

the result of my last alcoholic blackout after abusing alcohol for 12 long and painful years. I'm alive and sober today, Mr. Speaker, only because of the access I had to treatment in 1981. I'm living proof that treatment works and recovery is real.

But too many people don't have that access to treatment. It's a national disgrace that 270,000 Americans were denied addiction treatment last year. It's a national tragedy that 160,000 of our fellow Americans died from chemical addiction and 34,000 died from suicide as a result of their depression. And it's also, Mr. Speaker, a national crisis that untreated addiction and mental illness cost our economy over \$550 billion last year.

And what is Congress' response? Despite bipartisan passage by three House committees and two subcommittees, we were denied a vote in the full House on the Paul Wellstone Mental Health and Addiction Equity Act.

This legislation would give Americans suffering from addiction greater access to treatment by prohibiting health insurers from placing discriminatory barriers on treatment. As many as 16 million Americans in health plans could receive treatment under this act.

Despite the 273 cosponsors of H.R. 1424, this treatment parity bill, no vote was held. Despite the tens of millions of Americans suffering the ravages of addiction and mental illness, no vote was allowed to increase their access to lifesaving treatment.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to end the discrimination against people suffering from mental illness and chemical addiction. It's time to end the higher copayments, deductibles, out-of-pocket costs, and limited treatment stays, discriminatory barriers to treatment that don't exist for any other diseases. It's time to treat mental illness and chemical addiction under the same rules as physical illnesses.

Mr. Speaker, it's time for the House of Representatives to vote on the Paul Wellstone Mental Health and Addiction Equity Act. Those still suffering cannot afford to wait any longer.

RECOGNIZING CRAIG PENDLETON, FOUNDER OF NORTHWEST ATLANTIC MARINE ALLIANCE

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments to talk about Craig Pendleton, a fisherman from Maine who has dedicated his life to protecting and supporting small-boat fishermen and the communities that depend on them.

Craig is part of a long and proud tradition of fishing families in Maine. Like many fishermen in New England, he experienced the decline of major fishing stocks in the late 1980s and early 1990s and was frustrated by Federal management strategies that

seemed to penalize fishermen without really helping to rebuild the stocks.

Many fishermen experienced that frustration, but Craig stands out because he responded by rolling up his sleeves and working hard to find solutions. In 1997, my first year in the Congress, Craig founded the Northwest Atlantic Marine Alliance, or NAMA.

The purpose of NAMA was to work with fishermen up and down the coast of New England to articulate a vision for the future of fishing and fisheries management. Most of these fishermen were small owner-operators who had never participated in politics or management, but through NAMA Craig was able to get them involved.

NAMA was a new voice in the debate over how to manage New England's fisheries. Environmental organizations and Federal managers had long recognized that fish stocks were in trouble, but the small family fishermen were typically shut out of high-level discussions about how to solve the problem. These were the people without advocates, without lawyers, without expensive lobbyists. However, they were often the first to suffer the brunt of any new limits on fishing.

These are the fishermen that NAMA fights for. Over the years, under Craig Pendleton's lead, NAMA has worked tirelessly to help local fishermen understand the complicated jargon of new Federal fisheries regulations and draft their own proposals for new fisheries management plans. I worked closely with Craig and NAMA when I drafted provisions in the recently reauthorized Magnuson-Stevens Act to protect the interests of small-boat fishermen. Fishermen feel empowered by NAMA.

Recently, NAMA became one of the leading proponents of Area Management, an innovative fishery management strategy that allows local communities to take a leading role in managing fisheries resources. The strategy rests on the commonsense idea that fishermen, if they choose, should be able to take responsibility for environmental stewardship and the fair allocation of fisheries resources in their own communities.

Recently, Craig Pendleton announced that he is stepping down from the position he has held for 12 years as coordinating director of NAMA. Here today on the floor of the House, I would like to recognize Craig for all his years as a tireless advocate for fishermen and fish and for all that he has achieved for small-boat owners and operators in Maine and across the country.

I admire Craig and the other men and women involved with NAMA because they are willing to endure significant personal sacrifice to ensure that the fishing industry and way of life that they love are preserved for their children and grandchildren. I hope that those future generations will stand at the helms of their fishing vessels and see our time as a turning point, when small fishing communities across the country began to take a leading role in

the management of the fisheries resources on which they all depend. Craig Pendleton is a pioneer of that movement, and I would like to thank Craig on behalf of the people of Maine and wish him the best in his future endeavors.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. CLARKE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

THE HEALTHY HOSPITALS ACT

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. Madam Speaker, over the last several months, and certainly over the last 2 weeks, Congress has had a number of accomplishments. Today we did a number of things that were important such as funding for our troops. We also improved toy safety. But there have been a number of other opportunities which, unfortunately, with the schedule that we missed, that we could have done and should have done and I hope next year we will do. And that is while we are looking at issues to improve health care and reduce health care costs, when we talk about Medicare or Medicaid or SCHIP, one of the things we should have done was really work to lower costs and save money and save lives.

We hear both sides of the aisle these days talking about the costs of everything: The national debt in the trillions, earmarks need to be reduced, health care is too expensive. But too often we keep talking about these problems or saying perhaps Congress can find a way to pay for these things. But shouldn't we look at how to fix the problem and not just finance it?

We had a solution in front of us that could have saved \$50 billion in health care costs. But it didn't happen.

Earlier this year I introduced H.R. 1174, the Healthy Hospitals Act, which received strong bipartisan support. This legislation is a simple solution to lower costs associated with hospital- and health care-acquired infections.

The implementation of this bill is not expensive; it only requires hospitals to publicly disclose their hospital-acquired infection rates and follow simple cleanliness techniques that we already expect our caretakers to follow, things you assume that hospitals and clinics are doing, but, unfortunately, they are not always doing that: washing their hands, wearing gloves, sterilizing equipment before and after uses, testing patients for other diseases prior to treatment or admission to hospitals, giving antibiotics before and after surgery. These aren't

revolutionary ideas; they're just ideas that too often are not followed.

Well, how much of a difference does it really make letting the public know about hospital-acquired infection rates of individual hospitals? In my home State of Pennsylvania, to give a great example of what hospitals can do when they're held accountable for these infections, many hospitals, where they are now required by law to publicly post on the Internet their infection rates, have seen their rates drop to zero or near zero. Incredible, and a good story.

According to the Pennsylvania Health Care Cost Containment Council, the average charge of hospitalization in 2005 for a patient who became infected with a hospital-acquired infection was over \$185,000, but the average charge for a patient without infection was \$31,000. That's \$31,000 versus \$185,000, a difference of over \$150,000 per patient. Doesn't that tell us what we can be doing to save money and save lives? Now, multiply that statistic by 49 other States and we see what happens. We need to seek areas where we can reduce costs.

Let me point out the grim statistics of this year as of today. This year's toll of health care acquired infections, such as pneumonia, urinary tract infections, or what's been called the "super bug of methicillin-resistant infections," as of today, 1,934,246 cases, 87,010 deaths, and over \$48 billion spent on infections people acquired when they go to the hospital or go to the doctor.

Twenty-two other States have taken some steps to reduce these, and we need to make sure we make this a universal system of recording.

I hope that we work this next year to emphasize patient choice, patient quality, and patient safety, and pass H.R. 1174.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2640. An act to improve the National Instant Criminal Background Check System, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3890. An Act to amend the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act of 2003 to impose import sanctions on Burmese gemstones, expand the number of individuals against whom the visa ban is applicable, expand the blocking of assets and other prohibited activities, and for other purposes.

CLARIFICATION OF TERM OF THE COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table

the Senate bill (S. 2436) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the term of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 2436

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CLARIFICATION OF TERM OF THE COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 7803(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to appointment) is amended to read as follows:

“(1) APPOINTMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—There shall be in the Department of the Treasury a Commissioner of Internal Revenue who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Such appointment shall be made from individuals who, among other qualifications, have a demonstrated ability in management.

“(B) TERM.—The term of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall be a 5-year term, beginning with a term to commence on November 13, 1997. Each subsequent term shall begin on the day after the date on which the previous term expires.

“(C) VACANCY.—Any individual appointed as Commissioner of Internal Revenue during a term as defined in subparagraph (B) shall be appointed for the remainder of that term.

“(D) REMOVAL.—The Commissioner may be removed at the will of the President.

“(E) REAPPOINTMENT.—The Commissioner may be appointed to serve more than one term.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply as if included in the amendment made by section 1102(a) of the Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TAX TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2007

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4839) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make technical corrections, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4839

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Tax Technical Corrections Act of 2007”.

(b) AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in

this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(c) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; amendment of 1986 Code; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. Amendment related to the Tax Relief and Health Care Act of 2006.
- Sec. 3. Amendments related to title XII of the Pension Protection Act of 2006.
- Sec. 4. Amendments related to the Tax Increase Prevention and Reconciliation Act of 2005.
- Sec. 5. Amendments related to the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users.
- Sec. 6. Amendments related to the Energy Policy Act of 2005.
- Sec. 7. Amendments related to the American Jobs Creation Act of 2004.
- Sec. 8. Amendments related to the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001.
- Sec. 9. Amendments related to the Tax Relief Extension Act of 1999.
- Sec. 10. Amendment related to the Internal Revenue Service Restructuring and Reform Act of 1998.
- Sec. 11. Clerical corrections.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT RELATED TO THE TAX RELIEF AND HEALTH CARE ACT OF 2006.

(a) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 402 OF DIVISION A OF THE ACT.—Subparagraph (A) of section 53(e)(2) is amended to read as follows:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘AMT refundable credit amount’ means, with respect to any taxable year, the amount (not in excess of the long-term unused minimum tax credit for such taxable year) equal to the greater of—

“(i) \$5,000,

“(ii) 20 percent of the long-term unused minimum tax credit for such taxable year, or

“(iii) the amount (if any) of the AMT refundable credit amount determined under this paragraph for the taxpayer's preceding taxable year (as determined before any reduction under subparagraph (B)).”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect as if included in the provision of the Tax Relief and Health Care Act of 2006 to which it relates.

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS RELATED TO TITLE XII OF THE PENSION PROTECTION ACT OF 2006.

(a) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 1201 OF THE ACT.—Subparagraph (D) of section 408(d)(8) is amended by striking “all amounts distributed from all individual retirement plans were treated as 1 contract under paragraph (2)(A) for purposes of determining the inclusion of such distribution under section 72” and inserting “all amounts in all individual retirement plans of the individual were distributed during such taxable year and all such plans were treated as 1 contract for purposes of determining under section 72 the aggregate amount which would have been so includible”.

(b) AMENDMENT RELATED TO SECTION 1203 OF THE ACT.—Subsection (d) of section 1366 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) APPLICATION OF LIMITATION ON CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS.—In the case of any charitable contribution of property to which the second sentence of section 1367(a)(2) applies, paragraph (1) shall not apply to the extent of the excess (if any) of—