

don't have the teachers, we don't have quality programs; and this is a major problem because quality is a key ingredient in early education.

A poorly designed program or an understaffed one is not going to produce the results we owe our kids, so we must address this problem. We must recruit and retain early educators. And how do we do that? We can start by passing this authorization bill to streamline professional development opportunities, open doors to early education degree programs, and begin to address the woefully inadequate compensation our preschool teachers and child care workers receive.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill on behalf of our children and to honor and encourage the people who dedicate their lives to preparing our youngest children for success.

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

(Mr. DENT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania 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 Washington (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SMITH of Washington addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### BE PREPARED

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, "Be prepared" is the motto of the Boy Scouts of America. Unfortunately, for those Californians now in harm's way, the leadership of the U.S. Forest Service doesn't have the same commitment. Three years ago, the fleet of airplanes with firefighting capabilities available to the Forest Service declined dramatically, due to both attrition and accidents. I contacted the head of the Forest Service and aggressively suggested that steps be taken to ensure a surge capability in firefighting aircraft should a major conflagration erupt.

Much to my chagrin, the leadership at the National Forest Service was not responsive and our fire fighting aviation assets were permitted to dwindle. I continued to push the case for preparedness, focusing on the certification of specially designed Russian firefighting airplanes, so that water bombers would be available if our own depleted air assets were insufficient to handle an emergency. The availability of large American aircraft, like the DC-10, converted for firefighting purposes, was also suggested as a possible backup should the current number of firefighting aircraft prove inadequate.

The bureaucratic response from the U.S. Forest Service was disheartening, which is an understatement. The leadership did everything they could not to do anything. They bent over backwards to justify not taking steps to be prepared for the worst scenario. It appeared to be "good ol' boyism" and bureaucratic obstructionism with a vengeance. After all my pleas and demands, the Forest Service refused to take the steps necessary to be prepared for the worst. That intransigence was the order of the day at the Forest Service as late as December of last year, 2006.

The people of California are now suffering. It was only the intervention of Gov. Schwarzenegger that kept the privately developed fire fighting DC-10 available for the awe-inspiring part it is now playing in the current battle against the flames that have engulfed huge chunks of California. That DC-10, however, as well as the Russian waterbombers, is still not permitted to fight fires on the Federal lands in California, or elsewhere.

When the fire is extinguished and an evaluation is done, one thing that must be determined is whether or not a lack of aviation firefighting capacity undercut the courageous efforts of those confronting this enormous blazing inferno. Did people lose their homes because the waterbombers weren't there to save the day? One way or the other, those who made the decision to do nothing at the U.S. Forest Service will be held accountable.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, September 29, 2005.

Mr. DALE BOSWORTH,  
Chief, Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHIEF BOSWORTH: I write once again regarding the issue of the availability, in case of emergency, of the Russian fleet of firefighting aircraft as addressed in your letter of August 25, 2005.

Your letter represents an unacceptable and unwarranted change from what you stated in a meeting in my office on July 1, 2005. At the conclusion of that meeting it was my clear understanding that the United States Forest Service (USFS) would undertake specific steps to see that Russian air-tankers would be available to use in an emergency, should enough American firefighting assets not be available to respond to an extraordinary challenge.

In your most recent correspondence of August 25, you once again assert that Federal Aviation Administration certification is a prerequisite for any action to be taken by the USFS to ensure Russian firefighting planes could be used if necessary. However, as you expressed to me in our meeting, this is an USFS internal rule, not required by any statute. Such a policy, I believe, and you agreed, can and should be put aside if it could endanger life and property in this extremely volatile fire season. If another significant fire explodes in addition to the

wildfires now raging in Southern California, USFS assets may be stretched dangerously thin. I think that we can agree that bureaucratic procedures and regulatory impediments not required by law should not get in the way of these Russian planes being made available and used if life and property is otherwise in danger. If steps must be taken to ensure the interoperability of these Russian assets with our existing fleet in case of such an emergency, then why not take those steps? You seemed to agree with that logic at our July meeting.

Your letter, however, represents a reversal of what I believed was agreed upon in our conversation. That is no small matter. After Hurricane Katrina, the American public will not stand for decisions, in the face of an impending calamity, made with more mind to political turf protection than helping people. Steps must be taken to ensure that all options are available in case we face massive wildfires in the West. If the worst case scenario occurs and all options that could have been available are not, there will be a severe accounting. In the meantime, I find the USFS's inaction to be deplorable.

I look forward to your prompt response and, above all, action in response to this matter.

Sincerely,

DANA ROHRABACHER,  
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, December 8, 2006.

Mr. MARK REY,  
Under Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment, Department of Agriculture, Forest Service and Natural Resources Conservation Service, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. REY: Let me first express my regret about the death of your firefighters, especially Pablo Cerda, in the Esperanza fire. Pablo was one of my constituents, a Fountain Valley High School graduate. His tragic death is one of the primary reasons for this letter.

Your June 21, 2006 response to my April 5, 2006 letter was not responsive to the specifics that I requested. Your letter contained the same information that has been relayed to me in the past by your agency. There has been a disconnect between presentation information and the written responses, as indicated in my September 29, 2005 letter to Mr. Bosworth. For example, your second and third paragraphs which mention an initial attack response rate of 98.5 for the 2005 fire season are misleading. Initial attack rates have nothing to do with the availability of aircraft to support the firefighters on the ground. Initial attack concerns the use of resources nearest to the fire, not the availability and position of the federally funded aircraft to attack the fire.

I am still concerned that we have neither the correct tools nor the operational plans that are required to reduce the fire risk to California. Your response did not specifically answer my questions regarding the operations, logistics, and communications compatibility plans that must be in place if we are to use foreign assets to support firefighting in the U.S. In addition to my concerns about the availability of the Russian fleet of firefighting aircraft in case of emergency, I now have concerns about the overall management of our fire tanker fleet. The newest large tanker aircraft that is available, a DC-10 tanker, was created with private financing. This aircraft was not used until the day after the fire crew was overwhelmed in the Esperanza fire when the DC-10 tanker was used for six drops. The request and funding for the operations of this aircraft was done by the state of California, not

the federal government. This incident calls into question your written response that the firefighting forces are adequate to address the fire suppression needs in the western United States. It appears that the 16 large air tankers were not adequate since the use of the DC-10 had to be funded by the state of California.

The responsibility for airworthiness and safety of aircraft over the United States is the responsibility of the Federal Aviation Administration, not the Forest Service. The FAA has the category of Public Use Aircraft for aircraft used to fight fires, if aircraft wish to be used to save lives and property. For example, the National Guard C-130's are public use aircraft and do not have to pass the additional requirements of the Forest Service. We allowed the IL-76 flights into Little Rock Air Force Base after Katrina when they brought supplies to our citizens. Not to consider new or foreign aircraft under the excuse of interagency safety and airworthiness standards is a red herring which has cost the country both in funds, in property and in lives destroyed and at risk. Your unwillingness to take the necessary steps to ensure the availability of large aircraft in situations in which the current assets are not sufficient is unconscionable.

To summarize, your response was again filled with the bland generalities on this

issue and it continues to leave me with no confidence. The failure during the Esperanza fire validates my lack of confidence in your organization and decisions. Since we are at the end of the 2006 fire season, I want to be ensured that we are better prepared for the 2007 fire season than we were for this season. To this end I am talking to Senator Feinstein and others to ensure that this issue is not ignored until more firefighters lose their lives and property and homes are destroyed. I am also involved in a private evaluation of this issue. Unless I receive satisfactory explanations, there will be a painfully harsh critique of your decision making on this issue. I expect to hear from you in detail before the first of the year.

Sincerely,

DANA ROHRABACHER,  
Member of Congress.

REVISIONS TO ALLOCATION FOR HOUSE COMMITTEES

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, Under sections 211, 301(b), and 320(a), of S. Con. Res. 21,

the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2008, I hereby submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a revision to the budget allocations and aggregates for certain House committees for fiscal years 2007, 2008, and the period of 2008 through 2012. This revision represents an adjustment to certain House committee budget allocations and aggregates for the purposes of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, and in response to the bill H.R. 3963 made in order by the Committee on Rules (Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2007). Corresponding tables are attached.

Under section 211 of S. Con. Res. 21, this adjustment to the budget allocations and aggregates applies while the measure is under consideration. The adjustments will take effect upon enactment of the measure. For purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, a revised allocation made under section 211 of S. Con. Res. 21 is to be considered as an allocation included in the resolution.

Any questions may be directed to Ellen Balis or Gail Millar.

BUDGET AGGREGATES

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	Fiscal year 2007	Fiscal year 2008 <sup>1</sup>	Fiscal years 2008–2012
<b>Current Aggregates:<sup>2</sup></b>			
Budget Authority	2,250,680	2,350,996	n.a.
Outlays	2,263,759	2,353,954	n.a.
Revenues	1,900,340	2,015,841	11,137,671
<b>Change in Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act (H.R. 3963):</b>			
Budget Authority	0	9,332	n.a.
Outlays	0	2,386	n.a.
Revenues	0	6,210	35,510
<b>Revised Aggregates:</b>			
Budget Authority	2,250,680	2,360,328	n.a.
Outlays	2,263,759	2,356,340	n.a.
Revenues	1,900,340	2,022,051	11,173,181

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2009 through 2012 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

<sup>1</sup> Pending action by the House Appropriations Committee on spending covered by section 207(d)(1)(E) (overseas deployments and related activities), resolution assumptions are not included in the current aggregates.

<sup>2</sup> Excludes emergency amounts exempt from enforcement in the budget resolution.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(A) ALLOCATIONS FOR RESOLUTION CHANGES

(Fiscal Years, in millions of dollars)

House Committee	2007		2008		2008–2012 Total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
<b>Current allocation:</b>						
Energy and Commerce	-1	-1	366	362	-59	-63
<b>Change in Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act (H.R. 3963):</b>						
Energy and Commerce	0	0	9,332	2,386	49,711	35,384
<b>Revised allocation:</b>						
Energy and Commerce	-1	-1	9,698	2,748	49,652	35,321

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

(Mr. RAMSTAD 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 Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following

enrolled bill was signed by the Speaker on Wednesday, October 24, 2007:

H.R. 995, to amend Public Law 106-348 to extend the authorization for establishing a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor veterans who became disabled while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, October 25, 2007.

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

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for documents issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

DANIEL P. BEARD,  
Chief Administrative Officer.

ENERGY CRISIS IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from