

in many situations, and now that the backlog has been eliminated, it is correct, it would be more restrictive, it would have to go to the court, but that, of course, is what was contemplated in 1978. We do not believe that that would in any substantial way slow down the process and, therefore, not in any way put us at risk.

Having said all of that, we still agree with you that if we can get this done in a timely fashion that would be good.

I want to tell my friend, though, very candidly, I think there is some sentiment that if we don't get it done that that is going to put this side of the aisle that wants to look at this bill, after the Senate passes it back to us, with whatever provisions they include in it, carefully, we understand that we are going to be portrayed as somehow undermining the security of America. We think that argument is bogus, but we do think it may well be made.

Mr. BLUNT. Well, if I determine to make that argument, I will tell my friend, I will make it in good faith, and we do have a difference of opinion on this. Hopefully, the Senate will get its work done in a way that we will have a maximum amount of time in the relatively short time available here to look at this, and we won't have to have the argument about how critical that change is.

I personally believe that the 1978 law was written in a way where it was not anticipated that we would have to go to the FISA Court to listen to people in a foreign country who were making calls or communicating, and because of the way the law was written, it had come to mean that by now.

□ 2000

Mr. HOYER. I do want to make the point that I don't think we have much difference on that issue because we agree that technology has changed. As we all know, there is a switch here in the United States now that the 1978 law did not anticipate. Frankly, I don't think there is a great deal of contention. I think in a bipartisan fashion we believe that needs to be addressed. We addressed it in our bill and the Senate addressed it in their bill. Frankly, I don't think that is one of the items in contention.

In fact, I would suggest to my friend we could deal with the immunity issue, which looks back not at present capacity nor future capacity, and resolve that issue in a separate bill if that was the concern about going forward. I think that could be done relatively quickly.

My only point to the gentleman is I agree with you, technology has changed. I think there is bipartisan agreement we need to address that and facilitate the foreign-to-foreign intercept with a blanket approval simply related to process, and I think we could do that relatively easily because I don't think that is particularly contentious between us.

Mr. BLUNT. I appreciate that, and we will see where we are next week,

and I look forward to the review that you and I will both have a chance to make of those documents.

You didn't mention it, but I heard there is a possibility we may take up an energy-related tax bill next week, something similar to the energy-related tax provisions that we had in the first year of this Congress in December of last year. I wonder if there is any information you can give me on that topic.

Mr. HOYER. There is a possibility we will be considering an energy bill much like some of the provisions that were included in H.R. 6 in the 6 for '06 package that we passed in the first 100 hours, and other portions of which were included in the energy bill that did not make it through.

I don't have specifics on that at this point in time, but that is being discussed and that is a possibility and he is correct.

Mr. BLUNT. So the schedule for next week is Tuesday through Friday, and we are looking at the items we discussed plus the possibility of other work that might come from the Senate.

I yield.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Obviously Friday is on the schedule. I expect we will be here on Friday. We have some other legislation on the suspension calendar. I don't know how extensive that will be.

Clearly we have been talking about FISA. FISA authorization ends on Friday. Again, we have a difference in perception of the consequences of that; but nevertheless, we have scheduled Friday so we are available depending on what the Senate does and depending on whether we can get to some agreement to ensure our presence to act on that, if possible.

Mr. BLUNT. I thank the gentleman for that information.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SESTAK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

HOURLY MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, February 12, for morning-hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SPACE) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 6, 2008.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 6, 2008, at 9:35 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 2457.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 5, 2008.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 5, 2008, at 1:00 p.m.:

That the Senate passed with an amendment; requests a conference with the House and appoints conferees H.R. 2419.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

HONORING OFFICER CHRISTOPHER RIDLEY

(Mr. ENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, nearly 2 weeks ago Officer Christopher Ridley, age 23, of the Mount Vernon New York Police Department saw a street scuffle outside a county social services building in White Plains, New York. While off duty and in plain clothes, he drew his service weapon and attempted to break up the fight.

Unfortunately, officers from the Westchester County police also came upon the scuffle and tragically and mistakenly fired on Officer Ridley, who was killed.

Last week I attended the wake and funeral of Officer Ridley in the City of Mount Vernon, which is in my congressional district. Hundreds of local residents, police, and others from throughout the area turned out to pay their final respects. My heart goes out to Officer Ridley and his family by this terrible tragedy. One of our finest was

struck down at a very young age, which is around the age of two of my children.

The investigation into the shooting has begun, but the life of a brave 23-year-old is already taken. I ask my colleagues to remember Officer Ridley, who was posthumously promoted to detective, and also remember so many others for the brave sacrifice they make each and every day protecting us and our communities.

We must always remember those in law enforcement for the difficult job they are called to do each and every day.

May Detective Ridley always be remembered for his brave commitment to maintaining the peace and keeping us safe.

RECOGNIZING PERIANESTHESIA NURSE AWARENESS WEEK

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to praise and recognize the efforts of the Nation's more than 57,000 perianesthesia nurses. This week is PeriAnesthesia Nurse Awareness Week, a week that is dedicated each year to celebrating the important work that perianesthesia nurses do.

America's perianesthesia nurses practice in all phases of preanesthesia and postanesthesia care, ambulatory surgery, pain management, and special procedure areas.

The theme of this year's awareness week is "Advocacy." The American Society of PeriAnesthesia Nurses has designated advocacy as this year's theme in recognition of how the depth and breadth of perianesthesia nursing meets the varied health care needs of the American population in a broad range of nursing environments.

The American Society of PeriAnesthesia Nurses, which represents the perianesthesia nurses of this country, strives to advance nursing practice through education, research, and standards. The important work of perianesthesia nurses is best exemplified by their commitment to quality health care and the safety of patients in both hospital and ambulatory surgery settings.

Our Nation's demand for perianesthesia nurses will increase in the coming years as the American population ages, as we make new advances in medicine that prolong life, and as we continue to witness the meteoric expansion of home health care services. Perianesthesia nurses play a vital role in the operation and success of our Nation's health care system.

I ask my colleagues and my fellow Americans to join me in honoring the perianesthesia nurses who care so unselfishly and professionally for us all. The work they do happens every day all year round, and I hope they receive our appreciation on more than just this special week in their honor.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

BUSH BUDGET ZEROES SCAAP FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. GIFFORDS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Mr. Speaker, tonight I would like to take a few minutes for folks here in Washington to focus on southern Arizona. There, along 114 miles of border in my district, Federal, State, county, and local law enforcement are on the front lines defending our border.

Arizona faces unimaginable immigration and border security challenges. Last year, over 387,000 illegal immigrants were apprehended in Arizona, and an average of 1,000 illegal immigrants per day were arrested and deported from Tucson.

The Tucson sector, which includes my district, is the most porous section along the 2,000-mile U.S.-Mexico border. More than 48 percent of the Nation's drug traffic enters our country through southern Arizona.

This Monday, the President released his fiscal year 2009 budget proposal, and once again his budget failed to include any funding for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, also known as SCAAP.

The President refuses to recognize the importance of SCAAP funds. Without this funding, States and localities will be financially overwhelmed by costs that are the Federal Government's sole responsibility.

Securing our Nation's borders is this government's priority, in my opinion. However, communities through southern Arizona and the Nation face extraordinary costs that are unfortunately being carried by them for incarcerating undocumented immigrants.

Because of limited Federal contributions, the bulk of these costs are being borne by some very small counties. Some of these counties are also some of the poorest in the Nation. They are currently already operating under very slim budgets and staffing. This is why it is so important and so appropriate that the Federal funding be included.

SCAAP was created by the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994. It is designed to reimburse States and local municipalities for the arrest, incarceration, and transportation costs associated with illegal immigrants who commit crimes in our communities.

Under Federal law, the Federal Government has two options. It can either take undocumented criminals into Federal custody or it can compensate State and local jurisdictions.

We are facing an immigration crisis here in Arizona. We are underfunding SCAAP, and the President is continuing to overburden our State and local governments. He is hampering the State's ability to protect our communities and uphold our laws.

SCAAP funding is particularly important to communities like Bisbee and Douglas and Sierra Vista, those communities along the 2,000 miles of our southern borders, those States and local governments that incur greater costs than other jurisdictions.

Over the past several years, these communities have exceeded SCAAP reimbursement funding by hundreds of millions of dollars. In fact, most counties along the U.S.-Mexico border are currently being reimbursed less than 9 percent of their cost.

Just today, Mr. Speaker, in our Western Hemisphere Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I heard from a number of Federal agencies about the President's Merida Initiative.

I believe it is unacceptable that the President would refuse to reimburse our local law enforcement agencies, while asking Congress to spend \$1.44 billion in assistance to Mexico and Central America. We need to invest our dollars in local law enforcement before we spend billions of dollars across the border. We have to prioritize the safety of our American communities first. We have to take the appropriate steps to ensure that SCAAP funding is in place, especially to border States like Arizona, and that it remains a Federal priority.

I urge my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle to reject the President's cuts to SCAAP funding. Arizona, like many States, is currently facing a budget shortfall. Every dollar reduction in SCAAP reimbursement means a dollar less in Arizona or another State that they can spend on essential public safety services. So please join me in supporting our State and local law enforcement agencies by adequately funding the SCAAP program in the House fiscal year 2009 budget.

□ 2015

SUNSET MEMORIAL

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

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, it is February 7, 2008, in the land of the free and the home of the brave; and before the sun set today in America, almost 4,000 more defenseless, unborn children were killed by abortion on demand, and that's just today. That is more than the number of innocent American lives that we lost on September 11, only it happens every day.

It has now been exactly 12,799 days since the tragic judicial fiat called *Roe v. Wade* was handed down. Since then the very foundation of this Nation has