

ExxonMobil profits and spend them. We haven't taken yet any profits from any of these companies, and they dwarf, they dwarf ExxonMobil. We go all the way down to this far on the chart before we find the first privately owned company, ExxonMobil.

ExxonMobil is owned privately by you, the shareholders, the stockholders. You can buy it every day. ExxonMobil is going to be charged taxes. It's going to make them less competitive worldwide. We are going to do away with more jobs so that these companies, these state-owned companies might have an easier time to take our jobs. I wonder at the thought process that went into that. I wonder what compelled policymakers here, the Speaker of the House to say we are going to tax American consumers, we are going to tax American companies, and we are going to let Hugo Chavez, we are going to let Nigeria, we are going to let Kuwait, Saudi Arabia go.

We also have other considerations. In the bills that we have passed, the bills that we have passed out of this Congress so far about energy, we have done kind of sort of a tricky thing. There is much discussion about Enron. That was the large power company that became synonymous with tricky dealings, double dealings.

What did they do? One of the things they did in defrauding the consumer, one of the things they did in defrauding the shareholders is that they did things called round-trip sales. If they needed their balance sheet to look better on a certain day, they would maybe buy or sell a lot of energy, maybe a specified amount of energy, and then they would simply buy it back, sell it to their own selves in a different company, and buy it and sell it, buy it and sell it, round trip, so that nobody was actually giving them money, but it looked like money coming in, and no one could ever see their balance sheet to see that they were actually paying out the money to themselves. It was coming in. The sales looked really good until some day you simply have to have the cash in hand. Those round-trip sales became synonymous with Enron and their double dealing.

But let's look at what this Congress, the new majority, who said they are going to do things in such an ethical fashion, let's look at what they have done. They have used the same taxes on offshore oil and gas in the gulf coast, the gulf region. They used those as an offset because we in Congress say we can't spend money without providing for it; the PAYGO provision. So they use those same taxes in H.R. 6, and, by the way, I am calling these the Enron tax provisions because they are kind of like those Enron round-trip sales, those ways of stating things so you have to check both sides of the ledger before you understand, but there's really not anything there.

So our friends on the other side of the aisle used those offshore taxes, those 1998/1999 leases to offset, to be

the PAYGO in H.R. 6. They used it in H.R. 2419. H.R. 6 we passed back on January 18. H.R. 2419, we passed July 27. They used them again on August 4 in H.R. 3221. And they used them again in H.R. 3058, which still has only passed committee but yet has not passed the floor.

When we as policymakers begin to do round-trip sales, it's no wonder that we have the reputation that only 9 or 10 percent of the American public really trusts what we are doing. We are doing things that do not make sense for our economy. We are doing things that are creating a false illusion about our potential to pay for things that we are saying we are going to do. We are watching our jobs leave and go away, all because we in this country need affordable energy, and yet we are doing things that hurt the chances of providing affordable energy.

Again, the point that we object to in this coming bill, the energy bill we are talking about this week, are the renewable fuel standards that are not achievable and keep us from implementing the healthy forest initiative so that we don't burn down our forests. It's objectionable that a renewable portfolio standard is being set that we cannot reach. It's objectionable that we are raising taxes by \$21 billion to American consumers. It's objectionable that we are using a tax that is going to be punitive to American companies but will not tax foreign oil companies, will not tax Hugo Chavez. At the end of the day we have to ask ourselves exactly why. Why is it that this majority is taking these stances that harm Americans so much? I don't know an answer to that.

I would like to submit for the RECORD a summary of the report, the Charles River report. In that, Charles River is suggesting that we are going to lose jobs, almost \$5 million from the energy policies that are being suggested right now by this Congress. We are going to lose 5 million jobs. The average American household's purchasing power could drop by \$1,700 by 2030. Aggregate business investment in the U.S. could drop by as much as \$220 billion by 2030. Our gross domestic product could decline by more than \$1 trillion by 2030. The costs of petroleum products could more than double by 2030. If you take a look at that report, you will see the damaging effects to your future, your children's future, and your grandchildren's future. The Charles River report is nationally respected and says: Please, please reconsider what you're doing in Congress, what the majority is doing in Congress right now to affect energy prices in the wrong way. We need lower costs of gasoline at the pump, lower costs of heating oil. We need policies which will implement those, not drive them up. We need them to be driven lower.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the time that you have yielded me tonight. I thank my friends from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) and from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY). This is a very important con-

sideration that we are talking about tonight.

THE ECONOMIC IMPACTS OF PROPOSED ENERGY LEGISLATION, CHARLES RIVER ASSOCIATES INTERNATIONAL, NOVEMBER 2007

A report by a respected economic analysis firm examines the economic impacts of seven major energy legislative provisions being considered by Congress. If adopted, these provisions would mandate that American families and businesses replace proven energy sources such as oil and natural gas with unproven high cost sources, likely leading to higher energy costs. The study reveals the following:

Almost 5 million jobs could be lost by the year 2030. The impact would likely be felt even sooner, with an estimate of more than 2 million jobs lost by the year 2020, and about 3.4 million jobs lost by the year 2025. These estimates take into account jobs that would be created by the nearly five-fold expansion of the biofuels mandate.

The average American household's purchasing power could drop by about \$1,700 by 2030. Higher energy and non-energy costs estimated in the study would likely mean that consumers must spend a larger percentage of their income to maintain their current level of consumption. This could force Americans to make lifestyle changes, as significant quantities of energy would be needed to produce and transport many goods and services.

Aggregate business investment in the U.S. could drop by as much as \$220 billion by 2030. Higher energy costs place upward pressure on manufacturing costs, and businesses have less capital to absorb the impact. As household and business consumption fall, demand for goods and services weakens.

Our national GDP could decline by more than \$1 trillion by 2030, relative to the baseline. This estimated 4 percent decline in GDP would be the result of energy supplies declining and energy sources becoming more expensive. The economy as a whole likely would suffer, but the impact would resonate strongest in the following sectors: commercial transportation, electric generation, motor vehicles, and manufactured goods.

Costs of petroleum products could more than double by 2030. The impact would likely be felt sooner, with a roughly 44 percent cost increase by 2020. In addition to refined fuels and home heating oil, this would likely impact the many products that have oil or natural gas components, including toothpaste, cell phones, infant seats, and pacemakers.

□ 1930

IOWA PRESIDENTIAL CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the privilege to be recognized and address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. Each time I come to the floor to address you and speak into the RECORD, I am very well aware that there are people in my district, Iowans and Americans, who are tuned in for one reason or another, who are shaping their ideas and their values as they listen to us here in the people's House, this great deliberative and this great debate body which has 435 Members, representing 300 million of us, each of

us representing roughly 660,000 constituents. We are called upon by the Constitution and the rights that are passed from God through the Declaration and the Constitution, we are called upon to step up to those responsibilities. We are elected to represent the people in our districts with the priorities of what is good for America. First God, then country, then State, and then district.

I know, Mr. Speaker, there are Members of this body who view their job as simply reflecting the political will of their constituents. In other words, take a poll, wet the finger, see which way the wind is blowing, put down a vote, and determine that your longevity here in this Congress somehow puts together this vast mosaic which turns out to be a beautiful painting. I, Mr. Speaker, do not believe that.

I believe we are charged with the responsibility of leadership. We are elected for our judgment. We owe our best effort and best judgment to our constituents, and part of that best effort and best judgment is to listen to them and receive their input, but exchange the information that we gather here and across the country.

We are full-time paying attention to the issues that affect this Nation. We have access to more information than most of our constituents do. We have a responsibility to process that information, give our opinion back to our constituents, exchange our ideas and reach a conclusion on how best to conduct ourselves on our public statements which affect public policy, on our votes and on our activities, on the bills that we sponsor and cosponsor and author, and the positions that we take in committee and here on the floor. All of that comes with a great profound responsibility of serving people here in the United States Congress.

I came here this evening to address one of those profound responsibilities, and maybe a little bit outside of the realm of an official duty of a Member of Congress, but certainly implied within our duty and responsibility, and that is that all of us in this Chamber are involved in a constant conversation with each other, with our constituents, with our associates, with the press, on how we select the next leader in the free world because, Mr. Speaker, the nomination process here in America will determine generally two nominees, one Democrat and one Republican, and perhaps an Independent, that will be on the ballot in November. One of them will be the next leader of the free world. One of them will be the Commander in Chief of the Armed Services of the only unchallenged superpower on the globe, and with that comes a series of profound responsibilities.

So how then do we in these positions of leadership, how do we take this job, and I am going to say seriously, to make this evaluation? How do we come to the conclusion on whom we support and might consider endorsing for President of the United States?

I, Mr. Speaker, have the great privilege to represent a district in Iowa, one of five Congressional districts, where we are the first in the Nation contest. Iowans will, in the caucus on January 3, make the first recommendation to the rest of the Nation and the individuals that Iowans believe would make the next President of the United States, both Democrats and Republicans.

We have had that responsibility of the first in the Nation caucus for several decades now. I believe it was Jimmy Carter that first identified the leverage and the opportunity to come to Iowa in the first in the nation caucus and engage in that process and emerge victorious and go on to New Hampshire and South Carolina and beyond and be successful in the process of nomination and be successful in the process of being elected as President.

Jimmy Carter identified that opportunity in Iowa, and since that time we have had Presidential candidates constantly in Iowa over the last year and a half in particular. But this process is an open process whereby it is the first time in my memory that both the Democrats and the Republicans neither has an incumbent President that will be up for renomination for a second term or a Vice President who might have been picked or anointed by a sitting President. It is wide open. It is wide open for Democrats and Republicans. We have known that for 3 years, perhaps, maybe a little more than 3 years.

So we have seen candidates come through Iowa, and I am sure the people in New Hampshire have as well, and the South Carolinians as well, and this has been going on for a year and a half. Now it is coming down to the crunch time. Iowans will be making their decision on whom they will support in the caucus within the next 30 days, 29 days, perhaps.

There are a lot of Iowans who have not yet made up their mind. I am here to say I understand why. The January 3 contest will bring 100,000 Republicans out who will go to homes across the State. Some will be sitting in living rooms and gymnasiums where they pull the caucus together for an entire county. Some will go to schools or other public buildings, but many will go to the homes. They will go to the homes of Iowans and sit in the living room. Sometimes they will not all fit in one room and they will flow into other rooms, but they will go through the process, Republicans and Democrats, declaring themselves. Democrats openly declare themselves for Presidential candidate. Republicans put up a vote on a piece of paper, and they can maybe vote for a Presidential candidate in a caucus and not be identified as a supporter for a particular candidate. Generally, we listen to each other speak with such focus we know how people vote whether it is a secret vote or whether it is the way it is in a small neighborhood contest.

But before I get into that, I want to get into how important it is that we have a process of nomination that includes a contest like an Iowa caucus, an opportunity for individuals, to caucus-goers, registered voters, and they will all be registered voters who have a voice in our caucuses, regular people, heartland people, regular Americans from all walks of life, it is so important we have a process that allows the supporters of the candidates to get to know the Presidential candidates.

We are in this modern cyber era where information goes with the click of a mouse and you can transfer capital around the world in a nanosecond. In that period of time, we can also transmit visual images and radio commercials and print text in the blogosphere. Anyone who has an e-mail distribution list can listen to a Presidential candidate in a living room in Davenport, Iowa, write that little quote down and pump it into their BlackBerry and send it off to 10,000 people on their e-mail distribution list. We have those kinds of folks who do that.

These Presidential candidates are being evaluated day by day, hour by hour, minute by minute, by people who take their privilege to weigh in on this nomination process very seriously.

We have developed over the generations astute people who are engaged in politics. But I don't want to say that Iowans are the only ones that have that ability because we don't. Obviously that ability exists in every State in significant numbers. But I do want to say that if no State has a first in the Nation caucus process, if every State, for example, if we went to Super Tuesday on the 5th of February, if everybody held the primary contest at the same time, the polls opened at 7 in the morning and closed at 9 at night, we would all go in as a Nation, 300 million of us, those who voted in the primary, and we cast a ballot for our selection for nominee, if we did that, we would nominate the Democrat candidate and the Republican candidate who had the deepest pockets, most ability to raise money and the most ability to buy ads and put their chosen persona out before the American people to convince them that on Super Tuesday, February 5, they should go to the polls and vote for them. Not a personal contest, but a media image, money raising contest is what we would have. We will have that media image, money raising contest on Super Tuesday on February 5 and those dates beyond that other States have their primaries, and some have a caucus or convention.

But this first in the Nation caucus is different. You simply cannot earn votes by running media. You simply can't run television ads and radio ads and print and mailer and do robocalls and be able to get people to be inspired to get up on a cold January night and go on out into their neighborhood's living room or the school gymnasium and declare for a candidate for President. It takes more than that.

If people are going to invest hours of their time, because it isn't just write the name of a Presidential candidate on a piece of paper and turn it in. It also includes the initial offering of the planks for the State party platform and the election of precinct captains and the election of the delegates that go to the county conventions. These nights are full of political debate and exchange of ideas.

There are people who will go to the caucuses who have not made up their mind who they will support for President, but they will listen to the speeches, whether Republicans or Democrats.

So what is this caucus process and why is it unique? It is unique because it requires organization. It requires the candidate to build an organization within the State, to identify workers within the counties and people that will go forth and profess the validity of their candidate as the best President that we could ask for in this era as President of the United States.

This statewide conversation that goes on continually is a conversation one on one, person to person. It goes on in the coffee shop and it goes on in schools and churches and over talk radio constantly. It goes on over the telephone lines from neighbor to neighbor and business conversation to business conversation. People seeking to influence others to support their candidate and others that are ambivalent, and some that will lay out the principles that they require a candidate to stand for, but may not be behind the personality of the individuals.

And there are components of this statewide conversation that have to do with anecdotes about each of the Presidential candidates, how they conducted themselves in private. Maybe they went to a barbecue someplace in Iowa County and when nobody was looking, they got up and cleaned off the table and helped out. Or maybe they got mad at a staff aide and cut loose and yelled at them behind the curtain and the stage when they thought nobody was listening. And maybe they walked off with some young kids when intense conversations were going on about policy and sat down over by the lake and had a conversation about God and country with young impressionable children that won't be voting for that candidate. They might be leaders of this country at a future time. They might have invested in young people instead of likely caucus-goers.

All of these little anecdotes get added up and transferred along and retold, and they become part of the personality, part of the evaluation of each of the Presidential candidates.

This is a statewide conversation through e-mail, by telephone, in print media, word of mouth, things that are said and unsaid. Most good, some negative. But in the end, Iowans will come to a measure of a consensus and they will support different candidates, obviously. But they will make a recommendation. Some candidates will be

weeded out and some candidates will be advanced. But there will be two tickets punched in New Hampshire, no more than three, maybe only one.

□ 1945

But to win the Iowa caucus says you have met the standards. You have held up under the bright light of public scrutiny and you have done that for more than a year, and you have not been found wanting in your character or your policy. Your faith will be measured. Your work ethic will be measured. The tempo of your work, the people who are gathered around as paid staff and volunteers, all of them become part of a team, and the personalities of each of those players makes a difference in the evaluations process. If we do not have such a process, then again it becomes just a media campaign, just a media contest.

I would take you back, Mr. Speaker, to reflect upon the 2004 caucus when, at this stage before the caucus, a month before the caucus, the national news media had Howard Dean as the nominee for President for the Democrat Party, because Howard Dean had built an organization, he had raised a ton of money, he had an Internet presence there that was unique and hadn't been matched at the time. The polls were showing that Howard Dean was way ahead and that his next closest competitor was not likely to be able to overcome him or overtake him. And yet 3 weeks before the caucus, at least 2 weeks, in that period of time, 2 to 3 weeks before the caucus, we knew that Howard Dean was not going to win the Iowa caucus. He might have won the nomination elsewhere, but we knew he wasn't going to win the Iowa caucus. We could tell on the streets of Iowa. People were starting to walk away from and back away from Howard Dean.

Mr. Speaker, I don't come here to speak ill of the individual. He set a new standard and certainly made a name for himself in the State and across America. And many, many Iowans had the opportunity to meet Howard Dean. But I think that the conclusion that they drew and the reason that they didn't show up in the Democrat caucus where you have to stand up and say, I'm for Howard Dean, all of us that are for him, come gather around here, we'll count our bodies and that will be the number of people that showed up to support him. If there is an insufficient number, then we won't be able to report support for Howard from this caucus. That's the system and the rules that they have. And, truthfully, they did not show up to support Howard Dean. That was not because of the scream. The scream was a result of folks not showing up to support him, Mr. Speaker. I believe that Iowans came to the conclusion that Howard Dean, of all the things he had to offer, did not have the temperament to be President of the United States. I think that was the bottom line conclusion.

And as Iowans walked away from Howard Dean, John Kerry then won Iowa and went on to win the nomination. His prospects were pretty dim at this point and 4 years ago, but we know how history launched John Kerry forward and how Howard Dean went forward to let out the scream that was the scream of frustration that, of all the good things he had done as he was on the inside track and he was turning on towards victory and it collapsed, because in the end we're making a measurement on real people, evaluating their work ethic, their faith, their character, their personalities, how they interact with people. That's something that only happens there and only happens in Iowa. It happens, I think, in New Hampshire also to some degree, but it is a different process. It is a primary process, not a caucus process. So it changes the dynamic in New Hampshire. And then beyond it becomes more and more of a media and less and less of an organizational effort.

But to have this unique process, this first-in-the-Nation caucus process so that Presidential candidates are meeting people face-to-face, eye-to-eye. Some might call it a relic of the old days, but I will tell you that I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is the foundation of one of the great things about America that those of us who have the privilege to represent the people, whether it is in the White House or in the Congress or in the statehouse or through our courthouses or city hall, we face the people, we answer their questions, we let them evaluate the things we believe in and we let them evaluate our work ethic and our value system, and then they make the decision. It is up to the people.

So I am a great fan of this caucus process. I will do all I can to protect and preserve it, because I do not want to see an America that is simply a paid media nomination and a paid media campaign that insulates Presidential candidates from the people and perhaps launches somebody off to be President who might not meet that test if they had to look you or me in the eye. That is what the caucus does.

On the Republican side of this in the Iowa caucus, Mr. Speaker, we are evaluating a lot of different components, and we have watched the polls sort some of this through. We have some very good people there that stand solid on the issues. Some people with whom I stand alongside on the floor of the House of Representatives, if I put down a wish list of the Presidential candidates, where they stand on each of the issues and a little box to check, we have some people from this House running for President to check all my boxes. They check every piece that I would want to have in a Presidential candidate. And partly due to the media and partly due to the selection process, some of them don't have a lot of traction right now, and it's too bad. They deserve more of our respect. And some of them have stepped forward with a solid agenda on the issues.

I want to at this point, Mr. Speaker, compliment my friend TOM TANCREDO for making immigration the issue of the day. When I first met him, I already knew him, I thought, because of the hours that he had spent on this floor speaking into this microphone, Mr. Speaker, about the importance of border control, about the importance of preserving our national sovereignty by controlling our borders and who comes in the United States and who does not, protecting the security of the American people from the terrorists from without. TOM TANCREDO has done that job to the extent where, in the debate the other night, they spent 30 minutes or more, all of the Presidential candidates, debating on who would be the toughest on immigration and who would be the most like TOM TANCREDO. I call that a victory for TOM TANCREDO.

I think he has implanted the issue that burns the most passionately within him, the immigration reform, border control, workplace enforcement, ending anchor babies, the automatic citizenship that comes with babies of illegal immigrants who are born here on American soil. All of those components that he has worked so hard for all of these years, many of which I stood on this very floor and debated with him and supported with him, and he has come forward to support me on the agenda that I brought forward. I want to compliment TOM TANCREDO, because they all were there, standing there seeking to out-TOM TANCREDO, TOM TANCREDO. And to some extent that is what happens in a Presidential campaign when the issue that is the most important to you is adopted by the rest of the candidates.

Now, it doesn't mean they didn't have some opinions on it. It doesn't mean that immigration wasn't important to them. But what I have seen happen is that they understood that TOM TANCREDO was right, and they wanted to make sure that they had a plank in their platform that reflected the view that he brings to the immigration issue, and generally it is a no amnesty pledge.

I believe all the Presidential candidates have taken the pledge to be opposed to amnesty. Mr. Speaker, amnesty is and it needs to be defined, and I have done so here many times, to grant amnesty is to pardon immigration lawbreakers and reward them with the objective of their crimes.

The reason that definition is that way is because those who come into the United States across the border illegally are criminals. They are guilty of the criminal misdemeanor of illegal entry into the United States. And those who overstay their visas are unlawfully present here in the United States, and they are generally guilty of a civil misdemeanor of overstaying their visa. But most of them, and I will say those who are unlawfully present and many of those who are lawfully present and it is not lawful for them to

work here, still falsify documents, still present themselves to be somebody they are not in order to get a job, in order to do some type of business here to gain the benefits of this society. Most of those who cross the border are criminals because they violated a criminal misdemeanor, and most of those who overstayed their visas have also violated or committed some crime, generally document fraud, identity fraud in order to achieve access to our benefits or jobs here in the United States.

So this is a group of people who stood up and said they do not deserve amnesty. We do not want to reward immigration lawbreakers. So whether they jumped the border illegally or overstayed their visa, they are lawbreakers. And they should not be rewarded, because if we do, we will get more of them, not less. And to grant a pardon to immigration lawbreakers and reward them with the objective of their crime. What was their objective? Well, to be in the United States for one thing, obviously, because that is the definition of what they have done is found themselves unlawfully present in the United States. So if that is their objective to be in the United States, if we grant them an amnesty that lets them stay in the United States, that's amnesty. We have rewarded them with the objective of their crimes. Or, if they are here and they are working here unlawfully and we jigger the books so that we give them an opportunity to continue working here but we legalize it, we have granted them amnesty because we pardoned them for their crime and we give them their objective, which is a job. Or, if they just want to live here and utilize the social benefits of this great welfare state that we have, that also could be the objective of their crime. Or, if we let them stay here in the United States and they actually are part of that smaller percentage who do have ill will towards Americans or who are criminals or those who do smuggle drugs, those who are part of the criminal element, if they would be allowed to stay here as well, we don't know who the criminals are and who aren't. And the idea that if we would just legalize them, they would all come forward, good guys and bad, and they all sign up and we give them a United States identification document, and then we would know where they are and what they are doing is just a false premise, Mr. Speaker.

The standard is Presidential candidates on the Republican side need to oppose amnesty. Presidential candidates on the Democrat side, I think we know, they have been fairly consistently for amnesty if I read their statements correctly, and I believe I do. If I am incorrect on that, I would hope that one or all of the Democrats would step forward and sign off on the "no amnesty" pledge. I am happy to put the amnesty definition in print. And, if you are listening, to grant amnesty is to pardon immigration lawbreakers

and reward them with the objective of their crimes.

Well, Presidential candidates on the Republican side have all sworn off on amnesty. We just don't agree quite on what amnesty is all the way down the line. And that brings me some concern.

But that is one of the foundational issues that has been debated here, and I wanted to in the RECORD thank TOM TANCREDO for making sure that it is part of this dialogue in the presidential race on the Republican and on the Democrat side of the aisle. And, TOM, you have won this debate. Now we have to figure out how to implement the policy, but you have won this debate.

So that is the definition of amnesty. That is what has taken place here and across Iowa and New Hampshire and down into South Carolina and beyond.

I want to point out also that this Presidential contest does start in Iowa January 3, the first-in-the-Nation caucus then. Immediately, within a couple of days, on the 5th of January, it goes to a convention in Wyoming. And I am glad for them being involved early in the process. It's not very much focused on what happens in Wyoming, but shortly after that the following Tuesday, January 8, just 5 days after the Iowa caucus, is the New Hampshire primary. And we all know that is the first-in-the-Nation primary, and it is significant not so much in the numbers of delegates that will be achieved there but in the message that it sends to the rest of the country. From the 8th of January until 7 days later on the 15th of January, that is when the primary is in Michigan, and then on the 19th we have the primary in South Carolina which will take us to the fifth process. And in Nevada on the same day there is a caucus.

And so the early five contests that we have, Iowa on the 3rd of January, Wyoming on the 5th, New Hampshire on the 8th, Michigan on the 15th, and Nevada and South Carolina on the 19th of January, those early races, six States actually, but the major contests will be Iowa, New Hampshire, Michigan, South Carolina. Those will set the stage for the Florida, Alabama, Alaska primary on the 29th.

As this moves forward, the momentum that comes from a victory in Iowa transcends, at least launches a candidate on the road to New Hampshire, asks the people in New Hampshire: Take another look. If you were looking at this a different way, take another look and see. There was a reason Iowans made the decision that they did. Do you agree with them or do you not agree with them? And I don't want to stir up any contrarian attitude on the part of the New Hampshireites. I have great relationships with the people and I would love to be up there with your primary. I really would. But this process; it is a process of momentum, it is a process of selection. And as Iowans measure the character of the Presidential candidates and as they go to the caucus on the night of the 3rd of

January, that message will be heard around the country and around the world. And those who have not then made a decision on who they support will be taking another look. Some who have made a decision might be reassessing.

So I would ask this. Let's evaluate their character, their work ethic, their personalities, how they handle themselves in a time of stress or a time of relaxation. Let's do that. But I like to look at this as a matter of principle, and I would ask that these Presidential candidates be those who carry with them the convictions on a series of issues that I think are important to the future of America. And this, Mr. Speaker, is the point for which I come to this floor.

The issues that I believe this Nation's future pivots on, the most important issues, among them are life, marriage, the war on terror, illegal immigration, tax reform, second amendment, health care, and national sovereignty.

Of that list of issues that I have laid out here, Mr. Speaker, I will start with life, and that is innocent unborn human life. In particular, life from its natural beginnings, which is from fertilization/conception until natural death. The human life is sacred in all of its forms. It begins and ends as I have described. Do the Presidential candidates understand that and believe that? Or, I would ask them if they did not, then to them I would say, when did your life begin?

□ 2000

Mine began at conception. When did your life begin?

Madam Speaker, I believe that every American that's going to have an opinion on policy needs to ask themselves that very question. When did your life begin? Mine, I believe, began at that moment of conception. I believe that's when I was blessed with a soul, and I have a destiny like all of us, and we're all created in God's image and we have a duty. And from whom much is given, much is required. And so the issue of life is an essential component, and I will say the most important issue in this race or any race because that tells us the quality and the character and the integrity and the faith, the core faith of the Presidential candidates, how they view this subject.

The second issue is marriage. And Madam Speaker, marriage is an institution that I believe is a sacrament. It's a blessing that's given to us from God. Adam and Eve were joined together before original sin. Marriage is as old as man and woman itself. It's a blessing too that came from God, and marriage has survived original sin and marriage has survived the great flood, and marriage has been with us for thousands of years, and it's been defined as the same thing throughout, a man and a woman joined together in holy matrimony. That's marriage, according to our faith. It's marriage ac-

ording to our civil law in this country. It's marriage according to the Defense of Marriage Act at the Federal level. It's marriage according to the Defense of Marriage acts in all States except Massachusetts, if I have that chart correct, and it's between a man and a woman. And it's protected in the Constitutions of 27 States in America. We don't have a difficulty understanding what marriage is. It's between a man and a woman. And yet we have activists in the country that are using our courts to try to redefine marriage.

I would submit that if you believe differently than me, come to this Congress and make your case. If you believe differently than the law, different than the 27 Constitutions in America, different than the Defense Marriage Act here in the Federal statute, then take your case to the States and make your argument there and lobby for the representatives and the State senators to redefine marriage if that is your wish, if that is your will, if that is your conviction. That is how it's done in this country. But when we hand over decisions to the courts when we know that we don't have the support of the people, then the people who hire the attorneys to take these suits to the courts are asking for an activist judge that will overturn the will of the people, will overturn the Constitution and overturn the State law or the Federal law, as the case may be, that's when we get strife, that's when we get stress in this country. That's when we get domestic conflict in America is when the judges make the laws. But when the people's voice is heard, we accept that as the will of the people and we move on.

If you believe differently than me, I believe marriage is between a man and a woman. I believe Iowa must pass a constitutional amendment now to fix a wrong that was committed, I believe, by an activist judge. I think we have to do that to preserve this oldest institution between people, this institution of marriage that goes back to the Garden of Eden and Adam and Eve, before original sin and before the great flood, and has survived all of that time. And now, here in this era, I am to believe that we're enlightened and we can look at this differently, that all of human experience, all of human history, and the Constitution and the law and our faith can all be set aside because we have modern-day people who want something different. And they would upset all of that for what? For their wish, for their will, when there are provisions that can be made within current law to make sure that people have the things in life that are necessary to respect their rights.

So life is essential. And it's a human life. Marriage is essential for a Presidential candidate to understand and to defend it because the President sets the moral standard for America, and the words that are uttered by a President either raise the standards or lower the standards. They shift the focus. And

that's why marriage is so important that we have Presidential candidates that understand this.

The next issue that I mentioned is the war on terror. And we know that here in this city we were attacked on September 11, 2001. We've been conducting this global war on terror since that time, and particularly with operations within Iraq and Afghanistan. And who would have dreamed that on that day, September 11, we didn't think we'd get through the afternoon without being attacked again, let alone all of these 6 years and 3 months since that period of time. No one would have believed that this Nation would have been without a terrorist attack on its soil, a significant terrorist attack on this soil, at least a successful one. But that has been the case because this President has carried this issue to the enemy. The global war against these terrorists must be pursued. We cannot cut and run. We cannot decide to pull our troops back to the horizon. We can't wake up tomorrow morning and decide the horizon is Okinawa. We have a responsibility to defend this country in this global war on terror. And I believe, Madam Speaker, that at least the Republican candidates and probably the Democrat candidates will defend this Nation in this global war on terror, some more aggressively, some with more insight, some with a vision towards a final victory, some reluctantly because they don't really believe that this is a war that we're fighting. Some kind of think on the other side that we just need to understand why they hate us and maybe we can take away the reasons for the hate. But we have to fight this war on terror, and our Republican candidates all will, to one degree or another, a little bit of difference in methodology, but they'll fight this war on terror.

I mentioned the illegal immigration and how important that is. It changes our destiny, Madam Speaker.

And then the next component of this is tax reform. Now, there are people here in this Congress that believe that through money management, through tax management, regulation management, access to tax revenue and handling that money out, that we can engineer this entire society, that we can socially engineer in America with a tax policy, that if we just set our tax structure right, we can grow the businesses that need to grow and shrink the businesses we'd like to shrink and reward the people that need to be rewarded and punish the people that need to be punished. Some people think that through tax policy you can do all of those things. I am not among them, Madam Speaker. I believe that tax policy should be for the purposes of raising revenue, for the legitimate functions of government, for the constitutionally legitimate function of government and nothing else; that we should not have a thought about if we reward this behavior and punish this behavior

with our tax structure, that will maneuver this country into a direction that we like better.

We should have a tax structure that's fair, that makes everyone a taxpayer, that rewards earning, savings and investment and work and sweat equity. We need to have a kind of a tax policy that takes the tax off of all productivity in America and puts it on consumption. If we do that, and I would remind you, Madam Speaker, that the Federal Government has the first lien on all productivity in America. If you're going to produce in this country, if you punch the time clock at 8:00 on Monday morning, or if you go collect the interest on your passbook savings account, or if you sell the farm and you take the capital gains and you roll it over and you invest it into a factory with a production line and higher workers, wherever there's production, wherever there is a return on an investment, the Federal Government has the first lien. And Ronald Reagan said what we tax, we get less of. And so we hear with our tax policy, tax everything that produces and nothing that consumes. Well, little of what is consumed. And tax reform is a big issue. It's important. And I'll get back to that perhaps a little bit later, Madam Speaker.

One of the other issues that I mentioned that we want to make sure we can evaluate Presidential candidates in is the second amendment. Our gun rights, and if we look back in our Constitution under the second amendment, clearly, that we are guaranteed an individual right to keep and own firearms. A well-regulated militia being necessary to a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed. That's the second amendment, Madam Speaker.

There's a case before the United States Supreme Court that will come up perhaps in March of next year, and we will get the first decision of the Supreme Court on that question, I believe, in 70 years. But we need a President that will defend that right to keep and bear arms.

And I would remind the body, Madam Speaker, that the right to keep and bear arms is not a right for self-defense specifically. It wasn't written for that reason. It isn't necessarily a right to go out and target shoot or to hunt. Those things that I've mentioned, self-defense, hunting, target shooting, collecting firearms, all of those things are fringe benefits to the real reason for the second amendment. The real reason we have a right to keep and bear arms is because our forefathers feared tyranny, and they understood that a well-armed populace would not capitulate to a military state, that a dictator could not emerge and herd the people like sheep at the point of a bayonet if the people themselves had guns. That's the philosophy that's behind the second amendment. And you'll notice in the last 200-and-some years, we haven't had a single tyrant emerge as a leader

here in America. Some would disagree with me, but I'm sure that they're wrong in any analysis. And one of those reasons is because of the restraint that's in place because the people in America hold guns within their possessions, within their homes. And that is a silent deterrent against the emergence of tyranny. And while that's going on, we're deterring tyranny, and we're protecting our homes and we get to enjoy target shooting and hunting and collecting.

And by the way, if you go over to the Smithsonian, Madam Speaker, you can walk through the collection of firearms that are there and track the history of America, as the history of America is written within the firearms that have defended the balance of our freedoms, and without that defense, the ability to defend our freedoms, none of the rest of this holds together. So the second amendment becomes an essential evaluation and how it's defended by a Presidential candidate.

And health care is an issue that we are constantly churning and it will be an issue in the next Presidential race. It is today in the caucus and in the primary, both among Democrats and Republicans, how would these Presidential candidates deal with health care. And it is 1/4 of our economy that is consumed in health care, Madam Speaker. That's a significant percentage. And I'll come back to that perhaps in a moment.

But I wanted to mention the last issue, which is our national sovereignty. And this national sovereignty issue is one that we give away if we don't control our borders. If we simply have 2,000 miles on the southern border and 4,000 miles on the northern border and open seashores on the Atlantic and on the Pacific, and people that want to come to America come, and those that want to go certainly are always free to leave, Madam Speaker, that is no sign of sovereignty. No nation that doesn't protect its borders will long be a nation. And if we do not protect our borders, if people flow back and forth at will, if they carry goods and contraband back and forth across the border at will, we are no longer a sovereign nation. We're just a location where people do business and trade, whether it's legitimate or illegitimate. This national sovereignty has an essential component, and it must be part of our decision-making process as we evaluate the Presidential candidates.

And so, Madam Speaker, as we come to this, I began to ask these questions. How do I sort these issues? And what stands out as the essential components of this decision-making process? And I'll read through this list again. Life, marriage, the war on terror, illegal immigration, tax reform, the second amendment, health care, protecting our national sovereignty. How do these top Presidential candidates on the Republican side, how do they shake out when I evaluate where they stand on these issues and what are the most important?

Well, as I look across this list, and having served in this Congress now for 5 years, I come to the conclusion that the next President, whether he's a Democrat or Republican, will defend access to health care in America. I don't think that there are any Americans that are in danger of losing their access to health care under any policy that's advocated by a Republican or a Democrat. It might come in a different form from the Democrat side of the aisle. It would be universal socialized medicine. That's clearly in the debate platform and there's no one over there that disagrees. They're all talking about how they would provide socialized medicine, not whether.

□ 2015

That's not a disagreement. On the Republican side, there is discussion about this, and I don't know Republican candidates that support socialized medicine. Some have varying degrees on how they would approach this, but all would ensure that all Americans have access to health care.

So I don't think health care becomes the deciding issue by which I should throw my support behind an individual Presidential candidate. It's important. We'll debate it, we'll protect it, we'll preserve it, and hopefully we'll make it better. And I bring some ideas to this Congress that I hope can get implemented, along with many of my colleagues. I had a meeting this morning, as a matter of fact. So I will set health care off on the side and I will say it's not in jeopardy. I think that all Presidential candidates will preserve and protect access to health care.

Then I look at the war on terror and also come to the same conclusion that, on the Republican side at least, all Presidential candidates will continue to conduct this war on terror. We understand who our enemy is far better today than we did 6 years and 3 months ago and we will understand our enemy better a year from now. And the next President of the United States will understand this enemy better than we did 4 years ago, and certainly 8 years ago.

But I believe that this Congress supports this global war on terror. It's a battle. You brought 40 resolutions against us, but the American people are going to continue to defeat this enemy that is seeking to kill us. I believe the next Republican will do the same. And I think it's a matter of debate and degrees; whether Rudy Giuliani would have the most insight and be the most aggressive or whether JOHN MCCAIN would have the most insight and be the most aggressive. There are strong convictions on the part of Mitt Romney or Fred Thompson or Mike Huckabee, would all stand up to this foe, would all work to defeat our enemies, would all narrow the laser beam down on Osama bin Laden and on al Qaeda. And I think all would work to promote our American values overseas so that the people over there understand that we want to help them rid

themselves of the habitat that breeds that kind of terror. I think that happens.

So I think I can put health care over on the side and say it's not at risk in this nomination. Americans are going to be okay. We can debate this in Congress on how we want to move forward with it, but let's set it off on the side because we're going to be all right with it. Let's set the global war on terror off on the side because I believe that all Presidential candidates will fight that.

And as I take these issues on down then, the second amendment is another one. It's important. It's essential. We need to protect our right to keep and bear arms, and yet this Congress will protect our second amendment rights. The courts, I believe we will discover in March, or if the decision comes down the following June, that they will have protected our second amendment rights and written for a long time a definitive word on the meaning and the understanding of the second amendment to be consistent with our historical readings and understanding and the text of the Constitution. I think that happens. And I think, even with an unfriendly President on the second amendment, I think that this Congress in the end protects our second amendment rights. So as much as I believe in the second amendment, I think I can set that over on this side with the war on terror and with health care, those three in that category, that we can protect and defend this another way.

But what does it take a President to do? What will the next President do that will turn the destiny of the United States the most profoundly for the good, or miss that opportunity by taking a wrong turn and never being able to get back to the interstate again? And I believe the next President will make probably two appointments to the Supreme Court, maybe more, and these will be significant appointments to the Court.

I think it's imperative that we elect a President who understands that the nominees to the Supreme Court must be originalists, they must be textualists, they must be the kind of jurists who read the Constitution and understand that the Constitution means what it says, means the text that's in the Constitution. They must be the kind of judiciary that look at the Constitution and understand that we need to evaluate it within the original understanding of the Constitution because, without that, without originalism, without textualists, without the original intent of the Constitution as the foundational criterion for determining the constitutionality of current law, without that, the Constitution is no guarantee at all, except a guarantee to the justices to be able to manipulate their decisions to move this society in the direction they choose, as if they were legislators.

The last people that should be amending our Constitution, whether literally amending it or de facto

amending the Constitution by their decisions, are the nine Justices of the Supreme Court. The next President has to understand that. And he cannot ask the question of the potential nominees for the Court, are you pro-life or are you pro-choice? Are you pro-marriage or are you pro gay marriage? They can't ask that question because that would interfere with the confirmation process. It would interfere with the decision-making process. And, in fact, I don't ask those questions of the judges myself because I know they have to make a decision on the case that's before them. We would be asking them to make a decision on a case that hasn't been written or presented to them, perhaps.

But they need to be the kind of justices that have profound and reverent respect for this Constitution, for its meaning, for its guarantee. Because in it is the guarantee of our rights and our freedom like none other on the face of this Earth. And we cannot have a justice, or five of the nine, that decide they want to social engineer by the decisions that they make.

This next President must understand this, must have advisers that will probe into the potential nominees, and must come down with nominations of the kind of quality that we see in Justice Roberts, Justice Alito, two stellar appointments to the Supreme Court made by President Bush. If we can continue down that line, we will eventually see the justices in the lower courts start to respect the text of the Constitution, too. And then, in my perfect world, they will start to teach the Constitution in con law in law school instead of teaching off the case law. I know some of you do. Many do not. And that is essential.

So the issues for the next President to understand and promote and embody are the appointments to the Supreme Court being essential, that they be originalists, within the vein of Roberts and Alito. I want those decisions to come down on the Constitution, not on their will or their whim of what the policy should be; not in some legal contortionist approach to try to arrive at a conclusion that fits their social liberalism. I want a justice that can maybe come to a conclusion that, even though they disagree with the policy that unfolds, the Constitution says so, they must follow it. That becomes the most important thing. And life and marriage do hang in the balance on that, but those decisions will be made off the Constitution in my future world, not off the whim of the policy because we wish it so.

So as I look down through this list, life and marriage, wrapped up in the original understanding of the Constitution, that being, I think, the most important, and then the issue of our national sovereignty wrapped up within the immigration issue, who will defend our borders? Who is strong and who is silent? And as I evaluate the Presidential candidates, there are some who

have clearly supported our amnesty policy. And the Senator from Arizona has a policy such that has his name on it, or at least did have, the McCain-Kennedy. And some of that has changed, but the debate is the same and the policy is the same. It is amnesty. He served America honorably for every day of his adult life, and I have profound respect for Senator MCCAIN. He and I disagree on the amnesty issue and on the border. And I think that our national sovereignty and the destiny of America is turned if we don't uphold the rule of law.

I'm concerned about the mayor of a sanctuary city, Rudy Giuliani, who has essentially presided over a city that the "broken windows" policy is wonderful. It set a standard and cleaned up a city, but it did not preserve and protect the rule of law when it came to immigration. This Nation cannot be sustained if we don't uphold the central pillar of American exceptionalism, the rule of law. Those things weigh heavy in my head and on my heart and on my instincts when it comes to the evaluation process.

It weighs heavy on me that the State of Arkansas, to some degree, has become a sanctuary State because of the promotion there of the DREAM Act. Now, it has a nice name, but what it is is scholarships for illegals to go to college. And also opposition there for a ban on tax dollars going to welfare to illegals. People that are unlawfully present in the United States, the question needs to be asked and answered to each of these Presidential candidates, and I would implore you, you have this opportunity in places like Iowa, New Hampshire and South Carolina, ask these Presidential candidates, what would you do with the people here in the United States who are unlawfully here, whether they came across illegally on the border or overstayed their visa, how would you deal with them? Would you send them home, or wouldn't you, if they had broken no other laws? And if the answer is, well, we can make some other accommodation, or I would send them to college under a scholarship program, or I would grant them a path to citizenship, all of those things are amnesty.

If we don't have the will to send people home when we encounter them on the streets of America through our local law enforcement, for example, if we don't have the will to send them home, then we cannot have an immigration policy that is established here by the people in America. Our immigration policy will be driven by people in foreign countries that, some who drive here, some who take a boat here, some who fly here, but they come to America and do what they want to do, and then we have Presidential candidates out there that would adjust our national policy to accommodate their wish, their will, their whim against the wishes of the American people, against the rule of law. I think that weighs heavily when we make decisions on

who we support for President, weighs heavily if they have supported amnesty, and weighs heavily if they've advocated policies like sanctuary cities, if they've presided over sanctuary cities. It weighs heavily if protecting that central pillar of American exceptionalism, rule of law, has been sacrificed to a whim because of a heart taking over where the head needs to rule. We need to have tough love or we will be sacrificing the rule of law. And I am quite concerned that we have a series of Presidential candidates that won't hold their ground on that issue because holding their ground on the immigration issue holds our ground on the sovereignty issue.

Now, if they would make the right appointments to the Supreme Court, that's going to be, to some degree, a redeeming characteristic, but in the end, the right appointments to the Supreme Court and the sacrifice of our national sovereignty and the importation of every willing traveler changes forever the face of America. We have a unique American character, a unique American spirit. We have a vitality here, much of which comes from having skimmed the cream of the crop off the donor civilizations through the process of a legal immigration policy, and we have such a massive illegal policy that we can no longer have a debate in this Congress on a legal immigration policy. We need a President to lead us out of that, not a President that leads us into that mess even further.

To think of the idea of another 4 or 8 years of hypercompassionate conservatism that would grant a DREAM Act scholarship to people who are here illegally, or grant paths to citizenship to reward people who are unlawfully present here in the United States, that would not uphold the rule of law, undermines our sovereignty, what America do we have left?

If we have a court that would preserve life and marriage, but we don't have a national sovereignty that's protected because the heart of a presidential candidate ruled over their head, then we sacrifice our sovereignty and our destiny.

So, Mr. Speaker, I submit this: Look through the list of the issues that matter, life, marriage, the war on terror, illegal immigration, tax reform, the second amendment, health care, and our national sovereignty. Look at those issues that we can put over to the side and say, we can protect them and promote them here from Congress and we think all the Presidential candidates will stand behind them, and those would be the war on terror, the tax reform issue, which probably doesn't change our destiny right now, but we can put that off on the side because I just think that it's not a destiny changer at this moment. The second amendment we will protect here in this Congress. It's important, but we'll protect it. Health care is important, but we'll protect it. It's not constitutional, by the way, for those of you

who are wondering. But what it comes down to is life, marriage and our national sovereignty as viewed through whether we will protect our borders.

Ask yourselves: Do these Presidential candidates understand these issues? What is their focus on life and marriage? What confidence do you have in their judicial appointments all the way down the line? But ask yourselves, where are they in the end? Are they for or against amnesty? Do they stand up for amnesty, as I have defined it, or do they redefine it for their own purpose because their heart leads their head?

I hope you make some sound decisions and make a solid recommendation to America. I thank you for your attention tonight, Madam Speaker.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2352

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WELCH of Vermont) at 11 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 6, ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND SECURITY ACT OF 2007

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-474) on the resolution (H. Res. 846) providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 6) to reduce our Nation's dependency on foreign oil by investing in clean, renewable, and alternative energy resources, promoting new emerging energy technologies, developing greater efficiency, and creating a Strategic Energy Efficiency and Renewables Reserve to invest in alternative energy, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HINOJOSA (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and December 4.

Ms. HOOLEY (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for December 4, 5, and 6 on account of medical reasons.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today until 7 p.m.

Mr. ORTIZ (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after 3 p.m. on account of an event in the district.

Mr. LUCAS (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today after 2:30 p.m. and the balance of the week on account of a family commitment.

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 Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MEEK of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WALDEN of Oregon) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, December 12.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, December 12.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 863. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to fraud in connection with major disaster or emergency funds; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1327. An act to create and extend certain temporary district court judgeships; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Ms. Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1429. An act to reauthorize the Head Start Act, to improve program quality, to expand access, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, December 6, 2007, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4230. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Unshu Oranges From the Republic of Korea into Alaska [Docket No. APHIS-2006-0133] (RIN: 0579-AC20) received October 25, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.