

let masses of people come in and bid down their wages; that we're not going to let people come into this country and give them, like that bill does, immediate legal status when some of them have communicable diseases, diseases which are coming into our schools which we licked years ago, threatening our children.

It is not hateful to say that we have to watch out for our children. It is not wrong for us to put that as a priority and say, yes, we care about those overseas, we care about others. But it is not wrong and hateful and it is not some sort of a selfishness to say we've got to take care of our own people with our limited resources.

Of course, big business has a hold on the GOP. There's no doubt about it. I've been in the party for a long time to see the undue influence that big business has on the party. It's very clear.

Yet big business is in an unholy alliance and the GOP is in an unholy alliance with the liberal left, the liberal left coalition that controls the Democratic party. It is this unholy coalition between the big business element of the Republican party and the liberal left coalition which dominates the Democratic party that is responsible for this invasion of our country, this attack to the well-being of our people. The coalition gives the jobs and passes out the benefits that have lured tens of millions of illegals into our country.

And it's no accident. This predicament was predictable. Big business wants to depress wages. The liberal left that controls the Democratic party wants to have political pawns. They believe that large numbers of illegals will help them change America, or even large numbers of newcomers will help them change America.

Well, if you give the jobs and benefits, as this coalition in our Congress has done for the last 10 years, if you give away the policies that created the jobs and the benefits that have gone to people who've come here illegally from overseas, well, if you give them the jobs and benefits, the masses of the people over there, if you told them that they are eligible for these benefits and these jobs, they will do anything to get here. And that's exactly what they've been doing. As you say, give it, and they will come. Surprise, surprise.

And now, the out-of-touch elite claim this new piece of legislation, the so-called comprehensive bill will, in some way, fix the immigration crisis. That's what you hear.

Well, everybody wants a comprehensive bill because we've got to do something. Doing nothing is better than doing something wrong. Doing nothing is better than doing something that'll make a problem worse. And of course the people who say you've got to do something are the ones who created the problem in the first place.

And, as I said, all of these things that they're trumpeting in the bill, the new enforcement measures, the security

measures, the fence, the new agents, the employer sanctions, all of these things are already in place in the law. But we have to give amnesty to illegals and actually encourage tens of millions more to come here in order to get that?

It's like Lucy holding out the football for Charlie Brown. This bill is yet another attempt to trick us as Lucy tricked Charlie every time. It is an illusion, a scam that will make things worse.

The Senate legislation being touted by Senator KENNEDY and the few Republican senators and our President, as I say, the purpose of that bill is to legalize the status of 15 to 20 million illegals, which will then bring tens of millions more. It is a pro-invasion bill. It behooves all of us, all of us to oppose that legislation because we love America.

The President has it all wrong. We want to do what's right for America. That's why we're opposing what he's suggesting.

In that bill, of course, is a provision that would increase the Border Patrol. And, as I say, the legislation going through the Senate actually increases the Border Patrol by fewer agents than is already required that the Border Patrol expand. A great deal has been made out of that. But let's take a look at what that really means.

Do we really believe that President Bush and this administration and, yes, those supporting this bill, are supportive of a strong border control of the fence and strengthening the Border Patrol?

This is an administration that has backed up U.S. attorneys who have taken Border Patrol agents who have stopped drug smugglers at our border and thrown the Border Patrol agents in jail for not following the proper procedures, giving immunity to the drug dealer, and throwing the book at the people, the law enforcement agents who are trying to protect us.

As we speak, Ramos and Compeon, two Border Patrol agents who, for 15 years combined in their lives, were risking their lives every day to protect us. One of them is a 10-year veteran of the Naval Reserve. The other served in the military before joining the Border Patrol. These people have clean records.

Yet the U.S. attorney has thrown the book at these folks, these two brave men, men whose records are clean. And yet he has, the U.S. attorney claims they are corrupt again by playing word games, just like his boss. And today, as we debate this bill, these two Border Patrol agents languish in solitary confinement in Federal prison.

How can anyone claim that they are in favor of the Border Patrol, strengthening the Border Patrol agents, when this administration has done so much to demoralize those people in the Border Patrol and to attack the well-being of those who are protecting us?

The demoralization of our Border Patrol is a grave threat to our national

security and the safety of people. We need to back our Border Patrol agents. They do not support this legislation. We need to be strong. We need to make sure that we are doing what is right for the American people. That is what this battle is all about.

Let's remember those two Border Patrol agents because they symbolize everything that's wrong with that legislation, everything that's wrong with the position of the elite in this country. These are just ordinary men, Ramos and Compeon, who were out trying to protect us, just like our military people overseas, risking their life. Yet they were told not to use their weapons on the border, and they did, and they did not follow the proper procedures, and they were thrown in jail.

Remembering them, remembering what we do right for our own people, let us oppose this effort to change the immigration laws that would bring more illegals into our country.

30-SOMETHING WORKING GROUP

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

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker; and it is an honor to come to the floor once again. My good colleagues that have, we come to the floor working on behalf of the 30-Something Working Group; and I can just attest that it's just great to be an American and have an opportunity to share our thoughts and ideas and concerns.

As you know, the 30-Something Working Group, we come to the floor to shed light on the action of the House and to talk about this new direction that we fought so hard for last November, especially on the Democratic side of the aisle, to move this country in a new direction and exactly what the American people have called for. So we're excited.

I'm glad to have Mr. ALTMIRE and also Mr. MURPHY here with me tonight. And I know that Mr. MURPHY has been pulling almost a double duty here. I understand he was Acting Speaker a little earlier tonight.

And I had the opportunity, while you were in the Chair, to join Speaker PELOSI celebrating her 20th year of public service, 20 years here in the House. There were a number of great Speakers that were there, honored her family for allowing her to serve this great country of ours, and also recognizing the fact that she's history as being the first female Speaker. But also there were people like Patti LaBelle there, and just a really star-studded event. She deserves that honor and that appreciation; and constituents also, I'm pretty sure, are pretty happy and proud. All Americans are.

With that, I, of course, we, Mr. Speaker, we and mainly as of late, talking about Iraq, and as we speak

here on the floor, there's a major debate going on just across the hall in the Senate dealing with comprehensive immigration reform. Just in the last 6 months, we have done so much and we've talked about so much and we've taken action on so many different issues; and I know that Mr. MURPHY and Mr. ALTMIRE and I will be addressing many of those issues tonight.

This is our first time since the Memorial Day break, and I had a wonderful opportunity to attend a NATO conference, parliamentary, that the Speaker appointed me and I think 12 other Members of the House, bipartisan, spent some time over in Portugal meeting with some of our European Union partners there, and had the opportunity to go to Tunisia to honor those World War II veterans that are, or honor those that paid the ultimate sacrifice. It's the only U.S. cemetery on the continent of Africa; and it was so very, very special and touching, just as an American and as a Member of Congress, to go there and lay a wreath on behalf of those that paid the ultimate sacrifice.

And then having, and still having, Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to come back here and join with my family, who's here in Washington, go down to the World War II Memorial, which had Tunisia and all of the different countries where World War II, we had fighting and men and women lost their lives, to make that connection, all in a 5-day span, is something great as an American.

□ 2215

I just want to share that with the Members of the House. And we know that one of our soldiers just today, one of the soldiers who was found in Iraq was laid to rest at Arlington Cemetery, and we know that there are two that are still missing of the recent ones that were missing from the IED that exploded recently in Iraq. So we paid honor to those that have paid the ultimate sacrifice and their families and also to those veterans that served beside them. And it was such a great week, and I know that many of the Members had an opportunity to go back to their districts to celebrate the life of those that paid the ultimate sacrifice.

With that, Mr. MURPHY, I would like to yield to you, sir.

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

You know, it is funny. This is my first time as a member of the 30-Something Group, and I know I am the puppy of the group because I am only 33 years old. So when I ran for Congress, I had tremendous support from the network community, those bloggers out there all across America. But there are bloggers, especially in Philadelphia and greater Philadelphia and the suburbs that blog every day, and they got so excited when the 30-Something Group was their voice when

you were in the minority. Your voice in talking about progressive values, talking about the things in the New Direction, that if we were just given the chance, we would lead. And when we got that chance just a few months ago in the 110th Congress, those bloggers, that network community, are just so proud of their efforts. And it is neat for me to be here to think that when we had a rebirth in our country and Philadelphia, the city of Philadelphia was part of that rebirth and to know that six of the ten biggest bloggers in our country are from Philadelphia and the Philadelphia suburbs. People like Chris Bowers of MyDD and Duncan Black of Atrios and how they are following the 30-Something Group every day and to be part of this group now is just a really proud moment.

And another proud moment that the gentleman from Florida mentioned is the fact that today is the 20th anniversary of the public service of the Speaker of the House, Ms. NANCY PELOSI from California. And when I was in this body just a few months ago speaking and taking that oath of office, taking that oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States as a Member of Congress, and when I was there with my wife, Jenni, and my 6-month old, at that time a month old, daughter, Maggie Murphy, and I know, Mr. Speaker, that they are watching at home on C-SPAN because I am down here trying to work on behalf of our great country, I know that I was thinking of not just the folks that are over in Iraq, those men that I served with or those men that I had taught when I was a professor at West Point, but I thought about my month-old daughter, Maggie, and I thought about what an incredible story it is that when she was born into this great country, the third most powerful person is a woman, the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

And I thought about a role model. Here is this Italian Catholic woman originally from Baltimore, now in San Francisco, and the criticism about the Speaker before she got in here was that she wasn't going to do a good job or she was going to lead from the left. She has really made this a House united. She has reached across the aisle to the Republicans. She has tried to lead in a moderate fashion, and I think we have to give her a lot of credit. I know the analysts have said that she is getting high marks as the Speaker, and I know that I am proud that she is our Speaker and I am proud to serve under her leadership.

I will keep my remarks relatively brief. It is my maiden voyage here with the 30-Something Group, and I am joined as well with one of my brothers, the other MURPHY, CHRIS MURPHY, who is the elder statesman from Connecticut, who is a whole, I think, 30 some days older than I am, and I know tonight the Speaker Pro Tempore is the gentleman from the great State of Indiana, the sheriff, but tonight I want

to speak about the New Direction that we are bringing about.

Finally, the rubber stamp Congress of the past is gone and the do something Congress is here. And we all campaigned in saying that we were going to hold President Bush accountable. And I had served in Baghdad as a captain with the 82nd Airborne Division, and I am so proud of my military service. My father served during Vietnam in the Navy. My grandfather served. My brother is still serving in the Air Force. And I think back to those times and what you come to expect of the Congress. And our men and women who are serving so honorably fight for our country. They fight to support and defend the Constitution of the United States, and they execute the public policy as it is drafted and implemented here in Washington.

And I know that I get e-mails from Iraq and Afghanistan and those heroes talk about sometimes they don't know what the policy necessarily should be, but what they do appreciate is the fact that we are actually having a debate, that we are actually asking the tough questions necessary. So when we talk about a New Direction in this 110th Congress, when we talk about accountability, part of that is what we just passed out of the Armed Services Committee with the defense appropriations bill. Talking about in Iraq when we give the Iraqis support, why is it that 4 years later they are still, for the most part, sitting on the sidelines? Why is it that we gave them pallets and pallets, crates and crates of literally U.S. money and pallets stacked this high, shipped it over to Baghdad, gave it out, and billions and billions of dollars are simply missing?

When we talk about accountability, we have to talk about the weapons that we have given the Iraqis. In the United States military, and I joined it back in 1993, we are taught pretty early that your weapon is your best friend. There was even a cadence that I used to sing when I would jog in the morning and run troops, "I used to date a beauty queen; now I date my M-16." And it is kind of funny, but it is true in that you are always around your weapon. It is part of that accountability. If you lose your weapon, that is the end of your career. You will be lucky if you don't get court-martialed.

But how that relates to Iraq is we have given the Iraqis 14,000 weapons, AK-47s, M-16s, that are now missing. Think about that. We have given 14,000 weapons to the Iraqis that are completely missing, unaccounted for. That is not the accountability that our taxpayers are expecting. That is not the accountability that we should be expecting when we fight the war on terror because when you give billions of dollars over in Iraq, when you give 14,000 weapons to Iraq that are now just missing, that affects the lives of our soldiers. And we cannot stand for that.

I would also like to talk about accountability when it comes to Afghanistan and Pakistan. Almost 6 years ago,

our Nation was attacked by Osama bin Laden. Thousands of innocent civilians, innocent Americans were murdered on September 11 of 2001. The culprit: Osama bin Laden. He was in Afghanistan. He trained al Qaeda, and al Qaeda was really given a free pass by the government there, the Taliban. And we made a decision. We got a coalition. We got Canada and all these other countries going in there in Afghanistan to do the job. And then a short time later, President Bush said, no, let's change our focus to Iraq. Well, we have ten times more troops now in Iraq now than in Afghanistan. And when we talk about accountability, you have to ask the question, what are we doing to get Osama bin Laden? Why is it that we give Pakistan billions of dollars? We actually give Pakistan \$80 million a month because we have intelligence that is unclassified that we can talk about here in this setting that Osama bin Laden is in Afghanistan and possibly on the border of Pakistan. So we need Pakistan's help as an ally.

Why is it that President Musharraf has outsourced the hunt for Osama bin Laden to his regional warlords?

Years ago we learned that we outsourced the hunt for Osama bin Laden in Tora Bora and he slipped through our fingers when we had a chance. We can't repeat the same mistakes. So if we are giving support to Pakistan and Afghanistan, which we should, they are our allies, we need to demand accountability. We need to demand the accountability that the American taxpayers, that the American families, and that the American soldiers deserve.

And the last point I would like to bring up on my maiden voyage here in the 30-something Group is education. One of the greatest jobs I ever had was being a professor at West Point teaching constitutional military law. And it was the Constitution that those young cadets who were about to become second lieutenants were going to take an oath to support and defend. And education is vital for Americans and our students to be more and more competitive in a global economy.

I joke with the gentleman from Florida we are not competing in my district in Bucks County for jobs against Florida. As I look at Mr. ALTMIRE, we are not competing with the folks in Pittsburgh in Bucks County. I look at the congressman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY). We are not competing with jobs necessarily against the folks in Connecticut. We are competing for jobs with people in China and South Korea and Japan and in Europe. And we need to have high investment in education so we remain more competitive.

And this gets me into our national debt. Right now our debt is over \$9 trillion. So that means every man, woman, and child in America owes over \$29,000 to our national debt. So that means when my daughter, Maggie, was born 6 months ago at Lower Bucks Hospital in

Bucks County, Pennsylvania, she was born in that hospital and she owed \$29,000 to our national debt. That is a debt that we owe to foreign countries like communist China, like Japan, like South Korea, like Mexico. We keep borrowing and borrowing and borrowing and borrowing.

Now, when I am back home, people say to me, PATRICK, we are at war. Of course it is going to cost money.

And I say, \$9 trillion we have in debt, \$9 trillion; yet this war in Iraq has only cost at this point about \$450 billion. That is a huge difference.

And how it relates to education is just in March of 2007, we paid \$21 billion just that month on the interest rate to this debt, just paying off the interest rate that we owe, \$21 billion. But that same month we only paid \$5 billion in education. So what we spend on education, \$5 billion, we spend four times that much that same month on our interest rate on our debt.

We need a change and we are making that change happen here in the 110th Congress. And I am proud to be part of it. I am proud to be part of the leadership to make sure we do what is necessary, establishing a pay-as-you-go system, doing the things necessary to hold all of us accountable and this government accountable.

So I would say to the gentleman of Florida, thank you for giving me the opportunity on this maiden voyage. I look forward to many more times back here with the 30-something Group, and I am proud of all those supporters not just back home in Bucks County and northeast Philadelphia and Montgomery County and the network community. I am proud, on this 20th anniversary, of the public service of our leader, Speaker PELOSI, to be here amongst the 30-something Group. Thank you so much.

□ 2230

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. MURPHY, I am just so happy that you had an opportunity to share some of your wisdom with us here tonight and also a perspective, especially someone who has been in harm's way and has been in the field with our men and women, and at the same time talking about education.

We just had a major education summit right before the break that the Speaker put forth, and Mr. MILLER and Ms. DELAURO were a part of that effort, and we were just so pleased to do that.

In the 30-Something Working Group, we kind of like to have a conversation. We know that everyone has to make an opening remark or statement, but, Mr. ALTMIRE, I am looking forward to hearing what you want to share with the members.

And, also, one of my constituents once called me. Serving in public service, you have an opportunity to hear some interesting things. He called me up. And you know these cable talk shows, where you go down to public television and you sign up and it's like

a nonprofit organization. He called me, and I was a State representative at that time, and he said, Kendrick, I want you to come on my show. And I said, well, what are we going to talk about? And he said, we're going to talk about the consequences of the consequences.

So I had to kind of, I was on the phone and I said, "consequences of the consequences?" And he said, "Yes, the consequences of the consequences could be consequential."

But in this case, as we look at the consequences of the consequences, using his description of what was going on at that particular time, I couldn't help, as I yield to you, but look at the Newsweek cover.

I went home tonight before I came over here. My wife joined me at the celebration for the Speaker. And this Newsweek cover that many of us will be reading this week says, "After Bush. How to Restore America's Place in the World." I mean, this is not a Democratic publication, Mr. Speaker. I think it's important for us to understand that we are living in serious times. And here at the 30-Something Working Group, we try to break things down so that everyone can understand, where Members won't say, well, I didn't know exactly my role at that particular time.

There are very historic votes that are taking place here. We just had an emergency supplemental. I think that every vote that every Member took was a heroic vote and a sheroic vote, in my opinion, need it be in the positive or the affirmative.

But I think it's important for all of us to realize that we have a role to play. And many of us, I know I do, share getting our men and women back home and bringing an end to this conflict, especially as it relates to U.S. troops serving in combat posture on the streets of Baghdad in the middle of a civil war.

Mr. ALTMIRE.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I just want to say how proud I am of my fellow Pennsylvanian and the second Murphy now to join the 30-Something Working Group, along with the gentleman from Connecticut. He is someone that we look to for his expertise, having been in the field of battle and having served in this conflict; and I really am excited to hear that he is going to be joining us now with the 30-something group to talk more about these issues. And he definitely has a unique perspective that he's adding. So I was excited to hear his voice, and I am very proud to hail from the same State.

I wanted to talk a little bit about one of the consequences of this action that we're talking about, as Mr. MEEK brought up, is the fact that we are creating, through our actions in Iraq and Afghanistan, hundreds of thousands of new veterans are returning to this country, many of whom are returning seriously injured. We have over 25,000 that have been injured. We are approaching 4,000 killed now. And those

that are returning and are going to have to use the VA system are going to find, thankfully, that for the first time in the history of the program, 77 years of the Department of Veterans Affairs, we have increased funding at a rate that has never been seen in the history of the Department. We are up to approximately \$15 billion in increased funding for the VA in this Congress.

And as every member of the 30-Something Working Group knows and certainly every Member of this House knows, this is a priority issue for me. Funding for Veterans Affairs has languished in the past several years, unfortunately, but this Congress has stepped up to the plate in a bipartisan way, I will say, to give the Veterans Affairs Department, especially the health accounts, the necessary funding to take care of these hundreds of thousands of veterans that we are creating in Iraq and Afghanistan.

These are men and women who have fought bravely, people like Mr. MURPHY from Pennsylvania who have put their lives on the line, who have left a family behind to do this and have made every possible sacrifice. They deserve to know that they can count on the United States to give them the health care that they deserve and that they have earned, that they've been promised when they entered the military.

So we voted in just the first 5 months here in this Congress to increase funding by \$15 billion for the VA. And significantly, for the first time ever, we exceeded the recommended independent budget request of the service organizations, the American Legion, the VFW, and others.

I want to repeat that point for my colleagues. For the first time ever, Congress exceeded the request of the service organizations. I think that's something we can be proud of.

We talk about the enormous achievements we've had in the first 5 months, the many bills and the different subjects that we have addressed. The fact that we have paid attention to and finally moved forward with our veterans health care facility in a way that is unprecedented in the history of this country is I think one of the things we can be most proud of in our first 5 months in office here.

Some of the things that this funding is going to allow us to do, we are going to be able to hire more doctors and nurses and improve medical services at the VA. As we saw with some of the Department of Defense facilities with regard to health care and Walter Reed, chronic underfunding can lead to some disastrous consequences. We need to make sure that we don't allow that to happen in our VA system. So this bill is going to improve the quality of care.

I have in my district a Department of Veterans Affairs hospital that is undergoing a \$100 plus million expansion right now. Hopefully, when that is done, we are going to have in my district the preeminent health care facility in the entire VA network; and I

want every VA facility to have that type of access across this country. Our veterans deserve nothing less than the highest quality health care this Nation can provide for them.

We are going to reduce waiting times. We have a backlog at the VA, unfortunately, of nearly 500,000 cases. And every Member of this House knows, you probably have the same experience that I am having in my office of people who are calling, frustrated veterans who want to access the VA health system but they have to wait, they have to get in line. And it is a very long line, weeks or months of waiting, because of that backlog, nearly 500,000 cases. The bill that we passed in this House, the legislation that we've passed is going to go a long way towards improving that situation.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. ALTMIRE, if you would yield, and Mr. MURPHY, I just don't want it to go by. You're talking about what we just passed before we left, received the funding for, with a major fight at the White House. I mean, the President wanted to veto it. He said that's not what I asked for. Meanwhile, Walter Reed was still standing by for the dollars to be able to make the corrections that they need to make.

We know that we passed the Chairman's, Mr. SKELTON's, bill, Armed Services bill off this floor to help us with readiness and all of those things. The President said that he is going to veto many of these things that are over his mark. But what you're talking about is something that we couldn't even dream of in the last Congress. I mean, you start thinking about how we moved the ball down field, and I mean by force. And Mr. Speaker, I can tell you, many of us, not only do we have to eat our Wheaties, but we have to do our pushups. And mentally we have to prepare ourselves between our ears to go to battle on behalf of the American people and those that have served.

So I hear exactly what you're saying. I just want to make sure that Members understand. And guess what? Again, Democratic leadership. A number of Republican colleagues, I believe with maybe 80 of them, voted against the emergency supplemental to get these dollars to our veterans to show you that if we can get these great issues to the floor and that we can get a vote on them that the American spirit and the bipartisan spirit will then take off, versus those that said, well, we don't need to do it. And we are doing it in a meaningful way that veterans are going to see an improvement as we move on.

So I just wanted to hit that real quick, and I yield back. But I just wanted to be able to, especially from a person that was around as it relates to Members on the floor, now, I guess I'm the only Member that was in the 109th Congress and 108th Congress, to reflect on that historical note there of just leadership and making it happen on behalf of our veterans in Pennsylvania and other States.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I appreciate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MEEK) for his comments and certainly his leadership on this issue, which is unmatched in this House. I am proud to hear your comments.

We have a situation at Walter Reed which we all came to know very well, of course, in the months. I had the opportunity to tour Walter Reed, and when you see these kids that are returning from battle and you think about them, one of the fantastic gentlemen that we met was a 2005 graduate of the Naval Academy. And you can picture him just 2 short years ago in his uniform, throwing his hat in the air, excited, cream of the crop, the best this Nation can put forward, and he came home just horrifically injured.

It breaks your heart to see these men and women who fought so bravely, and you think that they went home to Walter Reed, and it is our responsibility to give them the best medical care that money can provide, and we had disastrous things happening there. You think of the living conditions that were outlined in that Washington Post article, and the paint peeling from the walls and the rodents and the mold, and you think, how could we possibly have let this happen?

For several years, there were complaints that were made, but nothing was done about it. But this Congress is doing something about it. We have not only done the investigations and the oversight to find out what went wrong and to hold those accountable who are responsible for what happened at Walter Reed, but, just as important, we have a commitment in this House and in this Congress that this is never going to happen again.

We are going to give the necessary funding to the Department of Defense and to Walter Reed so that they can take care of the maintenance and the repair that's necessary. And we are going to do a top-to-bottom review of every Department of Defense health facility and every VA facility in this country, find out if anything similar is happening, if there are any problems of this sort, and fix them immediately, not wait for this to take place again.

Because it shouldn't take a Washington Post article. It shouldn't take the newspaper to bring this situation to light. We have a responsibility, and we are fulfilling that responsibility, to ensure that this never happens again. And we are doing that in a variety of ways, through oversight and through the funding increases that I've talked about.

The supplemental bill that we supported and that went to the President's desk, which was signed, included an increase in funding to help the Department of Defense health care and the VA health facilities fulfill these obligations. And, as I said, we are now at record levels. The Appropriations Committee dealing with Veterans Affairs just today announced that they had marked up their bill with a \$6.7 billion

increase in funding for the VA which, as I said, for this 1 year is the largest in history and is nearly \$4 billion above what the President had requested.

We are going to talk a little bit later about bipartisanship, and that is an issue of which there can be no disagreement. There are issues that we talk about, like immigration, like Iraq, like tax cuts, where there is a deep divide among us. There are serious policy differences among us. But every Member of this House can agree that there is no group that should stand ahead of our Nation's veterans when it comes time to make Federal funding decisions. That is an issue that we can all agree on.

I am proud to be a Member of this House that has, for the first time in a very long time, as I said, created an atmosphere where we all agree that veterans come first, and we need to increase the level of funding for the VA health facilities after years and years of neglect.

So, with that said, I would yield at this time to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Thank you very much, Mr. ALTMIRE.

I want to key off of your last point there, just spend a couple moments before we kick it back to Mr. MEEK, on that issue of bipartisanship. Because you are exactly right. You know, it seems like a pretty simple premise that the cost of the war should include taking care of the warriors when they return back home, that the cost of the war isn't just the guns and the ammunition and the mechanics necessary to fight a war in Iraq or Afghanistan, the cost of the war is also taking care of those men and women when they get back home. That is this war and that is previous wars.

So it sounds like a pretty unanimous premise that we could all get behind, but the fact is that we didn't get behind it, and we didn't get behind it until the Democrats took control of this Congress. It was just platitudes and rhetoric for a long time, "let's support our troops and support our veterans."

□ 2245

So I think we got to be clear today, as much as we are going to talk about the importance of bipartisanship, it took the Democrats to put some of these issues out before the House in order to garner bipartisan votes. I think that is maybe as important as anything that we have done in these first 5 months, is that we have gotten rid of that old rule that I heard a little bit about when I was watching this place from afar in Connecticut called the "majority of the majority."

I heard about this rule where nothing could come to the floor of the House of Representatives unless the majority of the majority party supported it. So you had very few opportunities for there to be real bipartisan cooperation, because you had to have almost unani-

mous agreement from the majority party, at the time the Republicans, in order for anything to get down here to the floor of the House.

We talked a lot, Mr. MEEK, when we stood up here after that sort of glorious first 100 hours about those bills, those six or seven bills that we passed, and how many Republicans we had on board with each one of those. They were really remarkable numbers. On average we had 60-70 Republican votes for each one of those. It doesn't get covered much in the news. The news wants to cover just the grinding and gnashing of the two parties.

We had a lot of bipartisan cooperation, and that has continued. That has continued. In the last few weeks here we had on a bill to reauthorize funding for children's healthcare, we had 123 Republicans supporting it. That same 123 Republicans supporting increased record funding for Katrina recovery. On the joint funding resolution that finally restored some fiscal balance to this country, we had 57 Republicans supporting it. Increasing the minimum wage, 82 Republicans.

I know when you turn on the cable news networks you are not going to hear about the times that we agree. But why a lot of us were so enthusiastic to stop by and send well wishes to Speaker PELOSI on her 20 years in Congress is because she has made good on her commitment to make this the most open and ethical and bipartisan Congress in a real, real long time.

I know, Mr. MEEK, this doesn't get the headlines all the time, that the newspapers want to talk about the places that we conflict. But there has been a lot of cooperation here and it has mattered. I think it has made a difference.

I think one of the things the people don't understand is sort of how this place works, and I certainly didn't understand it until I got here.

It used to be it was impossible, virtually impossible, for Democrats to get their amendments heard on the floor of the House of Representatives. You were going to get a bill introduced by the Republicans, and that was about it. No more debate, no changes, no amendments. Nothing. No real opportunity for the People's House to actually engage in a real argument, in a process of coming up with a better piece of legislation.

That has changed now. In the first 5 months of 2005, we had two what are called open rules, bills in which any Member can put forth an amendment, have a chance to have that idea vetted and aired out before the House of Representatives. We have quadrupled the number of bills that have come before this House under a so-called open rule.

I know these are sort of arcane terms that people out there may not understand, but they matter. It means that every single one of the 435 people that are elected here have a chance to make a bill better, have a chance to have their voice their constituents' voices

heard. For a long time it was shut down.

So it was a good night tonight to be able to celebrate Speaker PELOSI's two decades here in the House. A lot of us are excited about the potential that lies before us to be able to really reset our direction in Iraq, to do better things in energy policy, to stand up for working families.

But for a lot of us that came here on the backs and shoulders of our constituents who have virtually lost complete faith in politics, maybe we are just as excited about the fact that, despite what you may see in the cable news networks or reading the headlines, we actually are starting slowly to bring people together here, to open up this House, this process, again, to make it a true bipartisan People's House.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. You know, Mr. MURPHY, it is very hard to move in a bipartisan fashion. One speaks constantly about the bipartisan spirit, about bipartisan action. Spirit and action are two different interpretations of actually getting something done.

The action part means that Members are able to vote with their voting cards or walk up to that desk and sign a card that says yea or nay and work in a bipartisan spirit on the yea. Many amendments from our Republican colleagues, some of them are passed and some of them are not passed. But the bottom line is they have at least the opportunity to come to the floor and to bring their ideas to the floor. Definitely in the area of financial services.

We have spent a very long time, Mr. Speaker, on this floor hearing Republican amendments that were offered in committee, offered in subcommittee. Some came to the floor and we were able to work those amendments out to become a part of the work product. Others just wanted to file an amendment, for whatever reason, but had their opportunity in this democracy to do so.

Many of the Members in this House, of course we have a lot to do, and Members when they come to the floor, they said, I thought this amendment was already voted down in committee? But many of the Members on the minority side, the Republican side, had an opportunity to offer it, Mr. MURPHY. I think this really makes a difference between Democratic leadership and Republican leadership.

Even though we may not agree, giving the opportunity to others to be able to take part in this democracy, something that was suppressed in the two previous Congresses that I can speak to. And I can tell you that it should be well-noted here that this House has provided the kind of leadership to allow the minority party here in this House, which are the Republicans, to have a voice in the process of making laws. That is so very, very important.

I will say this and then yield back to you. Some are saying, why aren't you

treating the Republicans as the Republicans treated you or treated Democrats. Well, guess what? Forty-two new Members of the House, especially when you are on the Democratic side, all of you in this Chamber who are part of the majority makers, they voted for change. They didn't vote for the same. They voted for a government that can work in a bipartisan way. They voted for the kind of leadership to allow minority Members, who have constituents just like I have, to vote for veterans assistance, to be able to vote to make sure we put forth dollars to come up with alternative fuels and other ways that we can supply America so that we can invest in the Midwest versus the Middle East. They voted for all of that.

And guess what? That takes time and tolerance, Mr. Speaker, and that is something that the Republican majority in the previous Congress did not have. I am glad we have the tolerance. I am glad we are taking the time. I am glad we are working the way we are working, even though it is very painful for many of us and our constituents and many that have our families back in the district.

In this time and this place in history, when you have cover after cover, how do we restore America's place in the world, it is not how the world thinks about us. It is about what kind of leadership are we providing, not only for our constituents, but for the United States of America. And just at a time we are trying to dig ourselves out of out-of-control borrowing from foreign nations, we are seeing differently.

I am a Member of the NATO parliamentary group, and I can tell you, when you are talking to some countries, and it is kind of like you have to be quiet for a moment, have some level of contrition and listen to what other people are saying, because they feel we have been dictating to them what they should do and what they should think, and they are saying, by the way, you owe us money. You owe me money. You owe my country money.

So we have domestic issues that we have to cover. I know we are going to talk about stem cell research and I think that is very, very important. That is part of the new direction. It is leadership. Sometimes leadership is lonely. But we have to do it.

Mr. MURPHY, I just want to thank you for bringing some of these issues to light and talking about what it takes to bring about bipartisan action versus Members coming to the floor and saying we should have a bipartisan spirit.

Well, spirit is a good thing, if you use it religiously. One of my friends, Dr. Michael Eric Dyson, I have read a couple of his books, he says spirit makes religion act right. The real issue is that it is good to have spirit. We all feel good about it. But action is even better.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. You can talk the talk, but you have to come out here and do it. You have got to put bills before this House that have

Republican ideas in them and have Democrat ideas in them. And you have to be okay with the fact that we can share credit. Listen, nobody in my district cares whether I am a Republican or a Democrat, as long as I am on the right side of the issues, as long as I am fighting for what they believe I should be fighting for.

People don't think in Republican or Democratic terms back at the places we come from. They think about Republican and Democratic terms here inside the Beltway in Washington, DC, but back out in America, Mr. MEEK, people think about what is right and wrong; what is good for people and what is bad for people. Not Republican and not Democrat. I think we are beginning to start to figure that out.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. MURPHY, you are 110 percent right, and that is what folks voted for. They didn't vote for you to go be the strongest Democrat you can be, or I want you to go and be Republican-like. The bottom line is they voted for us to be Members of Congress, constitutional officers having a part in this process, one of the three branches of Government, and making sure that every Member is able to fulfill their constitutional duty and come here and participate.

I feel so good about it, it is like almost I have chill bumps. To be able to come to this floor, to be a part of the whole begging, if you get us an opportunity to train the thought it could. All of those things we talked about, you think about where we were and where we are now, and that we still have the kind of spirit that we had then, we still want to fight and we still have battles ahead of us.

We have a President that is saying you do anything over the budget that I set forth, no matter how good it may be, children's healthcare, veterans affairs, the issues dealing with the environment, I am going to veto it.

Well, you know something? We are here saying fine, if you want to veto it, then consider yourself challenged, versus, well, if you say you are going to veto it, then I guess we can't do it. Even though we have our challenges in the Senate, I think that it is very, very important as it relates to getting a number of these agenda items through, because of the close numbers there, I think the American people are going to continue to follow in the spirit of a new direction and help us carry out the agenda that they wanted originally, and hopefully some of our Republican colleagues in the Senate will be able to come together and have bipartisan action and move it forward.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Before we send this back over to Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. MEEK, let's talk about an issue on which I think this Congress is going to stand together tomorrow, Republicans and Democrats, and stand against the policies of a President who is going to show once again how out of step he is with the American public, and that is on the issue of stem cell research.

Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity when I was in the Connecticut State Senate to author Connecticut's Stem Cell Investment Act. Connecticut became the first State in the Nation through a legislative act to invest public dollars in stem cell research. I am real proud of that.

But part of the reason that I decided to leave the State Senate and come here to the United States Congress is because it was a bittersweet victory for us. We shouldn't have 50 different State legislatures investing in basic scientific research; certainly not the type of potentially pioneering, life-saving scientific research that stem cell research, both adult and embryonic, holds in its vast and potentially limitless potential.

So, tomorrow, we are going to take up a bill that we took up at the beginning of January, now coming back to us from the Senate, which is the Stem Cell Research Enhancement Act of 2007, which is once again going to allow for Federal dollars to be used for both embryonic and adult stem cell research around this country, and, by the way, finally put some real ethical and moral and scientific boundaries around that research.

One of the great secrets in this world today is if you don't live in a State like Connecticut, California or New Jersey that has put forth in State legislation some moral and ethical parameters around stem cell research, this research is largely unregulated in this country. So I think the most important thing we will do tomorrow is pass in a bipartisan way a bill that will start to turn on Federal funds for research that, as we know, potentially will unlock the treatments and cures for such insidious diseases as juvenile diabetes and Parkinson's research and maybe even for cancer some day.

This isn't tomorrow's cure and it is not even the day after tomorrow's cure, but if we don't start investing now and start investing at a Federal level, start investing our Federal dollars, we are never going to get to that day when we can start to realize the potential of stem cell research.

But here is where the rub is. We are going to do this with Republicans and Democrats standing together. There will be more Democrats supporting it than there will be Republicans. That is just how this issue is going to work. But this is going to be an issue in which this Congress, because we are in tune with what the people are telling us, that they want us to use the research at our disposal to try to make people's lives better, that is what this is all about, trying to use the resources of the Federal Government, the communal resources of the American people, to try to make our lives better, that is what stem cell research can do. They want us to make that jump. It is going to land on the President's desk and he has already told us once again that he will veto it.

He is continually out of step with where the American people are with

this war in Iraq. Now he will once again show us he is out of step with where the American people are on healthcare.

But, once again, we are going to show that if we stand together, if we put party aside and we listen to what the people want, in this case they want a Federal Government that is going to start standing up and trying to find cures for cancer and Parkinson's disease and bone marrow disease, that we can do some pretty amazing things here if we stand together.

We passed things with bipartisan support in the past. We will do it tomorrow on maybe one of the most important things that we will do before we take our break for the summer, which is invest in stem cell research.

□ 2300

Mr. MEEK of Florida. I just want to say that Mr. MURPHY presented himself so well tonight. Mr. RYAN is in Ohio tonight, and he BlackBerryed me and said he wished he could be here with us. As you know, Mr. RYAN is an outstanding Member of Congress. He had a death in his family and had to return to his district. We appreciate and recognize his absence. I am going to e-mail him back and say, Mr. RYAN, I think one of the reasons why things are moving so smoothly, you guessed, is because you're not here; but that is another issue.

Mr. ALTMIRE, one thing that we need to talk about as relates to stem cell research, there are so many diseases that could be cured, and 72 percent of Americans are supporting this research. We have kids with juvenile diabetes. There are a number of issues that we want to try to move on. This is a leadership issue. The thing about leadership is it is lonely sometimes.

I get e-mails and calls from my constituents, I support this; or, KENDRICK, I wasn't quite with you on that decision. But the good thing is something is happening, action versus inaction.

Mr. ALTMIRE. I wanted to commend the gentleman from Connecticut again. We say a lot of things when we are transferring comments here back and forth about the different roles that we play, but it truly is the truth to say there is no one in this Congress who has done more on a public policy basis to promote this issue than the gentleman from Connecticut. He has done it at the State level. He is passionate about it. He has done it here in Congress. He has made it a staple issue of his young career, and I want to commend him. He has shown great leadership.

And in saying that, I want to recognize that we have a colleague, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), who certainly deserves credit second to none for her pushing this agenda. I certainly don't want to overlook her in recognizing Mr. MURPHY's equal efforts on this issue.

I have a unique perspective in my support of this issue in that I am a pro-

life Member of Congress. I used the occasion of my first floor speech on the floor of this House specifically on this issue because it is that important to me.

I have a view that embryonic stem cell research and a vote to promote it is a pro-life vote. By voting to pursue embryonic stem cell research, we are voting to improve the lives of people. And most importantly with this bill, we are voting only on, and this is a very key point, lines of stem cells that would otherwise be discarded by the fertility clinic. That cannot be overlooked.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. That is a very good point.

Mr. ALTMIRE. This is not a situation where we are going to be able to pick and choose types of stem cells that can be used for other purposes. The administration talks about snowflake babies and other uses. These are only lines of stem cells where the donor has said I am done using them. They cannot be used for my other purpose, they are to be discarded, and then they agree that the stem cells could be used for research purposes. Otherwise they are discarded.

That is something that in my mind is the decisive point on this. If they are going to be discarded anyway, hundreds of thousands of lines of embryonic stem cells, why not use them for scientific research to save the lives and improve the lives of people who are alive today, real men and women who are suffering from diseases, and the people who don't know they are going to have those diseases in the future, people who are going to suffer from these diseases tomorrow.

We are talking about debilitating diseases, we are talking about long-term diseases that are reaching epidemic proportions in my district of southwestern Pennsylvania, like diabetes. Imagine if this research could show a cure or improved treatment for any of these illnesses. Why would we not use them for scientific purposes if they are otherwise going to be discarded.

I am certainly not the only pro-life Member who is going to support this tomorrow, as the gentleman said. But I do want to emphasize this is an issue whose time has come. The President has vetoed it in the 109th Congress. He has vetoed it once in this 110th Congress. We are expecting we are going to face a second veto, and I know the vote is going to be close on whether or not we are going to be able to override that veto.

But we have sent a message, and we are going to do it tomorrow, that the time for this issue has come. This is not about political games or trying to score points for a political agenda. This is about saving lives and improving the lives of people who are alive today, and I strongly support this initiative.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. You couldn't ask for a better feeling being a Member of Congress. I always share out that. Out on the steps of the Capitol at least

once or twice a week we have young people from our districts, and they want to hear from Members of Congress. The difference between us and the average American out there, and there are only 500-plus Members of Congress, we read something in the paper, something that could have been avoided, we hear a story from our constituents, something that could have been avoided, and to have an opportunity to vote on a piece of legislation like we are going to vote on tomorrow, no matter how many times we have to vote on it, we are a part of the solution to many of the health problems that are facing Americans throughout this country. We are the leader in the world as it relates to research and being responsible and being respectful.

To have 200 organizations supporting the bill is very, very important. It is supported by the American Medical Association, the AARP, the Association of American Medical Colleges, Parkinson's Action Network, the American Diabetes Association, Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation, Paralyzed Veterans of America, all of these groups. That is just to name a few. And also, 72 percent of Americans support this bill that we are looking to pass. You also have a number of corporations that are out there calling for it. Think about the money that could be saved, not only the money, but the lives. This is what it is all about.

People ask: How do you feel being a Member of Congress? I feel good because I feel we can bring to the floor and bring to this government what is needed to help Americans, and I am glad we are a part of that.

Mr. MURPHY, it is good having an authority on the floor. I was a member of the Florida State legislature, and a State legislature is an interesting organization to be a part of. I think the first line of public service is being a county commissioner or city commissioner. That is when somebody can leave their house and let you know what is on their mind. I am glad to have an opportunity to vote on this, and I look forward to releasing information to my constituents about what we have done, and hopefully put some pressure on the White House to do what so many Americans want us to do, and that is get at some of the issues that are facing our country right now.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. You talked about how much public support this enjoys, and it is broad and far ranging. I think the public support mirrors the support within this body. It probably cuts across partisan lines because the diseases that stem cell research can treat do not discriminate based on whether you are Democrat or Republican, not even on whether you are pro-choice or pro-life.

So when you have family members out there who are watching a loved one grapple with diabetes, watching a father or mother die of Alzheimer's disease, and they see there is this vehicle, there is this potential out there, untapped right now, with their Federal

tax dollars, they don't understand. They don't understand why their elected representatives wouldn't stand up and at least try to make an effort to bring a cure or treatment to their loved one who is struggling or dying with these diseases.

This issue enjoys public support because these diseases don't discriminate based on political discrimination, political views or geography. I think that is why you will see so many Republicans and Democrats supporting it.

This is an issue that arises a lot of passions in people. So there is rhetoric that sometimes doesn't match the reality. One of the arguments that you are going to hear tomorrow is we don't need to invest in embryonic stem cell research, which is the controversial piece of this debate, because adult stem cell research does the trick. That argument doesn't wash when you talk to the scientific community.

Adult stem cells have vast potential, and we have found ways to utilize them to make people better and give people longer lives.

□ 2310

But the fact is that adult stem cells only work on the person that those cells are harvested from. My adult stem cells work on me. So I can take stem cells out of my bloodstream, manipulate them, put them back into my bloodstream to try to cure the disease or whatever may be affecting me.

Embryonic stem cells have almost a limitless possibility of being manipulated, to being harvested and put into a limitless number of people. Those cells don't just work on the people they're taken from. Those cells can be manipulated and have universal traits to try to cure diseases.

So we're going to have to try to talk about that tomorrow and why we need to invest in both adult stem cell research and embryonic stem cell research.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I will do two things. First, it has come to my attention that while we were talking the Anaheim Ducks kept the Stanley Cup in the United States of America. I want to congratulate them. And I will now yield back to the gentleman from Florida to wrap up.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Thank you so very much, Mr. ALTMIRE.

Also, we want the Members, if they want any information we talked about tonight or want to speak to us, we have the www.speaker.gov Web site.

With that, Mr. Speaker, it was an honor to address the House, the 30 Something Working Group, tonight, the two MURPHIES and also Mr. ALTMIRE and myself.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SHUSTER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of attending his daughter's high school graduation.

Mr. CONYERS (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for after 1:30 p.m. today on account of personal business in the district.

Mr. BACA (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of personal business.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today after 2:00 p.m. on account of attending a funeral.

Mr. REYES (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for Tuesday, June 5, 2007, on account of illness.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for Tuesday, June 5 and for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

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.

Mr. SESTAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WU, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, June 13.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, June 13.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today and June 7.

Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, for 5 minutes, June 12.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Ms. Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1675. An act to suspend the requirements of the Department of Housing and Urban Development regarding electronic filing of previous participation certificates and regarding filing of such certificates with respect to certain low-income housing investors.

H.R. 1676. An act to reauthorize the program of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development for loan guarantees for Indian housing.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reports that on May 31, 2007, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 414. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 60 Calle McKinley, West in Mayaguez, Puerto Rico, as the "Miguel Angel Garcia Mendez Post Office Building".

H.R. 437. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 500

West Eisenhower Street in Rio Grande City, Texas, as the "Lino Perez, Jr. Post Office".

H.R. 625. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4230 Maine Avenue in Baldwin Park, California, as the "Atanacio Haro-Marin Post Office".

H.R. 1402. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 320 South Lecanto Highway in Lecanto, Florida, as the "Sergeant Dennis J. Flanagan Lecanto Post Office Building".

H.R. 2080. To amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to conform the District charter to revisions made by the Council of the District of Columbia relating to public education.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 7, 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:

2032. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a legislative proposal that would shift funding for the research, development, and maintenance of information technology functions of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (FCIC) from the Government to the insurance companies participating in the crop insurance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2033. A letter from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's notification to Congress of any significant modifications to the auction process for issuing United States Treasury obligations, pursuant to Public Law 103-202, section 203; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2034. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received May 4, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2035. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations — received May 4, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2036. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received May 4, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2037. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received March 18, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2038. A letter from the Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act (NAHASDA); Revisions to the Indian Housing Block Grant Program Formula