ROLL CALL ON FISA IN HJC

Via email, here are the roll call votes against the Forbes amendment (favoring immunity for Telcos) and for the RESTORE legislation.

Forbes:

No: Conyers, Berman, Boucher, Nadler, Scott, Watt, Lofgren, Jackson Lee, Waters, Delahunt, Wexler, Sanchez, Cohen, Sutton, Sherman, Baldwin, Weiner, Schiff, Davis, Wasserman Schultz, Ellison

Yes: Smith, Sensenbrenner, Coble, Goodlatte, Lungren, Cannon, Keller, Pence, Forbes, King, Feeney, Franks, Gohmert, Jordan

Final Passage

Yes:

HOUSE RULES

The WaPo has more on the logic behind the refusal of the 13 Congressmen subpoenaed yesterday to testify.

As required by House rules, the subpoenas were read into theCongressional Record late Monday evening. John D. Filamor, assistantHouse counsel, wrote Geragos on Sept. 6 to object to the subpoenas, citing House rules that forbid members from testifying in judicial proceedings unless their testimony is "material and relevant."

Filamor also cited the "speech or debate" clause of

CONGRESSIONAL SUBPOENAS ARE THE NEW GRAYMAIL

The AP has the list of Congressmen whom Brent Wilkes has subpoenaed to appear at his trial. There are virtually no surprises on the list—all are either former or current Chairs of the Committees that knew of Wilkes' behavior and/or noted earmarkers in their own right. Here's why I think each person was subpoenaed.

Duncan Hunter, R-CA:

MCCONNELL AND DICK

There are two stories out today claiming Mike McConnell, the Director of National Intelligence, is really wearing the pants in the Executive Branch's dealings with intelligence. The NYT has McConnell describing tremendous pressure from Congress, yet insisting he got no pressure from the White House.

In an interview in his office, Mr.

SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT THE FOLEY SCANDAL

WHY ARE PETE HOEKSTRA'S KNICKERS IN A TWIST?

Laura Rozen has been cataloging the back and forth between Jane Harman and Pete Hoekstra. First, Jane Harman unilaterally released the executive summary of the report on how Duke Cunningham executed his graft (a fair response, I think, to all the clear propaganda they've got Fred Fleitz churning out over there).

WHY ARE THEY AFRAID OF A LIVING WAGE, CLEAN AIR, AND FREE SPEECH?

Well, the Republicans have launched their longplanned attack on the Representatives who will be Committee Chairs when we take back Congress. It will get nastier than this—the WSJ hides, at least, the degree to which this fear campaign depends on race-baiting and gay-baiting. But let's look at some of the things they fear:

Energyand Commerce would return to the untender mercies of John Dingell, thelongest-serving Member first elected in 1955, who was

CAN YOU HEAR ME NOW?

The NYT's blockbuster story on Brent Wilkes is most interesting, IMO, for the delicate dance of threat and technical legal denial it portrays. Wilkes leaves little doubt as to why he agreed to the interview.

Ms. Luque said her client's legal problems were a battle that he "will fight and win.â€∏

Shesaid federal prosecutors told her in January that they were notinterested in Mr.

DELAY'S DILEMMA

Let's say you're Tom DeLay. It's February 2006, and your legal defense fund is beginning to run dry. Well, not just run dry. It's already running a deficit. You're already polling behind your Democratic opponent in the polls, and you haven't even won the primary yet. Thing is, you consider the three people running against you disloyal.

LAMONT'S "SINGLE ISSUE" VOTERS

The Q-Poll shows that 44% of Lamont's supporters support him mainly because of Lieberman's stance on the Iraq war. And Markos anticipates a bunch of pundits frowning on the large number of "Single Issue" voters.

For a pundit to suggest the Iraq war is a "Single Issue" simply betrays their ignorance of

the impact that war has and will continue to have on this country and the rest of the world.

Some are