

quick manner to resolve this unfortunate situation.

□ 1500

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me simply rise again on behalf of many of my colleagues on the House Judiciary Committee to commend to the attention of all Members H. Con. Res. 175 regarding the payment of survivor benefits to family members of deceased service personnel.

It is a highly formalistic sounding bill, highly technical, but I think you could sense, Mr. Speaker, the emotion in the voice and the countenance of its principal author. I would expect that Mr. LATHAM of Iowa is here on this floor for Kayla and for the children of those 143 soldiers who find themselves caught in a confused bureaucracy and unable to access the benefits to which they are entitled and to which the hero that they lost as a parent and a loved one intended them to enjoy.

So, again, I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 175, and I rise with a humble sense of gratitude for the tireless work of the gentleman from Iowa in bringing this legislation so quickly and so thoughtfully to the floor of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, allow me to rise and yield myself such time as I may consume to thank Mr. LATHAM for his sensitivity and leadership.

Mr. Speaker, let me acknowledge that there are men and women as we speak on the front lines in the battle for their Nation. Many in Iraq and Afghanistan but many lose their lives elsewhere around the world in the Nation's uniform.

This is an instructive and important legislative initiative, but can we imagine being lost in battle, a fallen soldier who's not able to provide for his or her family or his child? H. Con. Res. 175 and the backdrop of those who are now losing their lives in battle will help the children of these fallen soldiers by providing necessary guidance to the courts about how to treat the expressed desires of a deceased servicemember when it comes to the distribution of a death gratuity.

Hopefully, the constituent of Mr. LATHAM and many others will find refuge and relief. It is certainly not the Nation's desire to leave them wanting and destitute.

This particular bill provides comfort to those who need comfort and financial support for those who are suffering.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution so the wishes of the soldiers are given proper respect and consideration and a grateful Nation is truly grateful.

Let me also thank the ranking member, Mr. SMITH; the full committee chair, Mr. CONYERS; Mr. BERMAN and Mr. COBLE of which this particular amendment and legislation has come

through. And we ask that the legislation be passed with great support in this body.

I ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 175, which helps children of fallen soldiers access military death benefits. I would like to express my deep appreciation to my friend, Congressman LATHAM, for taking the lead on this issue. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important legislation.

On June 5th, 2006, Navy Petty Officer 2nd Class Jaime Jaenke was killed in Iraq when her Humvee was hit by a roadside bomb. Ms. Jaenke, from Iowa Falls, was the first female from Iowa to die in the Iraq conflict.

Jaenke left behind a daughter, Kayla, who is cared for by Jaenke's parents. She had designated her mother, Susan, as the beneficiary of a \$100,000 death benefit intended to help survivors. However, under law, only spouses or children are allowed to receive the benefit, so it must be kept in a trust for Kayla until she turns 18.

But the Jaenkes need the money now. They incurred unanticipated expenses such as hiring a lawyer to get legal guardianship and obtaining health insurance for Kayla. They also had funeral costs and other expenses, even as their horse stable was losing money.

Congressman LATHAM's resolution would express the sense of Congress that courts should have the discretion to redistribute death benefits to caretakers if the service member left clear intent for the use of these funds. This would be a Godsend to the Jaenkes and the at least 143 identical cases where other families are affected by these same circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, Congress needs to act, and they need to act fast, to help the families of those who have given so much for their countries. These families already have to face the anguish of losing a son or a daughter. They should not have to worry about the financial strain of dealing with unexpected expenses. I urge all of my colleagues to send a strong message to our military families that we understand the need for flexibility in protecting these families from unintended consequences.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my support for House Concurrent Resolution 175, of which I—along with the entire Iowa delegation—am a cosponsor.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from Iowa for his leadership on this issue.

This resolution expresses the sense of Congress that courts should take into consideration the expression of clear intent by a member of the United States Armed Forces regarding the distribution of death gratuity payments to their surviving children.

Such payments are intended to provide for the immediate needs of the survivors of deceased servicemembers. However, under current law, children cannot directly receive the payments until the age of 18, even if they are designated as the recipient by the servicemember.

The wishes of those who serve our country should be honored to the greatest extent possible. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I am proud that the fiscal year 2008 National Defense Authorization Act passed by this House allows servicemembers to designate up to 50 percent of their benefit payment to someone other than a spouse or

child, thereby assuring that children under the care of individuals or family members other than the servicemember's spouse are properly provided for by the gratuity system.

This resolution reaffirms the commitment of Congress to providing for the children of those who have served our country, and I strongly urge its passage.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Con. Res. 175.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MODIFYING DEADLINE RELATING TO ELECTION BY INDIAN TRIBES

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3095) to amend the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 to modify a deadline relating to a certain election by Indian tribes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3095

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

SECTION 1. ELECTION BY INDIAN TRIBES.

Section 127(a)(2)(B) of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 (42 U.S.C. 16927(a)(2)(B)) is amended by striking "within 1 year of the enactment of this Act" and inserting "by July 27, 2008."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COHEN). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, let me thank Mr. KILDEE for moving this legislation and thank him for his leadership. Two years ago, the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act was enacted. The act was a major advance in our Nation's efforts to protect our children from sexual and other violent crimes, to prevent child pornography, and to make the Internet safer for our sons and daughters.

Among its provisions, the act includes a mandate that each tribe either

affirmatively opt-in to the new sex offender requirements enacted as part of that act, or cede its authority for enforcement to the State in which the tribe is located. The act requires all tribes register their intentions by July 27, 2007.

While initially this deadline appeared to be reasonable, the tribes' ability to comply with it has been made virtually impossible in light of the fact that the Justice Department has taken much longer than expected to issue the necessary guidelines that will help implement the new requirements under the Adam Walsh Act.

In fact, we are advised that these guidelines will not be finalized until after the registration deadline. Under these circumstances, it only stands to reason that the tribes should be given additional time to make the necessary certification.

H.R. 3095, offered by Mr. KILDEE, addresses this problem by simply extending the registration deadline for one year until July 27, 2008. Without this brief extension, the sovereign authority of countless tribal lands will be substantially undermined.

I commend my colleagues, from Michigan Mr. KILDEE and Mr. RENZI of Arizona, for their leadership on this measure. H.R. 3095 goes a long way toward protecting the sovereign authority that historically has bestowed upon tribal lands.

Accordingly, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan, commonsense proposal.

Two years ago, the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act was enacted. The act was a major advance in our Nation's efforts to protect our children from sexual and other violent crimes, to prevent child pornography, and to make the Internet safer for our sons and daughters.

Among its provisions, the act includes a mandate that each tribe either affirmatively opt-in to the new sex offender requirements enacted as part of that act, or cede its authority for enforcement to the State in which the tribe is located. The act requires all tribes to register their intentions by July 27, 2007.

While initially this deadline appeared to be reasonable, the tribes' ability to comply with it has been made virtually impossible in light of the fact that the Justice Department has taken much longer than expected to issue the necessary guidelines that will help implement the new requirements under the Adam Walsh Act.

In fact, we are advised that these guidelines will not be finalized until after the registration deadline. Under these circumstances, it only stands to reason that the tribes should be given additional time to make the necessary certification.

H.R. 3095 addresses this problem by simply extending the registration deadline for 1 year until July 27, 2008. Without this brief extension, the sovereign authority of countless tribal lands will be substantially undermined.

I commend my colleagues from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and Arizona (Mr. RENZI) for their leadership on this measure. H.R. 3095 goes a long way toward protecting the sovereign authority that historically has been bestowed upon tribal lands.

Accordingly, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan, commonsense proposal.

H.R. 3095 offers a commonsense solution that respects the historically recognized sovereignty of our Nation's tribes while not compromising the critical objectives of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act with respect to protecting our Nation's children from sexual and other violent crimes.

This bipartisan measure warrants our support.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3095 which, simply put, will provide Indian tribes a 1-year extension in which to decide how to comply with the requirements of the Adam Walsh Protection and Safety Act of 2006. It's extremely important to note to colleagues looking in on this debate, H.R. 3095 does nothing to weaken the requirements of the Adam Walsh Act on Indian tribes. The children who live on Indian reservations deserve just as much protection as children in other communities.

The reality is that this important legislation simply creates an opportunity for Indian tribes to obtain 1-year extension to decide how to live under those requirements.

The Adam Walsh enacted new requirements for States and Indian tribes to maintain sex offender registration information, post such information on the Internet and share such information among States and other Indian tribes.

It allows Indian tribes one year to decide whether the Indian tribe itself will implement the sex offender registration and notification, or whether the tribe will rely on the registration and notification programs operated in an adjacent State to comply with the act's requirements.

H.R. 3095 simply extends the deadline for one year for Indian tribes to elect how they want to comply. The Justice Department recently proposed detailed regulations for States and Indian tribes to comply with the Adam Walsh Act, but those regulations are not yet final. The Indian tribes cannot make an informed decision on how to comply with the act until those regulations are final. And this year 1-year extension will give Indian tribes sufficient time to make that choice.

Again, let me say, H.R. 3095 does nothing to weaken the requirements of the Adam Walsh Act on Indian tribes. I urge my colleagues to support the bill as an important, somewhat technical amendment to this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to yield to the author of this legislation, along with his cosponsor, Mr. RENZI,

distinguished member of the House Education Committee, subcommittee chairman and a great leader on Native American issues in this Congress and in America, Mr. KILDEE of Michigan for 3 minutes.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as the co-chairman and founder of the Congressional Native American Caucus, I rise in support of H.R. 3095, a bill amending the Adam Walsh Child Protection Act of 2006.

Indian tribes are faced with a deadline established in the act that requires tribal governments to affirmatively elect to comply with the mandates of the act by July 27, 2007, or cede their authority for enforcement to the States.

My bill authorizes a 1-year extension of the deadline by which tribes are required to opt into the national sex offender registration and notification system.

Mr. Speaker, tribes strongly support the Adam Walsh Act, and they share the Federal Government's commitment to protecting their communities from sexual predators. However, tribes are asking us to extend the deadline so that they can make an informed decision on how to implement the mandates of the Adam Walsh Act.

The Department of Justice is still in its comment period on the proposed guidelines, which does not close until August 1. It is simply too early to force tribal governments to make a decision based on incomplete information and without guidance from the administration.

Mr. Speaker, I have received numerous requests from tribes across the Nation urging our support for a 1-year extension. I have letters from the National Congress of American Indians and the National Criminal Justice Administration supporting the request, also.

I'm pleased that this bill has received bipartisan support. I want to thank my colleagues from across the aisle for supporting this legislation.

I want to thank my chairman, Judiciary chairman, JOHN CONYERS; and Ranking Member LAMAR SMITH especially for their support as well.

I urge my colleagues to support final passage of this bill.

□ 1515

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

This is a very wise and important judgment that has been made by this legislation. H.R. 3095 offers a commonsense solution that respects the historically recognized sovereignty of our Nation's tribes, while not compromising the critical objectives of the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act with respect to protecting our Nation children's from sexual and other violent crimes.

I ask my colleagues to support this bipartisan measure. It is deserving of

our support. I would ask that this measure be supported.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3095.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURE TRANSPARENCY ACT

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2630) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit authorized committees and leadership PACs of a candidate or an individual holding Federal office from making payments to the candidate's or individual's spouse, to require such committees and PACs to report on disbursements made to the immediate family members of the candidate or individual, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2630

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Campaign Expenditure Transparency Act".

SEC. 2. PROHIBITING USE OF CAMPAIGN FUNDS TO COMPENSATE SPOUSES OF CANDIDATES; DISCLOSURE OF PAYMENTS MADE TO SPOUSES AND FAMILY MEMBERS.

(a) PROHIBITION; DISCLOSURE.—Section 313 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 439a) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) PROHIBITING COMPENSATION OF SPOUSES; DISCLOSURE OF PAYMENTS TO SPOUSES AND FAMILY MEMBERS.—

“(1) PROHIBITING COMPENSATION OF SPOUSES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no authorized committee of a candidate or any other political committee established, maintained, or controlled by a candidate or an individual holding Federal office (other than a political committee of a political party) shall directly or indirectly compensate the spouse of the candidate or individual (as the case may be) for services provided to or on behalf of the committee.

“(2) DISCLOSURE OF PAYMENTS TO SPOUSES AND IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBERS.—In addition to any other information included in a report submitted under section 304 by a committee described in paragraph (1), the committee shall include in the report a separate statement of any payments, including direct or indirect compensation, made to the spouse or any immediate family member of the candidate or individual involved during the period covered by the report.

“(3) IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBER DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘immediate family member’ means the son, daughter, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, mother, father, brother, sister, brother-in-law, sister-in-law, or grandchild of the candidate or individual involved.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 313(a)(1) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 439a(a)(1)) is amended by striking “for otherwise” and inserting “subject to subsection (c), for otherwise”.

SEC. 3. IMPOSITION OF PENALTY AGAINST CANDIDATE OR OFFICEHOLDER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 309 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 437g) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) In the case of a violation of section 313(c) committed by a committee described in such section, if the candidate or individual involved knew of the violation, any penalty imposed under this section shall be imposed on the candidate or individual and not on the committee.”.

(b) PROHIBITING REIMBURSEMENT BY COMMITTEE.—Section 313(c) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 439a(c)), as added by section 2(a), is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

“(3) PROHIBITING REIMBURSEMENT BY COMMITTEE OF PENALTY PAID BY CANDIDATE FOR VIOLATIONS.—A committee described in paragraph (1) may not make any payment to reimburse the candidate or individual involved for any penalty imposed for a violation of this subsection which is required to be paid by the candidate or individual under section 309(e).”.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to elections occurring after December 2007.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry. My understanding of the rules is that the time may be controlled by someone who is in opposition.

I do not know if the Republican representative is in actual opposition to this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Would the gentleman from California like to state his position for the record?

Mr. MCCARTHY of California. Mr. Speaker, I support the bill, but oppose the process.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill and, when asked under the rules, would claim the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XV, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) will control the 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I stand with the House leadership in full support of H.R. 2630, the Campaign Expenditure Transparency Act.

This legislation will help to reassure Americans that their public officials are working in their interest and not for personal gain. This bill will amend

the Federal Election Campaign Act to protect candidates or Federal officeholders from either directly or indirectly compensating their spouses with funds from any authorized political committee under their control.

H.R. 2630 also creates an important new requirement to disclose any compensation paid from campaign coffers to the immediate family members of the candidate or officeholder. The bill ensures that the rigid penalties for violations are enforced personally against the candidates or officeholders. It would prohibit political committees from reimbursing candidates or officeholders for any penalties.

Some may say this legislation may prevent some from running for office because they will run the risk of accidentally violating the law. This is not the case. These penalties may only take effect if the candidate or officeholder is aware of the violation.

H.R. 2630 is another way we can restore the confidence that the people's House is working for all Americans. I urge all Members to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The majority says they want to end the culture of corruption. There has been both the appearance of impropriety here in Congress and, in some cases, actual impropriety. These improprieties, despite any demagoguery, know no party bounds.

But the big elephant in the room that no one wants to talk about, in recent years, has involved other issues, issues like spouses going to work for major companies who have large government contracts and benefit from having an employee in the lawmaker's home. Does the Democratic majority seek to end this problem with this bill? No, they don't. That might step on important toes.

Another major problem that is not transparent is spouses themselves who lobby. Does the Democratic majority seek to end or regulate that by this bill? The answer is, no, they do not. That might step on too many important toes here in Washington.

So who will be affected by this bill in which the Democratic majority avoided any hearings to gather evidence and thereby prevented any opportunity for people like me to come forward with evidence and move toward this lack of transparency in this back-room process to shove it down our throats here on the floor?

It is said that they want to stop officeholders from enriching themselves or their families. I am one of those who would be affected, and it may be helpful to know exactly what kind of an effect it will have.

My story is this: While practicing law in Tyler, Texas, it became apparent that we had a major problem in one of our highest-level trial courts. I tried for months to find someone with the