Capps Hunter
Capuano Inslee
Cardoza Israel
Carney Issa
Carson Jackson (IL)
Castle Jackson-Lee
Castor (TX)
Chabot Jefferson
Chandler Johnson (GA)
Clarke Johnson (IL)
Clay Johnson, E. B.
Clever Jones (NC)
Clyburn Jones (OH)
Cohen Kagen
Cole (OK) Kanjorski
Conyers Kaptur
Cooper Keller
Costa Kennedy
Costello Kildee
Courtney Kilpatrick
Cramer Kind
Crenshaw King (NY)
Crowley Kirk
Cubin Klein (FL)
Cuellar Kline (MN)
Cummings Knollenberg
Davis (AL) Kuhl (NY)
Davis (CA) LaHood
Davis (IL) Lampson
Davis (KY) Langevin
Davis, Tom Lantos
Deal (GA) Larsen (WA)
DeFazio Larson (CT)
DeGette Latham
Delahunt LaTourette
DeLauro Lee
Dent Levin
Diaz-Balart, L. Lewis (CA)
Diaz-Balart, M. Lewis (GA)
Dicks Lewis (KY)
Dingell Lipinski
Doggett LoBiondo
Donnelly Loebach
Doolittle Lofgren, Zoe
Doyle Lowey
Dreier Lucas
Edwards Lungren, Daniel
Ehlers E.
Ellison Lynch
Ellsworth Mahoney (FL)
Emanuel Maloney (NY)
Emerson Markey

Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
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
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler

Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher

Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NAYS—75

Akin
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Blackburn
Boehner
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Coble
Conaway
Culberson
Davis, David
Drake
Duncan
Feeney
Flake
Fossella

Fox
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Hall (TX)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Jordan
King (IA)
Kingston
Lamborn
Linder
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McHenry
Mica
Miller (FL)
Musgrave
Myrick

Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pence
Pitts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Stearns
Sullivan
Thornberry
Tiberi
Walberg
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)

NOT VOTING—24

Andrews
Carnahan
Carter
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Lincoln
Gohmert
Hastert
Hastings (FL)

Hooley
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Kucinich
McCarthy (NY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Sanchez, Loretta

Shimkus
Tancredo
Terry
Visclosky
Watson
Weller
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

□ 1400

Mr. BRADY of Texas changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, September 6, 2007, I was unavoidably detained due to a prior obligation.

I request that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reflect that had I been present and voting, I would have voted as follows:

Rollcall No. 854: “Yea”. On approving the journal.

Rollcall No. 855: “Yea”. On agreeing to the resolution.

Rollcall No. 856: “No”. On agreeing to the amendment.

Rollcall No. 857: “No”. On agreeing to the amendment.

Rollcall No. 858: “No”. On agreeing to the amendment.

Rollcall No. 859: “Aye”. On passage of H.R. 2786.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, on September 6, 2007, I was unable to be present for all rollcall votes due to a family medical emergency.

If present, I would have voted accordingly on the following rollcall votes:

Roll No. 854—“nay”; Roll No. 855—“nay”; Roll No. 856—“aye”; Roll No. 857—“aye”; Roll No. 858—“aye”; Roll No. 859—“no”.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 2786, NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING ASSISTANCE AND SELF-DETERMINATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2007

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 2786, to include corrections in spelling, punctuation, section numbering and cross-referencing, and insertion of appropriate headings.

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

There was no objection.

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.

CHINA ACTING MORE LIKE AN ENEMY THAN A FRIEND

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

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, what I am about to say may not be politically correct and it may not make folks in the White House or some of my colleagues in Congress happy, but every time I go home to my district, people ask me, when are we going to get serious about dealing with China?

For a long time, China has acted more like an enemy than a friend. Over and over again, they have sold our families harmful and contaminated products, they have spied on us, and now we find out they are shipping weapons to our enemies in the Middle East to kill our soldiers. This is not the behavior of an ally, but the behavior of an enemy.

They hurt our children. We have found toys containing lead paint and bibs and vinyl lunch boxes containing lead. Just this Wednesday, toy manufacturer Mattel announced it is recalling 700,000 Chinese-made toys because they contain excessive amounts of lead paint. This is the third recall of Chinese-made toys by the company in the past month.

On August 1, Mattel's Fisher-Price announced it was recalling 1.5 million

preschool toys, including nearly 1 million in the U.S. And then on August 14, the company announced a worldwide recall of 19 million toys. We all know the dangers caused by lead paint, which is why it is not used in American-made toys or homes. As a child psychologist, I can tell you firsthand exposure to lead paint can lead to attention deficit disorders, brain damage and medical ailments in children and in later life.

China has continuously sent us products that are harmful to our families, and even our pets. Their harmful products sold to Americans include contaminated pet foods, used chop sticks, tires that have caused fatal accidents, diapers containing a fungus, lipstick containing carcinogens, juices with unsafe color additives, baby bottles with ingredients that can alter a child's hormones, pacifiers containing chemicals linked to cancer, and teething rings with toxic chemicals.

In addition, China has systematically manipulated its currency to create an unfair trade advantage over the United States and other global competitors. They have repeatedly allowed their workers to counterfeit American products and steal our patents, costing us billions of dollars of trade each year, thus destroying American manufacturing jobs.

They have built power plants with cheaper outdated technology, causing excessive pollution and environmental hazards throughout the world, including the United States, and they have stolen national secrets from our U.S. energy labs.

Congress and the White House have allowed China to continue its blatant disregard for our country; and as a result, China has become more and more emboldened. They have now begun to directly and indirectly attack our military, actions that have taken the lives of American soldiers.

Beijing appears to be the culprit of a cyberattack launched against the Pentagon this past June. While this attack was not with missiles or guns, it is nonetheless an attack on our sovereignty that should not be unchecked.

Now we learn that China is supplying our enemies with weapons and ammunition being used to kill our soldiers. These weapons have included large-caliber sniper rifles; rocket-propelled grenades; improvised explosive devices, or IEDs; and shoulder-fired rockets. Millions of rounds of ammunition have also been linked to China. And many of these weapons are finding their way into the hands of the Taliban and insurgents in Iran. As U.S., Iraqi, and coalition forces try to prevent weapons from coming into Iraq, China has been directly aiding and abetting our enemies.

For far too long, China has been harming our children, our families, and our economy. Now they are killing our soldiers.

Well, enough is enough. China must be held accountable. If Congress can't

act, the American people can, and Americans are saying no to China. From our food, to our clothes, to household goods, Americans are saying they will stop buying Chinese products.

Unless China stops its practices that hurt Americans, kill our soldiers and kill our jobs, I believe the American people will continue to stop buying Chinese-made goods. But Congress must also demand that if China does not stop these practices that hurt our soldiers and hurt our citizens, Congress, too, must act, and do so quickly.

SUPPORT H.R. 933, THE WITNESS SECURITY AND PROTECTION ACT OF 2007

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the deeply troubling issue of terrorism right here in our own backyard. It is a problem that is endangering our children, threatening our families, and plaguing our neighborhoods. I am talking about the brazen acts of violence, fire bombings and shootings that are preventing the good people in our communities from testifying to the crimes that they have witnessed. Who can blame them, when they are sitting targets for those who have no shame?

In cities across America, people are murdered in broad daylight and their killers are walking free because we cannot adequately address the issue of witness intimidation. We have all heard the news reports regarding the "anti-snitching" campaigns that have appeared in so many of our communities, but few of us are aware of what these efforts really mean to the people on the ground. But all around us, evidence of these campaigns' impact is present. Murder rates are at a record-breaking high this summer in my hometown of Baltimore City and indeed in communities across the country where criminals have persistently evaded law enforcement.

In order to combat this problem, I introduced H.R. 933, the Witness Security and Protection Act of 2007. Upon enactment, this legislation authorizes \$90 million per year over the next 3 years to assist State and local law enforcement with witness protection, while fostering Federal, State, and local partnerships.

Priority will be given to prosecuting officers and States with an average of at least 100 murders during the immediate past 5 years. However, smaller entities will also have a chance to receive funding. State and local prosecutors will also be able to use these funds to provide witness protection on their own or to pay the costs of enrolling their witnesses in the short-term State Witness Protection Program to be created within the United States Marshals Service's office.

The U.S. Marshals Service has a wealth of expertise and experience that

will assist State and local entities in developing more comprehensive programs. In over 30 years under the Federal Witness Security Program, not a single witness that followed security procedures has been harmed while being protected by the program. More to the point, cases involving the testimony of these participants have an 89 percent conviction rate. In contrast, State witness protection programs are severely underfunded and enjoy virtually no Federal support.

While there has been tremendous support for this initiative in Congress, the lack of support from the administration has certainly been startling. On April 24, 2007, the House Judiciary Committee held a hearing on the Witness Security and Protection Act. During that time, the Department of Justice official opposed this legislation based on the claim that it does not have the capacity or the will to implement a grant program. DOJ officials argued that running a grant program distracts from its ability to carry out its mission. Since when has inconvenience been an excuse for shortchanging justice in America?

On May 24, 2007, I met with officials from the DOJ and the U.S. Marshals Service to discuss my concerns. I left the meeting feeling optimistic about a compromise. However, this has not been the case. I have even given DOJ staff the opportunity to come up with a counterproposal to achieve the same goal as the Witness Security and Protection Act of 2007, that is, the goal of strengthening State and local witness protection programs without a grant program. Unfortunately, DOJ officials have not been able to come up with a compromise, or even an alternative, to H.R. 933.

In light of DOJ's failure to cooperate, it is extremely disappointing to learn that it has no problem supporting efforts in other countries, while dodging our efforts to set up similar programs in places such as Maryland and Washington.

The U.S. Marshals Service, Mr. Speaker, has been assisting about a dozen countries, including Colombia, Israel, Italy, Brazil and Thailand, with the creation of witness protection programs in response to increasing threats against key figures in foreign prosecutions.

International demand for the program is so great that Interpol, the world's largest law enforcement organization, is hosting a conference this month with the Marshals Service at Interpol's headquarters in France to address the needs of foreign governments. It is so very tragic that we can assist those abroad, but we will not fight terrorism right here in our backyards.

Mr. Speaker, improving protection for State and local witnesses will move us one step closer toward alleviating the fears and threats of prospective witnesses and help to safeguard our communities from violence.