

the right to vote. And we have not matured yet I think to this point. But I certainly believe we have the capacity to, because our philosophical premise is to accept the fact that the new civil rights struggle is for the unborn because women deserve better than abortion.

So Mr. SMITH, thank you so much for your leadership on this issue. And I'm very grateful to be a partner and colleague with you as we build toward a new way forward, a new day for America, and we can celebrate the beautiful gift of life and confront circumstances no matter how hard and difficult they are with a loving community response that helps get people through it. Thank you so much.

Mr. SOUDER. I wanted to share a few thoughts. Many years ago, I was a student at Indiana Purdue University in Fort Wayne. I'm old now. But in the late 1960s and 1970s, prior to *Roe v. Wade*, many of us were concerned about the liberalization of abortion laws in California and New York. And I was then a graduate student at the University of Notre Dame on January 22, 1973 when the Supreme Court decision on abortion came through. Therese Willke, the daughter of Dr. and Mrs. Willke from Cincinnati, who founded the National Right To Life and came up with the little feet, and I formed an organization called Student Coalition for the Human Life Amendment with Dr. Charles Rice who wrote the original human life amendment who was a law professor at Notre Dame and was our faculty adviser. We worked for many years trying to overturn the decision. But it has been interesting to watch both my pattern at the personal level and to watch the pro-life movement evolve. When I was a young male student, quite frankly, I didn't know much about babies, didn't really care a whole lot about babies, thought that maybe when they became college age I would be able to relate well, so I can't say I was initially motivated by love. I was motivated by horror. Who would take the life of these innocent babies?

Probably my first eye-opening experience was in the Lamaze baby course as I was watching my own daughter, Brooke, develop in the womb, feeling the attachment of a parent, and then all of a sudden the love side comes in.

The pro-life movement started mostly as a frustration to overturn a law. But as the pro-life movement evolved, we still have many people trying to be a symbol to the Nation, a conscience in the march here tomorrow and marches all over the country, like in Fort Wayne on Saturday. But my wife now works at the Hope Center. We support women's care centers. Tonight she is on a hotline trying to deal with young mothers. Because for too long, all we were concerned about was stopping abortion and not helping the mothers involved. What do they do? All of a sudden, they're in a disastrous situation. They don't know how they are going to deal with school. They don't

know how they are going to deal with their finances.

And what you see in the pro-life movement is not only a love for the baby, but increasingly a love for the parents. And that is part of our responsibility. We can't just point a finger. The question is how do we address poverty? How do we address it on an individual basis, not just conceptually? Are we open that when somebody is in need that will answer the phone, that will provide the food, that will provide the shelter, that will provide the clothing. And it is just amazing to watch these centers all over the country who aren't just talking the talk but are walking the walk.

Tomorrow we will see many of them here in Washington. And I want to thank all those millions of volunteers around the country for showing the true love that comes in the pro-life movement. We need to have political action. But we also need to have this personal action.

I want to again thank Mr. ELLISON for yielding. And I yield back the remainder of my time.

THE CONGRESSIONAL PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, my name is KEITH ELLISON, and I do represent the great State of Minnesota. And tonight I'm coming to the floor to talk about the progressive message of the Progressive Caucus, the Congressional Progressive Caucus, dedicated to ideas that some might describe as liberal, but all must recognize have benefited the United States over the course of time.

To be liberal is to be open-minded, to be accepting of others, to listen to different points of view and to try to be tolerant and inclusive of all people. But the progressive community in the United States and throughout our whole land is entitled to have a body of people in Congress who will reflect their views. And tonight we are coming together to offer these views. I'm proud to be able to take the floor tonight with the cochair of the Progressive Caucus, Mr. RAÚL GRIJALVA from the great State of Arizona. We are proud to have him in our leadership.

But I want to point out before I hand it back to our Chair that the progressive promise is fairness for all. The Congressional Progressive Caucus offers progressive promise for all. We believe in government of the people, by the people and for the people. Our fairness plan is rooted in our core principles. And it also embodies national priorities that are consistent with the values, needs and hopes of all of our people, not just the powerful and the privileged.

□ 1830

We pledge our unwavering commitment to these legislative priorities, and we will not rest until they become law.

I want to throw it out to our co-chairman, RAÚL GRIJALVA from the great State of Arizona and ask him, what makes you come to the House floor tonight and commit yourself to talking about the Progressive Caucus and the principles that support our caucus?

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you very much, Mr. ELLISON, and thank you, Congressman, for your initiative in beginning to highlight and to talk to the American people about the Progressive Caucus, about the fact that the Progressive Caucus stands for more than people have given us credit for, and stands for what I believe are the commonsense, rooted values of the American public in general.

Mr. ELLISON. Is fighting for economic justice and security in the U.S. and global economies, is that part of the Progressive message?

Mr. GRIJALVA. It is essential to the Progressive message as we look, as we try to spin our way out and as our President said yesterday, to come out of this long, dark night economically and socially in this country, and to get ourselves in a position where we are rebuilding America, its schools, its people, and its infrastructure. We are rebuilding its values, and we establish ourselves in a global sense, not only economically, but as leaders, that the American people have a shared responsibility in this. I thought those were very poignant and very important words. It was an historic inauguration, one that is fundamentally changing the scope and the tenor of this Nation.

President Obama called upon us to embrace a shared responsibility. He called upon us that this shared responsibility is going to be the cornerstone of how this country pulls itself out of its quagmire and begins a renewed and better future for all Americans. And I think the call for shared responsibility and sacrifice is a hallmark of our Nation's spirit, and it is a hallmark of its past.

I think today as we speak about the Progressive Caucus, it is also time to reflect on what we have been through and not to point fingers and not to malign anyone in particular, but to talk about the past, what went right and more importantly what went wrong, and how not to repeat those mistakes. I think the opportunity afforded to us tonight by yourself and others is a very important step in that direction.

Mr. ELLISON. In the beginning of our hour as we come together in this Special Order, I think you, as one of the leaders in the Progressive Caucus, have correctly identified economic justice as one of the critical things that the Progressive Caucus stands for, not only here at home but also abroad.

Congressman GRIJALVA, what does it mean to you that there are a billion

people who go to sleep every night around the world who live on less than a dollar a day?

Mr. GRIJALVA. One of the tragedies for our Nation has been in the last 8 years our inability to not only export our products but export our values to the rest of the world. With the exportation of values comes the exportation of ideas, democracy, and I think the most important thing is that we have an association with other people, not by domination, not by exploitation, but a cooperation that we are going to work together. And for a billion people and children in the Third World and poor people, to wake up trying to figure out where they are going to live and survive that next moment and that next day is a tragedy upon all of us, and it is a tragedy upon all of us who have the privilege of living in this great Nation.

That is part of economic justice because it is part of the picture, as you well know, KEITH, that if we are going to have real security in this Nation, we share the common value of prosperity and opportunity for other people in the world. One of the breeding grounds for hatred and one of the breeding grounds for violence in this world, and to some extent in our Nation, is the lack of—

Mr. ELLISON. That's right.

Mr. GRIJALVA.—the lack of health, the lack of education, the lack of food and the lack of opportunity.

Mr. ELLISON. So when we are talking about fighting for economic justice, we are talking about universal health care and about preserving guaranteed Social Security benefits for all Americans, including protecting private pensions and corporate accountability.

We are talking about investing in America by creating new jobs in the U.S., by building affordable housing and rebuilding America's schools and physical infrastructure, just like you talked about a minute ago, about cleaning up our environment and improving our homeland security.

What we mean when we say "economic security" is about exporting more American products and not more American jobs, and we demand fair trade, not just free trade, and affirming freedom of association and enforcing the right to organize. You and I know that we will probably be coming here one day in the future to talk about the Employee Free Choice Act. That is the right to organize in the labor union, and also to ensure that working families can live above the poverty line with dignity by raising and indexing the minimum wage.

I would like to ask you about protecting and preserving civil rights and civil liberties. What does that mean to you, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. GRIJALVA. One of the hallmarks of this great country of ours has been and continues to be our personal freedoms, our liberties and freedoms guaranteed under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, the rule of law. That

is the example that the rest of the world looks to us not only as leaders but as examples of that. I think President Obama said it well, we are to lead by example. And our civil rights and our civil liberties being the fundamental right of every American, the rule of law a fundamental right, the ability to exercise our discretion and our choice in a democracy, to protect our Constitution, to eliminate discrimination, those are what this country is built on. That is why people have died for this Nation, to protect those rights, and they are essential. And any part of what the Progressive Caucus does is to protect, as you well said, to protect, preserve those civil rights and liberties. They are part of what makes us American, what makes us unique and different, and, quite frankly, what makes us coveted. And to do what we need to do as a country and to continue that example, we need to protect number two in a big way and in an earnest way, and that is why the Progressive Caucus is so important to this Congress because we make that one of the platforms that we are united around.

Mr. ELLISON. Chairman GRIJALVA, as you know, the Progressive Caucus is dedicated to preserving civil rights and civil liberties. That means we believe in sunset expiring provisions of the PATRIOT Act and bring remaining provisions into line with the Constitution. We believe in protecting the personal liberty of all Americans from unbridled police powers and unchecked government intrusion. That means unlawful surveillance, things like that, violation of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. We believe an extended Voting Rights Act could reform the electoral process.

We believe in fighting corporate consolidation of the media because if the people don't know, how can they do anything about it. And we also believe in ensuring the enforcement of all legal rights in the workplace. That goes again to OSHA and things like that so people don't get injured. We worked hard for those rights, isn't that right, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. GRIJALVA. Those rights were earned by people who came before us, by anonymous people, by people who worked hard to make sure that those rights were in place and protected. It is incumbent upon us to protect their legacy and their hard work. Without the sacrifices they made years ago in establishing those rights in this country, the right to vote, the right to free association, the freedom from discrimination, the right to know, to lose those, we have to honor that legacy, and that legacy is part and parcel, it is as American pie as being American, and we need to protect those. I appreciate that you have highlighted that as one of the three important cornerstones of our caucus.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, do you want to talk about the third thing that the American people can count on the Progressive Caucus to fight for?

Mr. GRIJALVA. Yes. Our caucus has long believed that promoting global peace and security is essential to the security and the peace here at home. We have pledged under our mission to honor and help our overburdened international public servants, both civilian and military, so it is not always the hammer that we use internationally but is extending the hand of support. And the international public servants, God bless them, they sacrifice more than we can ever thank them for, but they need the support. They need the resources and the personnel, and they need the help.

And to bring home our troops, bring them home from Iraq as soon as possible, to make sure that the agreed-upon timetable, both by the Iraqis and by our new President, is upheld, followed through, that there are no permanent bases there, that there is no presence there, that we bring our troops home, thank them, give them the respect and support that they need, and begin a whole new era and a new dawn of how we do our international affairs and how do we really promote peace. And to rebuild all of the alliances around the world, to restore international respect for the American power and influence, and reaffirm our Nation's constructive engagement in the United Nations and other multilateral organizations. Rather than playing the role of reluctant partner in many of these alliances and organizations in the United Nations, we must be firmly and totally engaged, both with resource support to the United Nations and as a full participating partner in the enhancement of global peace and security.

And we need to enhance international cooperation to reduce threats posed by nuclear proliferation and weapons of mass destruction. The caucus is committed to nonproliferation of nuclear weapons. We are committed to the end of weapons of mass destruction, and one of the ways to do that, and possibly the most effective way to do that, is with international cooperation, treaties, and agreements. And to increase efforts to combat hunger, to fight the scourge of HIV-AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria, and other infectious diseases.

When 1 billion people wake up every morning wondering if there is going to be a next day, one of the ways that we can enhance our global peace and security for our Nation is to increase our efforts to combat the social and human ills that affect almost a full third of the world's population, and to encourage debt relief for poor countries and support the efforts of the U.N. to reach the Millennium goals for poor countries. That is the way that we feel, an important way, to enhance security globally and in turn enhance security for ourselves in this country.

Mr. ELLISON. I think it is important as we come together with the Progressive Caucus message, and it is our goal to come here week in and week out,

that people know what the Progressive Caucus stands for, that they know what the Progressive Caucus will fight for, and that they have a chance to join and participate.

So now, I think, Mr. Chairman, we are ready to talk about the main subject we are going to be talking about tonight and that has to do with a report that was recently issued called "Reining in the Imperial Presidency." This is a 500-page document that was drafted by Chairman JOHN CONYERS and his staff, the lessons and recommendations relating to the Presidency of George W. Bush, House Committee on Judiciary Staff to report to JOHN CONYERS.

In this report, it lays out a whole series of issues that need to be addressed. You know what, Chairman GRIJALVA, some people have said we don't want to look back, we don't want to dig up old dirt. We have a new President, why look back. But you know what, Chairman, I don't think we are looking back because you and I never want to have to deal with another President in the future who thinks, because George W. Bush did these things, they can do them, too.

We are looking to the future. We don't want to set a precedent around illegal wire-tapping, around domestic warrantless surveillance, around the U.S. attorney scandal, and things like that. We will get into this over the course of the next several minutes, and that is what we are going to be really talking about and digging into tonight.

Do you have any preliminary comments, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. GRIJALVA. Thank you very much, Congressman.

I can't add too much more to the fine introduction that you have just given to the subject. Again, my thanks to you for your effort and time that you are putting into making sure that our message is carried weekly before the American people, the Progressive Caucus's message.

□ 1845

You know, a new President was inaugurated yesterday. We turned an unbelievable corner in this country in so many ways. America's hunger for change, America's hopeful attitude and expectation that things will be better are historic firsts. An African American President, when perhaps his forefathers and his father could have never even voted in this country. It's a corner. It is a huge corner. And it speaks to the general goodness and the decency of the American people.

And, in doing so, all of us have the tendency or the desire to clean the slate. That's over. We need to move on. And I couldn't agree more. I could not agree more. We need to clean that slate and begin anew, begin to talk about this country in a different tone.

But, in cleaning the slate, we can't forget the past. The adage about history repeating itself is an important adage and a good thing to remember.

So when we look at this past administration, we want to forget it. We want to say that chapter in American life is over. Let's move on. Well, as we embark on this new political frontier that promises to restore America's values of justice and speaking the truth to the American people and the world, then the cornerstone is our Constitution and the checks and balances the system created—Congress, executive, judicial. And I think we owe it to our forefathers and we owe it to all the American people and to all the future generations that we are empowering, as a consequence of this great election, to ensure that the most basic tenets of our system are not disregarded or ignored by past, current or future administrations.

Simply said, we owe the American people the truth, not to ignore the past, and to present them with the facts and the proposed policies that will move our country forward and assure that the intrusions into our civil liberties, the intrusions into privacy, the intrusions into the powers of Congress and to restoring that checks and balances do not occur again. And to do so it is not to rehash the past, it is to learn from the past. Without running from the past, we are not able to make the corrective steps that we can.

Many of the dark chapters in this Nation's history were corrected because we learned from the past—segregation, the treatment of certain people because of who they were, what they looked like or where they came from. We learned from that. We learned from wars and preemption. We learned that that is a chapter we don't want to repeat.

Those lessons were taught to us as a consequence of knowing history and correcting history. So what we are asking for, as the Progressive Caucus—and you can speak to that, Mr. ELLISON, with the report that Chairman CONYERS put out—and we're very grateful to his effort for this—is that we're not asking for us to be punitive, mean, harsh or vindictive to the Bush administration.

We are saying there is some accountability here. There is a consequence to your actions. And there is a reckoning point with the American people. And that reckoning point is not about retribution, that reckoning point is we will not repeat these mistakes again. And we cannot do that unless there is full disclosure, an investigative process, and a set of recommendations and policies that cement in place the thought and the policies that this cannot occur again.

Mr. ELLISON. Chairman GRIJALVA, did we do this after the tragedy of 9/11? Did we engage in a process where we tried to discover what the truth was?

Mr. GRIJALVA. Excellent. I think that commission brought to light what we should have done, what we didn't do, and what we need to do in the future to secure the safety of the American people. And I think your point is

well taken. This is not a process of indictment. It is a process of correction. And I think the 9/11 Commission did just that, took corrective steps so it would not occur again and to mitigate any of those occurrences in the future.

Mr. ELLISON. You know what? Chairman GRIJALVA, I'm holding in my hand a pretty thick piece of paper right here. This is 500 pages all documenting allegations regarding abuses of power by the Bush administration. This thing is not designed, as you said, to try to settle old scores but to get to the truth of the matter of what really happened.

I mean, don't the American people deserve to know what Karl Rove would have said if he would have honored the subpoena that was lawfully served on him? Don't the American people deserve to know what Harriet Miers and Josh Bolten would have said when the Judiciary Committee had a subpoena duly served on them, where they were summoned to give testimony before the Judiciary Committee and they simply refused to show up? What would they have said?

This is the kind of process we need to go into. And I think the American people deserve to know what the truth is. And I think that this very weighty report—you know, you could probably work out with this thing, this thing is heavy—and it details allegations and it details the facts and information that cry out for answers.

And so what we've done is not just come to talk about a problem but really to discuss a solution. H.R. 104 is a bill that calls for a panel to do an investigative process to figure out what the truth is behind the allegations right here. Now, if nobody did anything wrong, then there won't be any problem and nobody should be concerned. But if there is some facts tied up in here that can be confirmed in this voluminous document.

I think it only makes sense that we should pass H.R. 104 to really figure out what actually happened. What actually happened with regard to allegations of torture and the torture memos that were written authorizing the torture of detainees? What happened with the extraordinary rendition, when, Mr. Chairman, people were brought from the United States and sent to countries and were tortured in those countries, where these countries aren't squeamish about torture? What happened with warrantless domestic surveillance? What happened with the U.S. Attorney scandal? These are things that need to happen.

What do you think about that?

Mr. GRIJALVA. Well, I think if you look at this nearly 500-page report that you just indicated, Mr. ELLISON, I think you will see that there are 47 separate recommendations in the report. But I think central to it is the point that you made, as you made the comparison to the 9/11 Commission, and that is the establishment of such a bipartisan commission, a blue ribbon, bipartisan commission of Congress to

thoroughly investigate and make legislative recommendations to the standing committees, or, if necessary, to call upon the Attorney General to appoint a special counsel to investigate and follow through and prosecute, if necessary.

I mention those because I really believe—and let me just quote Chairman CONYERS, and I believe he's going to be here later so he can quote himself. But as part of the statement that he issued with this report he said, "Even after scores of hearings, investigations and reports, we still do not have answers to some of the most fundamental questions left in the wake of Bush's prece-dency," CONYERS said.

Pointing to allegations of torture and inhumane treatment, extraordinary rendition, warrantless domestic surveillance, the Valerie Wilson leak, the U.S. Attorney scandal, investigations are not a matter of payback or political revenge, Chairman CONYERS says. It is our responsibility to examine what has occurred and set an appropriate baseline of conduct for future administrations.

In the set of recommendations, the report contains a forward by the chairman in which he talks about the need for H.R. 104, that it is a step to begin to correct what has gone wrong, to rein in the excessive power, to restore Congress to its legitimate, necessary and constitutional role of oversight over the executive branch, and to assure the American people with transparency, truth and public information. Those are what we are asking for.

Many of us—yourself and I and many members of the Progressive Caucus—have co-sponsored this legislation. We feel strongly about it. This is not looking back to point fingers. It is looking forward so that we have a blueprint for the future generations that, as I said earlier, this is not to occur again.

Mr. ELLISON. Well, Mr. Chairman, I mean, Josh Bolten, Karl Rove and Harriet Miers were served with subpoenas to appear in front of the Judiciary Committee within the context of the law. We followed the rules when we authorized those subpoenas to be served upon them, and the White House told them not to come. Now, there may one day be a Republican administration, a Republican House, I mean, we're Democrats now, but one day things may change. Do we really want to set up a situation, no matter who's in charge, where an individual can simply scoff-law or skip over or just ignore a subpoena of the Judiciary Committee? I think it sets a horrible precedent, no matter who is in charge of our government.

And so I think you're right. This is a forward-looking process. This is not about settling scores. This is about setting the record straight. I think it's important that the American people really know what happened. I mean, extraordinary rendition. I was in a committee hearing one day when a man named Maher Arar, who is a Cana-

dian of Syrian ancestry, was explaining how he had come from Europe through New York and was on his way to Canada when he was scooped up by representatives of our government and then held incommunicado, sent to Syria, and was tortured and was eventually released.

The Canadian Government did a full investigation of the whole matter and came to the conclusion that they grabbed the wrong guy. Oops. Well, the fact is the Canadian Government gave him a monetary award, but he could not come to the committee hearing and explain to us what actually happened to him. He had to appear by teleconference. Why? Because even our State Department, after they had demonstrably said they made a mistake about who they had picked up, still refused to take him off of the watch list.

My point is, these kind of things need a full hearing; these kind of things need a full airing. The rest of the world needs to know this is not how America does business. It was something that happened. We're not happy about it, but it happened.

We've been joined, Chairman GRIJALVA, by one of our most outstanding public servants from the great State of Texas. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE has been putting it down for a long time. How are you, Congresswoman?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. It is a pleasure to join two distinguished Members of not only this body but the Progressive Caucus. And I thank you so very much for yielding. And, as well, let me thank both of you for framing the issue and giving voice to what I believe represents a broad breadth of the American people.

And let me thank the distinguished co-chairman for jump-starting this session, for not taking for granted that we have a lot to celebrate—and we do. As the American people watch us, they still have in their memory what I thought was a day of reckoning, a day of reconciliation, a day of movement. But, at the same time, the Progressive Caucus wants to not only give voice—and I heard both of you speaking—but to give action, hearings and legisla-tion.

And, Congressman ELLISON, I appreciate greatly the reach that you have shown, the breadth and the depth, the understanding of finite issues dealing with the rule of law. And I came to the floor today—and I thank you for allowing me—just to take one small corner. I've heard the discussion as you opened and you talked about our economy, and I think the important point is there should be a progressive voice on all of that.

Now, some would say that we're the guys that are anti-PAYGO. No. There is no doubt that we have to balance our pocketbooks, our wallets just like any-one else. What we are for is to make sure that the voices of the people that ride the bus, that have to leave at 6 a.m. in the morning to get to work, that don't have childcare, that, in fact,

are still waiting on lines to be employed, never having been employed, those who are underemployed, those who have gotten out of, as I said, the line and therefore are not even counted anymore, those who are making \$18,000 a year, such as a constituent in my constituency, who is trying to hold on to a home that obviously was given some years ago under the adjustable mortgage rate, so this is who we are speaking to.

And I am, frankly, a supporter of a balanced budget. I want to make sure that our monies are used well, that there is transparency. But again, I want to have a hand—or a handle, if you will—on making sure those dollars—the economic stimulus package, I've had people ask me, am I going to have an impact? Is it going to get to me down in fifth ward Texas? I imagine there are some neighborhoods both in your great State and that of our chairperson's to ask, is it going to get to the Indian reservations or pueblos that have been lost, if you will—even though a lot of people say that they get a big donation, but there are great needs on our Indian reservations.

So I come today to just take a corner of what you were speaking of called the rule of law. And I would like to, as well, thank Chairman JOHN CONYERS. And, of course, we organized today, and I'm very excited to have had my first time opportunity to be on the Constitution Subcommittee. Mr. ELLISON, we miss you, but as well you are going on to do great works, and I look forward to working with you and collaborating on a number of issues.

But this basic document suggested that, one, the continuation of congressional oversight. One of the criticisms we got over the last 8 years—though it was not accurate, we were in the minority, as Democrats—is that there was no oversight. But we were, we were sort of fighting in the darkness.

I was reminiscing about the vote on the Iraq war before you came. There was a corner of about 133 of us who just worked and whipped and worked and whipped, but the loud noise, the thunderous noise drowned us out. We were on the floor asking and begging that we not go to war, that it was the wrong direction.

□ 1900

So congressional oversight is key. The independent criminal probes by the incoming Justice Department must continue. I would almost suggest that we look at this issue called prosecutorial abuse, and you know what? I'm open minded. I would as well look at the case in North Carolina. You remember that, with I believe it was not the soccer team but it was one of the sports teams of a university. It's coming to me. Everyone will remember that case. But they should also look at Jena 6.

Mr. ELLISON. The lacrosse team.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. The lacrosse team. Thank you very much.

You're absolutely right. I don't mind looking at that case or looking at the case of Jena 6, looking at the Sean Bell case in New York or wherever these cases might be. We must look at that. And then the creation of a blue ribbon commission to fully investigate the last administration's actions. I think we had a meeting and we thought that was a productive manner in which we should work.

But I want to focus on this FISA, the Restore Act, and just indicate that one of the areas that I was targeting was reverse targeting. For Americans what that means is I'm calling my aunt overseas and they use that call to then reverse target me. And what we have said is that that is such a significant breach of the Constitution, unreasonable search and seizure, that we wanted a warrant to issue. And, of course, we went back and forth and back and forth, and the language that we attempted to use was language that indicated that you must use a significant purpose as a basis for being able to do that. The language that finally got, I call it, watered down says when the government seeks to conduct electronic surveillance. That means if you just feel like fishing, they could surveil you here minding your business in the United States. The government wouldn't have to explain that it was a significant purpose. And, frankly, I think that much of the premise of our new President, and he made it clear—I congratulate him for some of the actions today indicating the closing of Guantanamo Bay. I heard you mention that. Most people think we'll be in danger, but I think we are in danger as it is now. And believe it or not, we have a rule of law and a system of law that will capture all of those who need to be captured in the system and will find all of those on the basis of our system innocent or guilty. I'm not interested in terrorists running free as well.

Mr. ELLISON. Reclaiming my time, could you speak on this critical issue. Some people might think that having a blue ribbon panel such as contemplated in H.R. 104 might be a backward-looking process and sort of be something about settling old scores now that the Dems have the White House and the Congress. But in your opinion as a lawyer of many years, what would such a process do in terms of signaling that such presidential behavior from a future President might not be permissible or might not be condoned if we were to have such a process?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I find it a constitutional necessity that will equate to the cleansing of this body and of this process or these processes that we've seen. A cleansing.

When we were engaged in the impeachment process that I was engaged in some years ago, we went back to the Madison Papers to be able to read as to whether or not we were on solid ground in the approach that we were taking. Many of us who opposed this impeachment believed that we were not on

solid ground because it was not a governmental action, if you will.

What we want to do is to lay the record and make it clear and not have someone guessing whether or not waterboarding equates to torture. We want someone to not guess whether or not it is appropriate for the counsel to the President to go into the night in a hospital room and seek some action from a sick cabinet officer. It could be an action to go to war. It could be an action to eliminate Medicare. But we want to have a basis of refining and clearing up. I'm not looking to throw darts and call names. These are pointed issues. And let me lead into something that goes to this point.

Mr. ELLISON. Before you lead to this point, I just want to ask you another question.

You and I and Chairman GRIJALVA only a few days ago raised our hands up and we said we would swear an oath to support and defend. What did we swear to support and defend? Can you tell us?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. The Constitution of the United States of America.

Mr. ELLISON. That's right. What does that mean to you?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank you for yielding. I think you have drawn for me, and that's a wonderful cross-examination, counselor, but you've drawn for me to say that that is a simple underpinning of a blue ribbon commission, to restore the understanding of the Constitution.

Might I tell my friends around America and my colleagues that are here that there is something called legislative history, and years down the road that legislative document will be used to help further interpret the actual law itself. That's why we're on the floor of the House, and this will be used to further interpret the understanding.

So the gentleman that was captured inappropriately by Canada, and there may be people now incarcerated here in the United States, they will look to the laws and its legislative history to assist them.

For example, two border patrol agents' sentences have been commuted. I happen to be a supporter of that. Why? I was a supporter of that because I found the facts needed to, in essence, provide mercy. It seemed like a contrary position by someone from the Progressive Caucus. But I also believe there should be fairness to individuals who were dealing with drugs on the border and an incident happened. I would have preferred for them to be reprimanded and fired if they misused a firearm or some other handling of it. They were incarcerated, in jail. I happen to think that even their rights might have been somewhat short-changed. So the sentence was commuted. In the course of that, there was probably a statement of sorts, some explanation that can be used further down the road to say why the sentence was commuted.

So this blue ribbon commission, and I know you're about to drop and I hope

to join with you, I think is a vital response to the cleansing of the last actions that occurred in the last 8 years but also to help support what the Constitution stands for. Our duty is to provide the eyes and ears of the American people.

Let me just finish with a point as well. I talked about FISA, but I wanted to also talk about the Congressional Lawmaking Authority Protection Act, which we are reintroducing, and it has to do with signing statements. And one would think we have this new President which we are so enthusiastic of supporting.

Mr. ELLISON. Forgive my reclaiming my time again, gentlelady, but if you could convey to the American people what is a signing statement? What is that?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I will be happy to do so because I think it really hit us over this last 8 years. The legislature, our body, the House and the Senate, would write a bill, and we would do our work teams. We would have what we call a conference, and that means that House and Senate Members would come to the conference. We'd finish that bill. It could be on the Medicare prescription drug benefit, of course, which was so controversial and went completely upside down and cost Americans millions and millions of dollars. That bill would go to the President's desk, and he would sign it with a signing statement saying you and the administration, my executives, my State Department, my Health and Human Services, my Department of Transportation, you don't have to pay attention to that at all. So they would completely have the authority or they would sense that their President has told them that the law that was passed by this body fairly representing the many millions of Americans in transparency—our hearings are open, the floor debate is open—did not matter. So the work that we might have done to create a summit jobs program, there might be a signing statement saying it's too costly or it is not a worthy program, ignore it. That means the Department of Labor could ignore it.

Mr. ELLISON. Now, did the President do a signing statement when it came to the law that this body passed and he signed with regard to torture?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. He obviously had in mind that he could overturn our position on that, as the PATRIOT Act and, of course, in others, yes. And, of course, we had the famous memo, the memorandum that came in one of the Department of Justice, if you will, lawyers who today still defend—

Mr. ELLISON. That's John Yoo and David Addington and people who worked for the Vice President?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Many of those who did likewise. And let me finish on these points because you raised a very good point.

In the redistricting case in Texas, the staff of the Department of Justice

agreed with the kind of redistricting arguments that were being made by the congressional delegation of Texas, the legal arguments that were being made about diversity, representation, and the way the lines were drawn. The professional staff agreed with the State of Texas prior to the loss of seven or eight Members, who happened to be Democrats. Well, interestingly enough, the political folk came in and altered their presentation and representation, which significantly caused a completely opposite result, which, of course, is the result that lost eight Members of Congress, not on the fact that eight Members of Congress don't have a right to win or lose, but it was because we reconfigured the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to the contrary of how it should have been interpreted. So that wasn't necessarily a signing statement, but we found many incidences like that in the actions of those, and needless to say, the Judiciary Committee spent many, many days and hours, able work by able subcommittees, on this whole question of the U.S. attorneys and political appointments.

Let me close, and then I want as well to have you yield to my good friend from Arizona, just to simply say that this is an important journey that we are about to venture, and that is the cleaning and cleansing and restoring of the Constitution; the protecting of your rights of privacy; the questioning of the watch list, which, as a chairwoman of the Transportation Security Committee of the last Congress, we looked at and will forge ahead in the new Congress as well. But this is an important and vital opportunity for not only the Progressive Caucus, which will lead, but as I look at it, the body of this institution. The Madison Papers would not be what they are today if there was not a meticulous and interested body of lawmakers that wrote meticulously what the law should be in the early stages of this Nation's history.

I want to be part of the positive history that protects every boy and girl, every man and woman, every family from the injustices that will come about through an unruly and a wrong-headed direction as it relates to the rule of law.

Let me thank you very much, Mr. Chairperson. Let me thank you again for yielding to me. And I think that we are making some important steps to help lead this Congress on issues that must be addressed to protect the American people and to work with the new President of the United States of America.

Mr. ELLISON. Thank you, Congresswoman. And we have only got about 15 more minutes; so we invite you to hang out with us a little bit.

But we have got to hear from our illustrious chairman, who has helped lead the way for the Progressive Caucus.

You've had a long time to reflect on what Congresswoman JACKSON-LEE has

said and, of course, you have some thoughts on your own. How does any of this stuff strike you, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. GRIJALVA. Let me, first of all, thank our esteemed colleague from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE). Her expertise and her voice is an ingredient that this Congress would sorely miss if it was not here. Her clarity and her honesty are something this body has come to depend on and those of us who work with her have come to rely on.

As we discuss this and particularly the resolution before us that you are discussing, Mr. ELLISON, let me thank you for the initiative. The Progressive Caucus in the past has spent too much time talking to itself and not enough time talking to the public and to the people we represent. So thank you for breaking that mold.

We are all proud Americans, all of us that serve here. And I think as Americans, and let me go back to the point that our colleague just made, we're about learning the truth in this body. And we're about making sure that that truth is given out to the American people that everybody knows. And I think as Americans we all have a sense of decency and fair play, that no one is above the law. And Ms. JACKSON-LEE made the point about the rule of law being the cornerstone of who we are. And she made the point about cleansing, and to Native people, cleansing is an important tradition. It is about taking body, the entity, and making it come to full circle and to removing things that are not natural to that body and to that circle. And if we refer that to the body of this institution, that's what we're asking for in a very simple way, to return us to that whole that we should be.

□ 1915

We are all here for a short period of time. Whether we are here for 20 years or 2 years, we are a mere breath in the history of this Nation. And I think our legacies are going to be judged, and this is why this discussion today is so important, by how we protect and preserve the rule of law and the Constitution.

So this is not about retribution. This is about moving forward. Because we need a blueprint to move forward, and I think this process of discovery, this process of letting the truth be known, can only lead to better policies, restored checks and balances and restoring to this body the oversight and authority that it gave away.

We are at that point now, and this is not a reflex on what is to come in the future, this is merely a discussion about the future with some milestones and markers about how we need to travel and still remain that Nation that everybody envies because we are governed by the rule of law.

Congressman, thank you so much. I am looking forward to these discussions. Again, thank you for the initiative, and I am looking forward to continuing to participate as the Progress-

sive Caucus against this very important discussion, this talk, this communication with the American people.

Mr. ELLISON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman; and as we begin to wind down, I would like to invite Congresswoman JACKSON-LEE of Texas to maybe give us a few concluding remarks.

We are here, this hour, we like to call it the progressive message. It is a special order afforded to Members of Congress to talk about what the progressive message is, whether it's on issues of executive authority, reining in executive authority, the economy, whatever it is. We want to let the American people know what the Progressive Caucus is talking about.

Would you like to give a few remarks as we come to the end of our hour tonight?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Let me thank you very much.

Obviously, we have only been at the tip of the iceberg of what we have to talk about in the future. Certainly I want to make the point very clear that as it relates to the TARP and the economic stimulus package, the Progressive Caucus will be very much engaged, collaborating, of course, with a number of other caucuses, Hispanic Caucus, Women's Caucus and the Congressional Black Caucus and others, not from the perspective of isolation but from the perspective of ensuring, again, that voices that cannot speak for themselves are heard and particularly to go to places where others might not attempt to go.

Again, what does that mean? It means that as we rallied around our opposition for the Iraq war, it was a willingness to be able to stand in the eye of the storm on many of these issues, whether it be on the reform of health care, looking to not talk about socialized medicine but ensuring that everyone has access to health care. That will be a progressive, if you will, challenge, to ensure that that happens.

Finally, let me say that we are here to shine the light on items that some may think was not necessarily an item or an issue that needed to be broadly affirmed or confirmed.

I am still questioning the administrative agreement that took place in the resolve of the Iraq war, not resolving it but establishing the role of our American soldiers, the soldiers that we love. The care and the nurturing of those soldiers in Iraq is an administrative document that this Congress has not had a chance to review.

So the Progressive Caucus is that light that is to shine, not for ourselves but for all of those who asked what is it that this government is doing and what are they doing for me as I am trying to do for my Nation.

So I thank you. We are patriots, and I hope that as our voices are heard, as you have made a commitment, we will be part of the cornerstone of legislation and laws, and we will therefore serve the American people even better.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this special

order. I would like to discuss the importance of America returning to the rule of law and respect for our Constitution in the immediate aftermath of the Bush-Cheney legacy. Madam Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to address this issue.

Since 2001, the Bush Administration's policies impacting civil liberties have raised grave constitutional and legal concerns. After the myriad hearings and investigations last year, there is much we do not know about the Bush Administration.

Last week, Chairman of the House Judiciary Committee released a report, entitled "Reining in the Imperial Presidency: Lessons and Recommendations Relating to the Presidency of George W. Bush." This document contained nearly 500 pages. The report detailed numerous examples of these abuses by the administration from allegations of torture and inhumane treatment, extraordinary rendition, and warrantless domestic surveillance to the U.S. Attorney scandals. The report also contained over 45 pages of recommendations designed to restore our Constitution's traditional system of checks and balances. Chief among these recommendations are: (1) The continuation of congressional oversight; (2) independent criminal probes by the incoming Justice Department; and; (3) the creation of a blue ribbon commission to fully investigate the Bush Administration's activities.

My office will work to put some of these into law. These included recommendation number 17 on pages 280 to 281, regarding the President, the Director of National Intelligence, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Director of the National Security Agency should implement policies to ensure that there is no "reverse targeting" used under authorities created by the FISA Amendments Act of 2008. Specifically, I have long championed the inclusion of language that would prohibit "reverse targeting."

Indeed, I worked on specific language that was included in an early version of the FISA Act, the RESTORE Act, which was added during the markup made a constructive contribution to the RESTORE Act by laying down a clear, objective criterion for the administration to follow and the FISA court to enforce in preventing reverse targeting.

"Reverse targeting," a concept well known to members of this Committee but not so well understood by those less steeped in the arcana of electronic surveillance, is the practice where the Government targets foreigners without a warrant while its actual purpose is to collect information on certain U.S. persons.

One of the major concerns that libertarians and classical conservatives, as well as progressives and civil liberties organizations, have is that there is an understandable temptation of national security agencies to engage in reverse targeting that may be difficult to resist in the absence of strong safeguards to prevent it.

My amendment reduces even further any such temptation to resort to reverse targeting by requiring the administration to obtain a regular, individualized FISA warrant whenever the "real" target of the surveillance is a person in the United States.

The amendment achieves this objective by requiring the administration to obtain a regular FISA warrant whenever a "significant purpose of an acquisition is to acquire the communications of a specific person reasonably believed

to be located in the United States." The current language in the bill provides that a warrant be obtained only when the Government "seeks to conduct electronic surveillance" of a person reasonably believed to be located in the United States.

It was far from clear how the operative language "seeks to" is to be interpreted. In contrast, the language used in my amendment, "significant purpose," is a term of art that has long been a staple of FISA jurisprudence and thus is well known and readily applied by the agencies, legal practitioners, and the FISA Court. Thus, the Jackson-Lee Amendment provides a clearer, more objective, criterion for the administration to follow and the FISA court to enforce to prevent the practice of reverse targeting without a warrant, which all of us can agree should not be permitted.

I am also pleased that the chairman has accepted my recommendation for the President to end abuses of Presidential signing statements. I have re-introduced a bill to address this issue in the 111th Congress.

In an earlier Congress, I introduced the "Congressional Lawmaking Authority Protection Act" or CLAP Act of 2006, which: (1) prohibited the expenditure of appropriated funds to distribute, disseminate, or publish Presidential signing statements that contradict or are inconsistent with the legislative intent of the Congress in enacting the laws; and (2) bars consideration of any signing statement by any court, administrative agency, or quasi-judicial body when construing or applying any law enacted by Congress. I am proud to say that the chairman was one of the original co-sponsors of my bill.

In the 110th Congress, I introduced another bill substantially in the same form in the current Congress, except that the new bill, H.R. 264, makes clear that the limitations of the law do not apply to Presidential signing statements that are consistent with congressional intent. This is not a hard test to administer. As the late Justice Potter Stewart said about obscenity: "it may be hard to define, but you know it when you see it."

I have now reintroduced this bill in the 111th Congress. Notwithstanding that we have a new President, my bill is still relevant.

If there be any question whether the Congress has the power to ban the use of appropriated funds to publish or distribute signing statements, the answer is simple: regardless of whether it is wise to do so, if no one seriously can question Congress's constitutional authority to terminate the Executive's use of appropriated funds to wage military operations, a fortiori, Congress has the constitutional authority to withhold from the President funds needed to distribute a signing statement that undermines the separation of powers.

The problem with presidential signing statements is that their use fosters abuse and misuse. Presidential signing statements seek to alter Congress's primacy in the legislative process by giving a President's intention in signing the bill equal or greater standing to Congress's intention in enacting it. This would be a radical, indeed revolutionary, change to our system of separated powers and checks and balances.

Bill signing statements eliminate the need for a President ever to exercise the veto since he or she could just reinterpret the bill he signs so as to make it unobjectionable to him. Such actions deprive Congress of the chance

to consider the President's objections, override his veto, and in the process make it clear that the President's position is rejected by an overwhelming majority of the people's representatives. Since few Presidents wish to suffer a humiliation so complete and public they have strong incentive to work closely with the Congress and are amenable to negotiation and compromise. This is precisely the type of competitive cooperation the Constitution contemplates and which bill signing statements threaten.

Again, I thank the Chairman for including these two very important ideas in his very thorough and thoughtful report.

There is much work to be done by the Members of Congress to fix the mistakes that were made during the prior administration so that the proper foundation can be laid for a successful President Obama and his administration. It is my hope that we can wipe the slate clean from the Bush Administration and start afresh for the current administration.

I agree that we must investigate the U.S. Attorney firings to determine what precisely happened. We need to determine why these firings occurred. Moreover, the incoming administration should limit the ability of Executive Branch officials to prevent victims of terrorism from recovering for their losses. The President should seek to resolve a dispute between victims of torture and the government of Iraq committed during the Gulf War.

Because of the myriad of problems that we have seen at the Department of Justice, I recommend that the Department of Justice should issue guidelines to require transparency and uniformity of corporate deferred and non-prosecution agreements. These are agreements between the Federal Government and individual corporations in which the Government agrees to not prosecute or defer criminal prosecution in exchange for the corporation agreeing to specific actions such as changes in corporate policies and payment of monetary penalties.

We should also consider whether we should consider legislation concerning the exercise of clemency involving government officials. This is important so that we can truly learn what happened during the Bush Administration.

We should also enact changes in statutes and rules to strengthen protection for Executive Branch whistleblowers, Congress's contempt powers, and the incoming administration should establish procedures for asserting executive privilege. There are a myriad of laws that we must enact to set this Nation on the right track. We must roll up our sleeves and get ready to work with the new administration to restore the rule of law to America and its position of respect on the world stage.

Mr. ELLISON. Thank you, Congresswoman.

Let me just say, tonight we have come together, members of the Progressive Caucus, a caucus organized, not based on ethnicity, like the Black Caucus or the Hispanic Caucus, not based on things like that, but based on our commonality of views, our value, what we all believe in. The Progressive Caucus represents diverse members of our congressional body, people from all over the country, different religions, different ethnic groups, all coming to project a progressive vision for our Nation.

We believe in fighting for economic justice and security in the United States and global economies. We also believe in protecting and preserving civil rights and civil liberties. We also believe in promoting global peace and security. These are some of the essential core beliefs of the Progressive Caucus, and you can count on us to come, week in, week out, with the progressive message to talk about how these critical values impact you.

Tonight we have spent time, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON-LEE and Congressman RAÚL GRIJALVA, talking about the imperial presidency that we have just seen ushered out of the door. We have seen a 500-page report, this big, thick, giant, humongous, enormous report full of facts and information in detail about allegations that the Bush administration may have overstepped its constitutional bounds. We believe this needs to be looked into. We believe the groundwork has been laid for an inquiry for a blue ribbon panel.

The vehicle, we believe, that should be used to get to the bottom, to get to the truth, is H.R. 104. H.R. 104, which Members and their community can look it up and read it, but what it would tell you if you looked it up is it would contain 47 separate recommendations designed to restore our Constitution's traditional system of checks and balances.

Chief among the recommendations are, one, continuation of congressional oversight; two, independent probes by the Justice Department; three, creation of a blue ribbon commission to fully investigate the activities; and they go on and on and on. You can look up the report online. It's there for you to look at it, at judiciary.house.gov/hearings/printers/110th. You can look it up that way.

Finally, we want to look into and don't want the American people to forget that our constitutional system is delicate. It must be maintained. It is a three-part system of checks and balances, executive, judiciary and legislative. The legislative branch is the first one mentioned in the Constitution.

We are a coequal branch of government. We don't work for the President, not the President we just got, Barack Obama, although we support him and wish him well. He is not our boss. The people are our boss. Also, we don't work for the President. We have a duty and an obligation to provide oversight to the executive.

We need to get to the bottom of allegations of torture and inhumane treatment, extraordinary rendition, warrantless domestic surveillance, the U.S. Attorney General scandal, a contrived drive to go to war with Iraq, signing statements to override laws of the land, intimidation and silencing of critics. We need to get into what happened with Valerie Plame. Why didn't Rove, Bolton and Myers show up to the Judiciary hearing after they were duly served? These are issues the American

people have a right to know, and we intend to get to the bottom of it.

This is going to conclude the Progressive Message. Mr. Speaker, it has been a wonderful hearing.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BOUCHER (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and January 22 on account of a death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SPRATT, for 5 minutes today.

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

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, January 27 and 28.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHOCK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, January 27 and 28.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MASSA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Thursday, January 22, 2009, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

177. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a document entitled, "Gasoline Savings From Ethanol Use by State"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

178. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Global Security Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's fiscal year 2008 report on the Regional Defense

Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2249c; to the Committee on Armed Services.

179. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [44 CFR Part 67] received January 7, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

180. A letter from the Regulatory Specialist, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Minimum Capital Ratios; Capital Adequacy Guidelines; Capital Maintenance; Capital; Deduction of Goodwill Net of Associated Deferred Tax Liability [Docket No.: OTS-2008-0019] (RIN: 1550-AC22) received January 12, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

181. A letter from the Assistant Deputy Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Teaching American History Grant Program Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number: 84.215X. — received January 12, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

182. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of the Department's intent to sign a Project Agreement concerning the Development of Advanced Non-Acoustic Sensing Technologies under the Agreement between the Department of Defense of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Sweden for Technology Research and Development Projects, Transmittal No. 22-08, pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

183. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of the Department's intent to sign a Project Agreement concerning the Joint Light Tactical Vehicle under the Memorandum of Understanding between the United States and Australia concerning Cooperation on Land Force Capability Modernization, Transmittal No. 18-08, pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

184. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of the Department's intent to sign a Project Agreement concerning the C-130J Block 7 and 8.1 Upgrade among Australia, Canada, Denmark, the Italian Republic, the Kingdom of Norway, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America, Transmittal No. 21-08, pursuant to Section 27(f) of the Arms Export Control Act and Section 1(f) of Executive Order 11958; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

185. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Cote d'Ivoire that was declared in Executive Order 13396 of February 7, 2006; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

186. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national