

I would like to thank Congressman McKEON, ranking member of the full committee, and Congressman RIC KELLER, ranking member of the Subcommittee on Higher Education, Lifelong Learning and Competitiveness, as well as our chairman, GEORGE MILLER, for working together with me to expedite this extension.

I respectfully urge all my colleagues to pass this legislation overwhelmingly.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KUHL of New York. Madam Speaker, for the last several years my colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee have worked to renew, and indeed improve, the Higher Education Act.

Last Congress, we passed H.R. 609, the College Access and Opportunity Act, which made important reforms to the Pell Grant program, the Perkins loan program, and provided more accountability in the area of college costs. Unfortunately, the Senate was not able to act, and the legislation died.

□ 1130

This Congress, the House has passed the reforms to address some of the problems that have arisen in the student loan industry and has passed legislation that made changes to the mandatory spending programs under the Higher Education Act through the reconciliation process. As of yesterday, the Senate has passed both the reconciliation bill and the Higher Education Act reauthorization bill.

The latest extension of the Higher Education Act expires on July 31, 2007. Today, we are passing another extension through October 31, 2007. It is my hope that the House will soon renew the remaining Higher Education Act, but in the meantime Congress must once again act to extend this bill, which we have done so previously on several occasions with bipartisan support. So today I rise in support of legislation to do so once again.

S. 1868, the second Higher Education Act of 2007, will ensure that vital Federal college access and student aid programs continue. I repeat continue, to serve those students who depend upon them. This legislation extends the Higher Education Act for a brief time, just 3 months. At the same time, S. 1868 also gives Congress additional time to complete a review of the remaining higher education programs as well.

Madam Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill before us today and work with us in the coming months to complete a fundamental reform package so that we can better serve the American students pursuing a college education.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Madam Speaker, I want to thank Congressman KUHL from New York for his positive remarks on S. 1868, and together we are going to

ask that our colleagues join us and pass this legislation overwhelmingly.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1868.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3093, COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 562 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 562

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3093) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, and Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration in the House of H.R. 3093 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

SEC. 3. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is authorized, on behalf of the Committee, to file a supplemental report to accompany H.R. 3093.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDEN). The gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ARCURI. For purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes

to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARCURI. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

House Resolution 562 provides an open rule for consideration of H.R. 3093, the Departments of Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2008.

I want to thank the distinguished chairman of the committee and ranking member for reporting out a bill that not only does not pay lip service but makes critical investment in our Nation's communities.

The bill provides \$725 million for Community Oriented Policing Services, more commonly known as the COPS program, 25 percent above the current funding level. As a former prosecutor, I know how vitally important these programs are in assisting local law enforcement to hire and train law enforcement officers to participate in community policing, purchase and deploy new crime fighting technologies, and develop and test new and innovative policing strategies.

The administration had proposed to modify the COPS program into a new discretionary grant program, but the committee has chosen instead to keep COPS as a separate dedicated grant program. This is a proven model for getting these grants to the communities that need them, and I applaud the committee for preserving this program.

The bill includes \$303 million for Economic Development Administration, the EDA. The EDA administers several economic development programs including public work grants for upgrading infrastructure, planning, and trade adjustment assistance for communities that bear the burden of jobs outsourced to other countries.

Additionally, the legislation would direct the EDA to consider with favorable bias grant proposals which incorporate green technologies and strategies that would reduce energy consumption, reduce harmful gas emissions, and contribute to sustainability.

The bill provides \$50 million, 52 percent more than the current funding, for the Weed and Seed program. The Weed and Seed program helps localities develop programs to weed out and deter crime, and then take the all-important step that is so often left out of seeding the formerly high crime areas with programs to promote neighborhood revitalization. The funds will be used to carry out this mission in cities, such as my home in Utica, New York, and

sponsor activities such as truancy prevention, conflict resolution, mentoring, and job training for at-risk youths.

Additionally, the bill, this resolution, provides for consideration and includes \$40 million for grants, technical assistance, and training to State and local governments to develop dedicated drug courts that subject nonviolent offenders to an integrated mix of treatment, drug testing, incentives, and sanctions.

As a DA, I quickly learned that no matter what initiatives law enforcement took to reduce the supply of drugs, it never really affected the demand for drugs which never seemed to diminish and, therefore, created a seemingly endless market for drug dealers. But when my office established the county's drug court program, I realized the powerful effect that the program had in helping enrolled participants get control of their addiction and thereby reducing their demand for drugs. The appropriation of \$40 million for drug court provided by H.R. 3093 is \$30 million more than the current level, and I congratulate the committee for increasing funds for this vital and proven weapon on the war on drugs.

H.R. 3093 would also create incentives to fight illegal immigration. It would prohibit the Federal Government from using any of these funds on any entity that does not participate in the basic pilot program which allows employers to verify whether potential or current employees can legally work in the United States. This voluntary pilot program was created by the Illegal Immigration Reform and Responsibility Act of 1996 and allows employers to verify employment status through an automated system linked to the Social Security Administration and Department of Homeland Security data bases.

This legislation also includes \$6.5 billion for the National Science Foundation. This level of funding will support the doubling of NSF's budget over the next 10 years, and represents a true commitment to investment in basic research and development, which will provide for innovation and future technologies. This commitment is an important part of the innovation agenda designed to maintain the United States' competitiveness.

H.R. 3093 also includes over \$17.6 billion for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. NASA's unique mission is to pioneer the future in space exploration, scientific discovery, and aeronautics research; and this appropriation enables them to accomplish this mission by restoring some of the cuts made by the administration to science, aeronautics, and education portfolios at the agency. This recommendation also provides for the continued efforts of NASA's Moon-Mars goals. The act calls on NASA to expand human knowledge, develop and operate advanced aeronautical and space-faring vehicles; encourage commercial use of

space; coordinate with other U.S. agencies to maximize research results; cooperate with other nations in research and applications and to preserve U.S. preeminence in aeronautics and space.

This bill also prohibits the use of funds by the FBI to issue National Security Letters in contravention of the statutes authorizing their use. National Security Letters enable the FBI to secretly review customer records of suspected foreign agents without judicial review. In March, the Department of Justice Inspector General reported that the FBI agents had in numerous cases misused National Security Letters without complying with either statutes or DOJ guidelines governing their use. This widespread abuse of secret investigatory powers undermines the very notions of liberty and freedom from tyranny upon which this Nation was founded. The prohibition on use of funds contained in H.R. 3093 will ensure that such abuse does not continue.

Mr. Speaker, I have addressed only a handful of the important programs for which H.R. 3093 would appropriate funds. My remarks have focused on the criminal justice, NASA funding, and economic development aspects of the bill; but there are many other important areas addressed in this legislation. It provides funding for critical scientific research, including several programs which study global warming and climate change that the administration attempted to eliminate. The Appropriations Committee has approved a bill which would maintain the funding of this critical research, and I once again thank them for their work and welcome a chance to vote in favor of this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this Commerce, Justice, Science appropriations bill provides more than \$53.5 billion in discretionary spending for fiscal year 2008, which is over 6 percent more than last year's enacted level.

□ 1145

While I support some of the increases in this bill that support our national priorities, such as counterterrorism and crime-fighting initiatives, I'm concerned that this bill falls in line with the spend now, tax later philosophy of the Democrat majority. This philosophy, as outlined in the Democrats' budget plan, puts each taxpayer on the path toward an average \$3,000 increase in their Federal tax bill. This, once again, is another burden for the average taxpayer to bear.

Rather than prioritizing spending and making the tough choices, this bill

aims to solve our Nation's problems by simply spending more money. This also ignores real threats to our security that must be addressed.

So, Mr. Speaker, one very serious problem that must be addressed before Congress adjourns next week, and that is changing current law so that our Intelligence Community has the tools it needs to monitor the telephone conversations of foreign terrorists physically located in foreign countries.

Homeland Security Secretary Michael Chertoff earlier this month indicated that the United States remains vulnerable to another terrorist attack, and that recent chatter levels are near those levels prior to September 11, 2001. But because of our failure to respond to technological advances, current law ties the hands of our Intelligence Community since significant portions of our intelligence is being missed, intelligence that could prevent a future attack on our Nation.

If we expect our Intelligence Community to do everything in their power under the law to protect our Nation against a future attack, then we must give them the resources and tools they need to stay ahead of those who wish to harm us.

It is vital that we act immediately to modernize the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act in order to clarify that the United States no longer will be required to get a warrant to listen to terrorists who are not in the United States.

Let me repeat that, Mr. Speaker. In order to clarify, change the law in order to clarify that the United States no longer will be required to get a warrant to listen to terrorists who are not in the United States. Each minute we wait to act, our Intelligence Community could be missing vital information, increasing our risk of another attack on U.S. soil.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I will be asking my colleagues to defeat the previous question on the rule so that the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act can be immediately modernized.

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

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) for his comments, and I couldn't agree with him more. Clearly, the safety of our Nation from foreign enemies is critical, and it's something that needs to be a priority and is a priority with this Congress and prior Congresses.

But one thing that I think is critical that we can never forget is safety doesn't begin at our borders. Safety is something that we need to recognize within our borders as well, and this bill takes great strides in terms of ensuring that our children are safe when they go to school. It puts more police officers on the street. It increases funding for the DNA database to help us locate rapists and criminals who have committed crimes and locate them and

bring them to justice. It funds the drug court program, which is critical in terms of dealing with people who are addicted to drugs.

This bill takes a balanced approach to law enforcement, takes a balanced approach to what this country needs to keep our citizens safe, both internally and externally as well. And I believe that it is a very good bill, and that we should support it.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield as much time as he may consume to the ranking member of the Rules Committee, Mr. DREIER from California.

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very good friend from Pasco for yielding to me. And I thank him for his management of this rule, as well as my new friend from New York (Mr. ARCURI).

I have to say that I'm glad that there is bipartisan concern voiced about security, and I appreciate the remarks that my friend from New York has just made, Mr. Speaker, about the issue of ensuring that we provide security for our children and for anyone who possibly could face the challenge of being a victim of crime in this country.

The fact of the matter is I am very, very supportive of the notion that Mr. HASTINGS is putting forward here that we need to do everything that we can to prevent those who want to, en masse, kill us, as Americans, from being able to do that.

Now, it was 1978, Mr. Speaker, during the Cold War, that the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act was put into place. It was designed to deal with what today is very, very antiquated technology. I mean, I remember when we had this debate before about the notion of being able to follow one single telephone line that is out there. Well, when all we had were hard lines and one telephone line, courts would get a warrant to follow that one phone line because that's the only way people could communicate.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we all know that the world, when it comes to telecommunications, certainly is a heck of a lot different than it was 30 years ago, 29 years ago, 1978.

And what is it that we're saying?

Mr. HASTINGS is saying that, in recognition of the statements that were made most recently by the Secretary of Homeland Security Mr. Chertoff, that there is a higher level of chatter, and we need to do what we can to monitor it; coupled with statements made by the Director of National Intelligence, Director McConnell, who's made it very, very clear that we are today blind and deaf when it comes to the ability to monitor not people here in the United States, Mr. Speaker, we're talking about people who are foreigners and who are trying to do us in.

And so Mr. HASTINGS is simply saying that what we need to do is defeat the previous question so that we can make in order a chance for us to deal with the issue of modernization of that three-decade-old Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act which today hampers us when it comes to the need for us to try and prevent terrorists from killing Americans. It's just that simple. And that kind of modification, that kind of modernization, that kind of reform is absolutely essential if we're going to have the tools necessary to successfully prosecute the war on terror.

And so I believe that every Member, Democrat and Republican alike, who's concerned about our need to ensure that people who are overseas and want to do us in, and that we cannot monitor, we should be able to do just that. And I think most thinking Americans believe that having the capability to monitor those in Iran, in Syria and in other countries who would want to do us in, that they should, in fact, be monitored, and we should get that information.

Now, this bill itself does, as my friend from Pasco has said, have a number of good things in it. It has some very, very important items that will help us deal with the challenge of crime that exists in this country, and obviously it provides very important funding for a high priority that I have, and that is NASA funding. The jet propulsion laboratory in La Canada Flint Ridge, California, is a very important facility which has made great strides with its Mars program and a wide range of other programs that they're involved in.

Mr. Speaker, this program also has funding for something that I believe is essential for us to realize, and it's on an issue that this place has debated time and time again, and it's one that we're still struggling over, and that is the issue of border security and the problem of illegal immigration.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to be offering an amendment when this bill proceeds which will allow us to actually increase the funding for what is known as the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, SCAAP.

Now, one of the things we found, we put this program into place in the mid-1990s, and we found that State and local governments are, in fact, shouldering the responsibility, the financial burden, of the incarceration of people who are in this country illegally and commit crimes. In my county alone of Los Angeles, the cost is \$150 million a year, according to my friend who's the sheriff of Los Angeles County. He's said that to me repeatedly; \$150 million a year to incarcerate people who are in this country illegally and have perpetrated crimes against our citizenry.

It's not the responsibility of the City of Los Angeles, the County of Los Angeles or the State of California to shoulder that financial burden. The protection of international borders lies

with the Federal Government, Washington, D.C., and that's why we have the SCAAP program.

We need to secure our borders. We need to take the responsibility for securing our borders. And because we have not done that yet, and I still am optimistic about our chance to do that, we need to make sure that we reimburse the States and counties and cities that are, in fact, responsible for the financial burden today of incarceration of those people who are in this country illegally and have perpetrated crimes against us.

And so I will be offering that amendment. We'll be transferring monies, Mr. Speaker, out of the administrative expenses of the Department of Commerce and the Department of Justice, and I hope that we will be able to have strong bipartisan support.

I will say I'm very proud that our California delegation has, in years past, come together, Republicans and Democrats, working together to increase the level of funding for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program. Last year I was proud to have offered an amendment that had a \$50 million increase for the SCAAP funding level that brought it to the \$405 million level where it is today, and we had Democrats and Republicans joining in support of the amendment that I offered.

I hope very much, Mr. Speaker, that once again this year we'll have Democrats and Republicans who will join in support of the amendment that I will be offering that will have that increase in the funding level for SCAAP, so that we will be able to say to State and local governments that you are not going to be totally responsible for shouldering that burden.

So I thank my friend for yielding. I want to join, again, in urging a "no" vote on the previous question so that we can make this very important amendment in order for FISA reform. And I hope that when we do get to consideration of the bill itself, that we'll have strong bipartisan support for the very important amendment that I'm going to be offering to increase funding for SCAAP.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia, the chairman of the CJS subcommittee, Mr. MOLLOHAN.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule for consideration of the fiscal year 2008 appropriations bill for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, Science and related agencies.

I would first like to thank distinguished Chairwoman SLAUGHTER, Ranking Member DREIER and the entire Rules Committee for this open rule.

Mr. Speaker, we bring before you today a balanced appropriation bill that's responsive to Member input on both sides of the aisle and reflects the legislative priorities of this Congress. This bill is creative in addressing problems that face our Nation, such as the

rising crime rates that can only be addressed through additional law enforcement resources, the need for scientific research and discovery to inspire our youth and maintain our competitive edge in an increasingly competitive world economy, and the need for our country to understand and address the documented phenomena of global climate change.

In this diverse bill we have gone to great lengths to address these and many other issues, and, Mr. Speaker, I think the House will be pleased with the result. And again, I urge support for this rule.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL).

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first I'd like to say, as a former Justice Department official who worked on national security, wiretaps or FISAs, I can think of no more important issues facing this country and this Congress than the modernization of the FISA statute. And I hope and I plead with my colleagues to support this measure.

I rise today to bring to the House's attention an issue dealing with changes to NASA's account structure required by H.R. 3093 and the challenges this provision will impose on NASA.

Title III of this bill increases the number of appropriations accounts that fund NASA from three to seven, and it requires conversion to this new structure in fiscal year 2008. Implementing this change will impose a tremendous burden on NASA's accounting system, at an unknown cost, and it's unclear what the net advantage of such a structural change, what that would be.

□ 1200

The current structure with three accounts coupled with customary congressional direction contained in the committee report language provides the agency unambiguous guidance regarding spending levels of the program, project, and in some cases at the activity level.

Since 2001, NASA has been implementing a new software package to standardize its accounting and financial software across all 11 of its centers, and at the same time NASA has been putting in place a new means of allocating overhead costs. These efforts have not yet been completed, and to now direct the agency to reformat its basic accounting system is especially burdensome and complex. It may also force the agency to reevaluate the manner in which it calculates overhead rates.

In a letter addressed to the House Appropriations leadership last month on the account structure change, NASA Administrator Mike Griffin stated that "it would have a severe and extensive impact upon NASA's financial

system" and "would make maintaining NASA's ability to execute in full cost exceedingly complex."

H.R. 3093 also directs NASA to implement the account structure change in 2008, a task that NASA says it simply cannot do in the time permitted.

So I strongly urge the committee leadership to reflect carefully on the concerns raised by Administrator Griffin and to work with NASA in the weeks ahead to reach an agreement on a budget structure that allows for greater transparency without undermining NASA's current accounting system.

I would like to thank the chairman and ranking member of the Appropriations Committee for their hard work and for the resources provided to NASA in this bill.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont, my colleague from the Rules Committee (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New York, my colleague from Washington, and colleagues on the Rules Committee.

Today, as you know, the House takes up the 10th of 12 appropriation measures, and this bill is all about continuing to make progress in America, in this Congress, in changing our domestic priorities. There are two points about this bill I want to address: first, law enforcement; second, science.

Law enforcement in our communities is the front line of protecting our communities. It is best done locally. This legislation, bipartisan, by the way, reverses 5 years of cuts to local law enforcement grants at a time when we need it. Violent crime, unfortunately, is on the rise. This funds our local law enforcement communities to do the job of building and maintaining safe communities. It does soundly reject the administration's proposed cuts to undo funding formulas that have been particularly helpful with the small State minimum.

The bill heavily invests in the safety and well-being of Americans, providing a total of \$3.2 billion for State and local law enforcement efforts. \$430 million will go to the Office on Violence Against Women. And, as you know, that strives to reduce the prevalence of violence committed against women. \$100 million goes for the Cops on the Beat program, something that has been a major bipartisan success over the years.

The second issue is science. I want specifically to applaud the subcommittee for its support of the sciences and the emerging multidisciplinary field of service science. That combines disciplines like computer science, operations research, industrial engineering, business strategy, and management sciences to meet the 21st century needs of the workforce. The National Science Foundation should review what is currently being done in the area of service science and explore what more can be done.

The work of the NSF and the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST, is critical to fostering greater U.S. innovation and competitiveness in science, technology, engineering, and math. The investment in these agencies is an investment in that education and the development of the crucial multidisciplinary skills that are required to maintain our workforce and compete in the world economy.

As much more of our economy is service-based, we must ensure that our science agencies are focused on both research and education that promote innovation in service sectors such as education, health care, energy, telecommunications, and finance. The growing service sector in my State of Vermont is probably typical. It provides some of our best-paying jobs, nearly 80 percent of our employment. Last year we exported more than a half billion dollars in services, and 8,000 Vermonters were employed because of foreign investment in that sector.

This bill's investment in service-related research and STEM education through the NSF and NIST will foster innovation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON), who is a leader in this body on national security issues.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, if the previous question is defeated today, we will offer an immediate amendment to reform the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

The reform is very, very simple. It doesn't affect most programs, but all it does is say that you do not need a warrant to listen to foreign communications by foreigners who are in foreign countries. That is all it says. But it is critical that we make this change, and it is critical that we make this change immediately.

I would say to my colleagues and to those Members of congressional staffs who are monitoring the proceedings on the floor here today, I have served in this Congress for 9 years. I served as a United States Air Force officer for 7 years and on the national security staff at the White House for 2. In my 9 years in the Congress, I have never been more concerned about Congress's failure to act than I am today.

This is absolutely critical to the country to fix, and the only people that can fix it are Members of the United States Congress. We cannot work around this law. We have to fix this law, and it is squarely in our laps to fix it.

The leadership on both sides of the aisle and the Committee on Intelligence on both sides of the aisle have been briefed in detail about the problems our intelligence community is facing, that we have blinded them and forced them to stick their fingers in their ears because of anomalies in technology that have changed faster than we have been willing to change

the law. And every one of us knows that it has already imperiled American lives. And yet this House sits here and does nothing, absolutely nothing, when we know that lives are at risk. We must allow our intelligence agencies to monitor terrorist communications without a warrant in the United States when they are listening to foreign communications.

How the heck did we get ourselves in this place in the first place? In 1978, almost all long-haul communications were over the air, and for foreign intelligence collection, you didn't need a warrant; almost all short-haul communications, local calls, were over a wire, and you did.

Now, because the technology has changed, the situation is completely reversed. Almost all local calls are over the air. There are 230 million cell phones in this country. But that is not where the foreign intelligence is. Now almost all long-haul communications are over a wire, and we are forcing our intelligence agencies to go to judges to get probable cause on some terrorist who is overseas communicating with another terrorist overseas just because the point of the wiretap is in the United States. This is stupid and it is imperiling American lives.

The danger is very serious. The Director of National Intelligence, Mr. MCCONNELL, testified in front of the Senate Intelligence Committee recently that "We are actually missing a significant portion of what we should be getting."

We all remember where we were the morning of 9/11. We remember whom we were with, what we were wearing, what we had for breakfast. But I wager nobody in this room remembers where they were when the British Government arrested 16 terrorists who were within 48 hours of walking onto airliners at Heathrow and blowing them up over the Atlantic. That happened a year ago in August. Within 48 hours, they were within 48 hours, and the tragedy would have been greater than on 9/11. It didn't happen and you don't remember it because American, British, and Pakistani intelligence detected the plot before it was carried out.

I have pleaded with my colleagues on the Intelligence Committee and with the leadership on both sides of the aisle in this House, and I pray to God that we will not need another 9/11 Commission after another national tragedy and they will be looking back and saying, "Why didn't the Congress do something? They knew and they failed to act."

Today you have an opportunity to insist that this body act because we do know we are failing to protect this country.

I would urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question and to immediately consider amendments to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the gentlewoman's passion and concern. We are all very

concerned for the safety of our country.

But I think it is critical that we not forget the reason we are here today. We are here to debate a rule which is very concerned, which deals with a balanced approach to making our country safer domestically, to being concerned with putting more police officers on the street, for increasing funding for Drug Corps, for increasing funding for science and NASA. That is what we are here to do today. That is what we are here to debate, and I would strongly urge passage of this ruling.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON).

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me this morning for this rule.

I first want to thank the members of the committee and the subcommittee for their hard work on this very important bill, particularly including the part concerning NASA, which I want to speak about for just a minute. Chairman OBEY and Chairman MOLLOHAN have been tremendously dedicated to assisting me and making good things happen. I applaud them.

Mr. Speaker, my district includes NASA's Johnson Space Center, the crown jewel of the Nation's space program. The Johnson Space Center serves as a key component of the southeast Texas economy, employing the best and brightest minds who serve as leaders in the sciences, education, business, and human space exploration, not to mention the important roles they and their families play in our local communities. I will aggressively champion the work and dedication of these hard-working Americans and the many benefits they bring to all of our districts and our country.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about fiscal responsibility and doing our best to practice good government, we must be mindful of programs that are important to fund, those that return more on the taxpayer dollar and are wise investments. And I can think of no better example than investing in our future and the future of NASA. Over the years, the math shows that every dollar invested in the space program is returned exponentially in the form of new products, new technologies, and new businesses. Relative to our entire Federal budget, NASA dollars' share comes to less than 1 percent, about six- or seven-tenths of a percent. By comparison, Americans spend over \$45 billion a year on soft drinks.

NASA research and technologies have provided law enforcement with advanced equipment to detect suspicious liquids and substances, protective gear for chemical analysis, safer oxygen tanks for firefighters, equipment to treat children's cancer, improved cardiac care techniques, advanced aircraft technology for safer commercial flights, satellite technology to improve our understanding of the Earth's climate, and more accurate weather forecasting to better protect us from natural disasters.

So for less than one-third of our national soft drink budget, NASA pushes the boundaries of the final frontier, creating commerce, assisting with education, increasing our economic competitiveness, enhancing health care, monitoring climate change, building stronger bonds with our allies, and ensuring the survival of the human race.

So, Mr. Speaker, I kindly ask my colleagues, take a good look at the myriad ways NASA has benefited our great Nation. For me and for many of the folks who work at NASA and on NASA matters on a day-to-day basis, this isn't a Republican or Democratic issue; it is a matter of keeping America at the top of the space race and continuing the unparalleled legacy of achievement that so many NASA employees and partners have achieved.

□ 1215

So I look forward to continuing to work with the committee members, the conferees and all my colleagues to increase NASA funding. I appreciate the work of the Rules Committee, and I ask all of our colleagues to support this rule.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me talk about this process of defeating the previous question so we can take up the amendment regarding the FISA Act.

This does not slow down the process at all. I want to repeat that, Mr. Speaker; this does not slow down the process at all. It simply makes in order, with the appropriate waivers, to discuss the amendment that was described by Mrs. WILSON from New Mexico.

This is a very, very serious issue. It has been described by a number of people how important this is to our Intelligence Community. And by definition, it falls into the area of secure knowledge. But for those that are on the committees of jurisdiction, those that hear this on a regular basis, we need to act on it sooner than later. And we can act on it today without slowing down the process whatsoever by defeating the previous question, voting "no" on the previous question.

I will be submitting an amendment that will be made in order, with the appropriate waivers, and we can debate the issue. It sounds to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is strong bipartisan support in order to achieve this end that has been described. We have the opportunity to do it now. We ought to do it before the August recess.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I am asking my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question. By defeating the previous question, we will give Members the ability to vote today on the merits of changing current law to ensure our Intelligence Community has the tools that they need to help protect our Nation from a potentially imminent terrorist attack.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text

of the amendment and extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, the Appropriations Committee has presented us with a bill that will provide funding agencies related to Commerce, Justice and Science for the fiscal year 2008.

The bill contains a higher overall allocation than was requested by the President, but with very good reason. By all measures this bill will have a real, tangible impact on all Americans, improving their daily lives in many ways. It funds the Economic Development Administration, Weed & Seed program, prescription drug monitoring, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the National Science Foundation, NASA, the Census Bureau, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, and community-oriented police services.

And I would just like to mention in that regard, from a personal perspective, in my community in which I live, there is a small police department, 20 officers; that as a result of the community-oriented police in New Hartford, New York, they were able to get three additional police officers, increase their technology significantly. That's a 15 percent increase in officers to that department. The COPS program makes our streets safer.

The Drug Corps program is a phenomenal program that this bill will continue to fund. And I would urge any of my colleagues in Congress to someday sit through a Drug Corps graduation program. When they see that, and they see the testimonies of the people who have finished, and listen to their families talk about how devastating drug addiction has been to their family and how this program has helped them, they would strongly support this bill and strongly support the Drug Corps program.

In short, H.R. 3093 provides critical funding for programs that keep our streets safe, our economy prosperous, and allows our scientists to continue studying global warming and climate change.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge a vote of "yes" on the previous question and on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Washington is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 562 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

At the end of the resolution insert the following:

SEC. 4. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in section 5 of this resolution if offered by Representative Hoekstra of Michigan or his designee. All points of order against consideration of

the amendment printed in section 5 are waived.

SEC. 5. The amendment referred to in section 4 is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following: Subsection (f) of section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801) is amended to read as follows—

'(f) 'Electronic surveillance' means—
'(1) the installation or use of an electronic, mechanical, or other surveillance device for acquiring information by intentionally directing surveillance at a particular known person who is reasonably believed to be in the United States under circumstances in which that person has a reasonable expectation of privacy and a warrant would be required for law enforcement purposes; or
'(2) the intentional acquisition of the contents of any communication under circumstances in which a person has a reasonable expectation of privacy and a warrant would be required for law enforcement purposes, if both the sender and all intended recipients are reasonably believed to be located within the United States.'

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress, (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's "American Congressional Dictionary": "If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adoption of the resolution (if ordered); and suspending the rules with respect to H.R. 2929; H. Res. 345; and H. Con. Res. 187.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 221, nays 195, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 716]

YEAS—221

Abercrombie	Clay	Farr
Ackerman	Cleaver	Fattah
Allen	Clyburn	Filner
Altmire	Cohen	Frank (MA)
Andrews	Conyers	Giffords
Arcuri	Cooper	Gillibrand
Baca	Costa	Gonzalez
Baird	Costello	Gordon
Baldwin	Courtney	Green, Al
Bean	Cramer	Green, Gene
Becerra	Crowley	Grijalva
Berkley	Cuellar	Gutierrez
Berman	Cummings	Hall (NY)
Berry	Davis (AL)	Hare
Bishop (GA)	Davis (CA)	Harman
Bishop (NY)	Davis (IL)	Hastings (FL)
Blumenauer	Davis, Lincoln	Herseth Sandlin
Boren	DeFazio	Higgins
Boswell	DeGette	Hill
Boucher	Delahunt	Hinchey
Boyd (FL)	DeLauro	Hinojosa
Boyd (KS)	Dicks	Hirono
Brady (PA)	Dingell	Hodes
Braley (IA)	Doggett	Holden
Brown, Corrine	Donnelly	Holt
Butterfield	Doyle	Honda
Capps	Edwards	Hooley
Capuano	Ellison	Hoyer
Cardoza	Ellsworth	Inslie
Carnahan	Emanuel	Jackson (IL)
Carney	Engel	Jackson-Lee
Castor	Eshoo	(TX)
Chandler	Etheridge	Jefferson

Johnson (GA) Mollohan
 Johnson, E. B. Moore (KS)
 Jones (OH) Moore (WI)
 Kagen Moran (VA)
 Kanjorski Murphy (CT)
 Kaptur Murphy, Patrick
 Kennedy Nadler
 Kildee Napolitano
 Kilpatrick Neal (MA)
 Kind Oberstar
 Klein (FL) Obey
 Kucinich Oliver
 Lampson Ortiz
 Langevin Pallone
 Lantos Pascrell
 Larsen (WA) Pastor
 Larson (CT) Payne
 Lee Perlmutter
 Levin Peterson (MN)
 Lewis (GA) Pomeroy
 Lipinski Price (NC)
 Loeb sack Rahall
 Lofgren, Zoe Rangel
 Lowey Reyes
 Lynch Rodriguez
 Mahoney (FL) Ross
 Maloney (NY) Rothman
 Markey Roybal-Allard
 Matheson Ruppertsberger
 Matsui Rush
 McCarthy (NY) Ryan (OH)
 McCollum (MN) Salazar
 McDermott Sánchez, Linda
 McGovern T.
 McIntyre Sanchez, Loretta
 McNulty Sarbanes
 Meek (FL) Schakowsky
 Meeks (NY) Schiff
 Michaud Schwartz
 Miller (NC) Scott (GA)
 Miller, George Scott (VA)
 Mitchell Serrano

NAYS—195

Aderholt Fallin
 Akin Feeney
 Alexander Ferguson
 Bachmann Flake
 Bachus Forbes
 Barrett (SC) Fortenberry
 Barrow Fossella
 Bartlett (MD) Foxx
 Barton (TX) Franks (AZ)
 Biggert Frelinghuysen
 Bilbray Gallegly
 Bilirakis Garrett (NJ)
 Blackburn Gerlach
 Blunt Gilchrest
 Boehner Gillmor
 Bonner Gingrey
 Bono Gohmert
 Boozman Goode
 Boustany Goodlatte
 Brady (TX) Granger
 Brown (SC) Graves
 Brown-Waite, Hall (TX)
 Ginny Hastert
 Buchanan Hastings (WA)
 Burgess Hayes
 Burton (IN) Heller
 Buyer Hensarling
 Calvert Herger
 Camp (MI) Hobson
 Campbell (CA) Hoekstra
 Cannon Hulshof
 Cantor Hunter
 Capito Inglis (SC)
 Carter Issa
 Castle Jindal
 Chabot Johnson (IL)
 Coble Johnson, Sam
 Conaway Jones (NC)
 Crenshaw Jordan
 Culberson Keller
 Davis (KY) King (IA)
 Davis, David King (NY)
 Davis, Tom Kingston
 Deal (GA) Kirk
 Dent Kline (MN)
 Diaz-Balart, L. Knollenberg
 Diaz-Balart, M. Kuhl (NY)
 Doolittle Lamborn
 Drake Latham
 Dreier LaTourette
 Duncan Lewis (CA)
 Ehlers Lewis (KY)
 Emerson Linder
 English (PA) LoBiondo
 Everett Lucas

Sestak
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Shuler
 Sires
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Spratt
 Stupak
 Sutton
 Tanner
 Tauscher
 Taylor
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tierney
 Towns
 Udall (CO)
 Udall (NM)
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walz (MN)
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Welch (VT)
 Wexler
 Wilson (OH)
 Woolsey
 Wu
 Wynn
 Yarmuth

Schmidt
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shadegg
 Shays
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Baker
 Bishop (UT)
 Carson
 Clarke
 Cole (OK)

Souder
 Stearns
 Sullivan
 Tancred
 Terry
 Thornberry
 Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Turner
 Upton
 Walberg
 Cubin
 Davis, Jo Ann
 Israel
 LaHood
 Marshall

Walden (OR)
 Walsh (FL)
 Weldon (FL)
 Weller
 Westmoreland
 Whitfield
 Wicker
 Wilson (NM)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wolf
 Young (FL)
 Melancon
 Murtha
 Stark
 Wamp
 Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—15

□ 1243

Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. HELLER of Nevada and Mrs. MUSGRAVE changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. MARKEY, BOUCHER and MATHESON changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LIMITING USE OF FUNDS TO ESTABLISH ANY MILITARY INSTALLATION OR BASE IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2929, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2929.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 399, nays 24, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 717]

YEAS—399

Abercrombie
 Ackerman
 Aderholt
 Akin
 Alexander
 Allen
 Altmire
 Andrews
 Arcuri
 Baca
 Bachmann
 Baird
 Baldwin
 Barrow
 Bartlett (MD)
 Bean
 Becerra
 Berkley
 Berman
 Berry
 Biggert
 Bilbray
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Bishop (UT)
 Blumenauer
 Blunt
 Boehner
 Bonner
 Bono

Boozman
 Boren
 Boswell
 Boucher
 Boustany
 Boyd (FL)
 Boyda (KS)
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Brown (SC)
 Brown, Corrine
 Brown-Waite,
 Ginny
 Buchanan
 Burton (IN)
 Butterfield
 Buyer
 Calvert
 Camp (MI)
 Cantor
 Capito
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardoza
 Carnahan
 Carney
 Carter
 Castle
 Castor
 Chabot
 Chandler

Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Coble
 Cohen
 Cole (OK)
 Conaway
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Costello
 Courtney
 Cramer
 Crenshaw
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Cummings
 Davis (AL)
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, David
 Davis, Lincoln
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent

Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Doyle
 Drake
 Dreier
 Duncan
 Edwards
 Ehlers
 Ellison
 Ellsworth
 Emanuel
 Emerson
 Engel
 English (PA)
 Eshoo
 Etheridge
 Everett
 Fallin
 Farr
 Fattah
 Feeney
 Ferguson
 Filner
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Fossella
 Foxx
 Frank (MA)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gallegly
 Garrett (NJ)
 Gerlach
 Giffords
 Gilchrest
 Gillibrand
 Gillmor
 Gohmert
 Gonzalez
 Goode
 Goodlatte
 Gordon
 Granger
 Graves
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutierrez
 Hall (NY)
 Hall (TX)
 Hare
 Harman
 Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayes
 Heller
 Hensarling
 Herseth Sandlin
 Higgins
 Hill
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hirono
 Hobson
 Hodes
 Hoekstra
 Holden
 Holt
 Honda
 Hooley
 Hoyer
 Hulshof
 Hunter
 Inslee
 Israel
 Issa
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
 Jefferson
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones (NC)
 Jones (OH)
 Kagen
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Keller
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilpatrick
 Kind

King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kirk
 Klein (FL)
 Kline (MN)
 Knollenberg
 Kucinich
 Kuhl (NY)
 Lamborn
 Lampson
 Langevin
 Lantos
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Mahoney (FL)
 Maloney (NY)
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCaul (TX)
 McCollum (MN)
 McCotter
 McCreery
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McHugh
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McMorris
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNeerney
 McNulty
 Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY)
 Melancon
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (MI)
 Miller (NC)
 Miller, Gary
 Miller, George
 Mitchell
 Mollohan
 Moore (KS)
 Moore (WI)
 Moran (KS)
 Moran (VA)
 Murphy (CT)
 Murphy, Patrick
 Murphy, Tim
 Murtha
 Musgrave
 Myrick
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal (MA)
 Neugebauer
 Nunes
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Oliver
 Ortiz
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor
 Paul
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Pence
 Perlmutter
 Peterson (MN)
 Peterson (PA)
 Petri
 Pickering
 Pitts
 Platts
 Poe

Pomeroy
 Porter
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 Pryce (OH)
 Putnam
 Radanovich
 Rahall
 Ramstad
 Rangel
 Regula
 Rehberg
 Reichert
 Renzi
 Reyes
 Reynolds
 Rodriguez
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothman
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Salazar
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Saxton
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schmidt
 Schwartz
 Scott (GA)
 Scott (VA)
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Sestak
 Shays
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuler
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sires
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Solis
 Souder
 Space
 Spratt
 Stearns
 Stupak
 Sullivan
 Sutton
 Tancred
 Tanner
 Tauscher
 Taylor
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Towns
 Udall (CO)
 Udall (NM)
 Upton
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walberg
 Walden (OR)
 Walsh (NY)
 Walz (MN)
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Welch (VT)