

our intelligence agencies to intercept foreign-to-foreign communications related to international terrorism. The argument is specious on its face. Democrats are just as committed as our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to preventing another terrorist attack on the United States.

As a member of the Gang of Eight from 2002–2006, I am very familiar with FISA and our Terrorist Surveillance Program. While I agree that some technical adjustments are appropriate, the core principle of FISA and the 4th Amendment—that individualized court warrants are required if the communications of a U.S. person are involved—must be preserved.

But my question is, in the context of the CHAMP Act now before us: where is the outrage for the 5 million American kids who have no health insurance and no prospect of getting it unless we pass this bill?

What is the real objective of Members who continue to clutter an essential debate on improving health outcomes for our neediest children with alarmist exchanges on the surveillance of potential terrorists? Perhaps it is to jam Democrats and score partisan points before the August recess instead of reaching out to the most vulnerable among us.

The CHAMP Act reaches out by providing insurance to 11 million children, covering mental health and dental benefits, and by allowing States to cover pregnant women and family planning.

It reauthorizes Title V abstinence education, but requires that it be medically and scientifically accurate, as well as proven effective. I expect every Member agrees that no Federal program should use taxpayer dollars to give inaccurate information to young people.

The CHAMP Act makes improvements to the Medicare program, too, providing our most vulnerable seniors with better coverage for cost-saving preventive care and by making it easier to apply for benefits.

Let me bring the issue close to home. The Venice Family Clinic, located in my congressional district, is the largest free clinic in the Nation. They know something about reaching out to the most vulnerable in our communities.

Clinic staff told me today about an 8-year-old boy and his younger brother. Both of them are on the waiting list for SCHIP because the program is maxed-out—and their working mother doesn't earn enough to buy health insurance.

This child suffers epileptic seizures every couple of weeks. He worries constantly about when the next one will occur, when and if he will be able to see a doctor or have access to medication that could help him. These are not things an 8-year-old in a country as rich as ours should be worrying about.

Expanding SCHIP will cover these children. It will change their lives, and the lives of 11 million other low income American kids.

FISA can, should and will be fixed—and we can fix health insurance for kids, too. Every child deserves the health insurance that my four children and one grandchild have. And I have two more grandchildren on the way. Hopefully, the CHAMP Act will be law before they are born early next year.

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to another distinguished member of the Energy and Commerce Committee, Mr. PITTS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to focus on one important failure of this legislation that I think the proliferators on the other side of the aisle would be interested in.

Since 2002, the present administration has granted the States the option of providing SCHIP coverage to the child before birth, the unborn child, prenatal care and other health services for the unborn child and the pregnant mother. Unfortunately, the bill offered today would override current regulation and extend coverage in the name of the pregnant woman only. My amendment to codify the words “unborn child” was disallowed, not made in order last night.

Protecting only the pregnant woman could lead to a greater number of abortions. It would make the woman eligible for all publicly-funded services, including State-funded elective abortions. In States with Medicaid expansion programs, this could increase the number of women eligible for free abortions, thus promoting more abortions of unborn children in the name of children's health. This bill's language essentially classifies the pregnant woman herself. It does not make sense.

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee be forfeited.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I object to that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. STARK. I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan? Does anybody wish to yield time?

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, could you give us a time report? How much time remains for each?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Louisiana has 30 minutes; the gentleman from California has 17½ minutes; the gentleman from Texas has 11 minutes; the gentleman from Michigan has 21½ minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. How much does the gentleman from Louisiana have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 30 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. None of it has been used.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. LINDER. Would you tell us how much time they have combined, the two committees and our two committees combined, left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 21½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from California has 17½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Louisiana has 30 minutes remaining; and the gentleman from Texas has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed

out of order and engage in a colloquy with Mr. STARK and Mr. DINGELL for purposes of trying to understand what is going on.

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

Mr. STARK. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter from the Catholic Health Association of the United States, which in part states that: We believe the most important pro-life thing that Congress can do right now is to ensure that the State Children's Health Insurance Program is reauthorized.

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I will not object if the gentleman from California will explain to me why we are fighting over what was in a pre-agreed-upon time arrangement. We have got six or seven speakers from the Energy and Commerce Committee. We are simply trying to do it in a balanced way. The gentleman from California has 17 minutes; the gentleman from Michigan has, I believe, 21 minutes. We just wish that the time go down in a balanced way. I don't understand why that should be a problem.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas will suspend.

The Chair will clarify. The gentleman from Michigan has 21½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from California has 17½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Louisiana has 30 minutes remaining; and the gentleman from Texas has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I yield to my friend from California to explain to me why they don't want to use some of their time right now.

Mr. STARK. I am happy to respond. You are a couple minutes ahead of us, and of course I am dying to hear what my colleagues on the Republican side of the Ways and Means have to say.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Reclaiming my reservation, my understanding was that the Energy and Commerce Committee was going to go first, and then the Ways and Means Committee was going to go in the second hour. That is why Mr. McCRERY is reserving his 30 minutes.

Mr. STARK. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. STARK. I think you have just touched on a misunderstanding. We had been led to believe that we would be rotating around among the various committees, and so that now we are kind of out of balance. Our understanding is that we would rotate back and forth between Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means for the full time. I apologize to the gentleman if we misled. Our concern was that we