

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 222, noes 185, answered “present” 2, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 175]  
AYES—222

Aderholt	Gibbons	Northup
Akin	Gilchrist	Nunes
Alexander	Gillmor	Nussle
Bachus	Gingrey	Osborne
Baker	Goode	Otter
Barrett (SC)	Goodlatte	Oxley
Bartlett (MD)	Granger	Paul
Barton (TX)	Graves	Pearce
Bass	Green (WI)	Pence
Beauprez	Gutknecht	Peterson (PA)
Biggert	Hall	Petri
Billirakis	Harris	Pickering
Bishop (UT)	Hart	Pitts
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Platts
Blunt	Hayes	Poe
Boehlert	Hayworth	Pombo
Boehner	Hefley	Porter
Bonilla	Hensarling	Price (GA)
Bonner	Hergert	Pryce (OH)
Bono	Hobson	Putnam
Boozman	Hoekstra	Radanovich
Boustany	Hostettler	Ranstad
Bradley (NH)	Hulshof	Regula
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Rehberg
Brown (SC)	Hyde	Reichert
Brown-Waite, Ginny	Inglis (SC)	Renzi
Burgess	Issa	Reynolds
Buyer	Jenkins	Rogers (AL)
Calvert	Jindal	Rogers (KY)
Camp	Johnson (CT)	Rogers (MI)
Cannon	Johnson (IL)	Rohrabacher
Cantor	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Capito	Jones (NC)	Royce
Carter	Keller	Ryan (WI)
Castle	Kelly	Ryun (KS)
Chabot	Kennedy (MN)	Saxton
Chocola	King (IA)	Schwarz (MI)
Coble	King (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Cole (OK)	Kingston	Sessions
Conaway	Kirk	Shadegg
Cox	Kline	Shaw
Crenshaw	Knollenberg	Shays
Culberson	Kolbe	Sherwood
Cunningham	Kuhl (NY)	Shimkus
Davis (KY)	LaHood	Shuster
Davis, Jo Ann	Latham	Simmons
Davis, Tom	LaTourette	Simpson
Deal (GA)	Leach	Smith (NJ)
DeLay	Lewis (CA)	Smith (TX)
Dent	Lewis (KY)	Sodrel
Diaz-Balart, L.	Linder	Souder
Diaz-Balart, M.	LoBiondo	Stearns
Dicks	Lucas	Sullivan
Doolittle	Lungren, Daniel	Tancredo
Drake	E.	Taylor (NC)
Dreier	Mack	Terry
Duncan	Manzullo	Thomas
Ehlers	Marchant	Thornberry
English (PA)	McCaul (TX)	Tiahrt
Everett	McCotter	Tiberi
Feeney	McCrery	Turner
Ferguson	McHenry	Upton
Fitzpatrick (PA)	McHugh	Walden (OR)
Flake	McKeon	Walsh
Foley	McMorris	Wamp
Forbes	Mica	Weldon (FL)
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Weldon (PA)
Fossella	Miller (MI)	Weller
Fox	Miller, Gary	Westmoreland
Franks (AZ)	Moran (KS)	Whitfield
Frelinghuysen	Murphy	Wilson (NM)
Galleghy	Musgrave	Wilson (SC)
Garrett (NJ)	Myrick	Wolf
Gerlach	Neugebauer	Young (AK)
	Ney	

NOES—185

Abercrombie	Boren	Cleaver
Allen	Boswell	Clyburn
Andrews	Boyd	Conyers
Baca	Brown (OH)	Cooper
Baldwin	Brown, Corrine	Costa
Barrow	Butterfield	Costello
Bean	Capps	Cramer
Becerra	Capuano	Crowley
Berkley	Cardin	Cuellar
Berman	Cardoza	Cummings
Berry	Carnahan	Davis (AL)
Bishop (GA)	Case	Davis (CA)
Bishop (NY)	Chandler	Davis (FL)
Blumenauer	Clay	Davis (TN)

DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Rothman
DeGette	Lipinski	Roybal-Allard
Delahunt	Lofgren, Zoe	Ruppersberger
DeLauro	Lowey	Rush
Doggett	Lynch	Ryan (OH)
Edwards	Maloney	Sabo
Emanuel	Markey	Salazar
Engel	Marshall	Sánchez, Linda
Eshoo	Matheson	T.
Etheridge	Matsui	Sanchez, Loretta
Evans	McCarthy	Sanders
Farr	McCollum (MN)	Schakowsky
Filner	McDermott	Schiff
Filner	McGovern	Schwartz (PA)
Ford	McIntyre	Scott (GA)
Frank (MA)	McKinney	Serrano
Gonzalez	Gordon	Sherman
Green, Al	McNulty	Skelton
Green, Gene	Meehan	Slaughter
Grijalva	Meek (FL)	Smith (WA)
Gutierrez	Meeks (NY)	Snyder
Harman	Melancon	Solis
Hastings (FL)	Menendez	Spratt
Herseth	Michaud	Stark
Higgins	Miller (NC)	Strickland
Hinchoy	Miller, George	Stupak
Hinojosa	Mollohan	Tanner
Holden	Moore (KS)	Tauscher
Holt	Moore (WI)	Taylor (MS)
Hooley	Moran (VA)	Thompson (CA)
Hoyer	Murtha	Thompson (MS)
Inslee	Nadler	Tierney
Israel	Napolitano	Towns
Jackson (IL)	Norwood	Udall (CO)
Jackson-Lee	Oberstar	Udall (NM)
(TX)	Obey	Van Hollen
Jefferson	Olver	Velázquez
Johnson, E. B.	Ortiz	Visclosky
Jones (OH)	Pallone	Wasserman
Kaptur	Pascarell	Schultz
Kennedy (RI)	Pastor	Watson
Kildee	Payne	Watt
Kind	Pelosi	Waxman
Kucinich	Peterson (MN)	Weiner
Langevin	Pomeroy	Wexler
Lantos	Price (NC)	Woolsey
Larsen (WA)	Rahall	Wu
Lee	Rangel	Wynn
Levin	Reyes	
	Ross	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—2

Emerson	Istook
Ackerman	Doyle
Baird	Fattah
Boucher	Gohmert
Brady (PA)	Honda
Burton (IN)	Kanjorski
Carson	Kilpatrick (MI)
Cubis	Larson (CT)
Davis (IL)	Millender-
Dingell	McDonald

NOT VOTING—24

□ 1151

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2360 and that I may include tabular material on the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 278 and rule

VIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2360.

□ 1153

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2360) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, with Mr. GILLMOR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MIKE ROGERS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MIKE ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to be here today to present the fiscal 2006 Homeland Security Appropriations bill.

The first chapter for the Department of Homeland Security has been written. Progress has been made, and our country is safer today than it was before September 11. In 2 years the Department has developed and deployed new technologies to inspect cargo at our seaports and detect hazards in our environment. US-VISIT has been put in place at all international airports and seaports; a one-stop shop for first responders has been created; more than 90,000 national assets have been catalogued in a national infrastructure database; and a communications system with State and local governments is in place.

These are important accomplishments, but they are not enough. There is a great deal of work to be done, and it is time to write the next chapter.

The bill before us today provides \$30.8 billion in discretionary funds for the upcoming fiscal year, \$1.4 billion above the current year and \$1.3 billion above the amounts requested by the President. There are some tough choices in here, but they have been made after a careful review of how the Department is functioning, which programs work, and which ones, quite frankly, are broken.

Nearly 2 years ago, when the Department was first created and came before the Committee on Appropriations seeking funds, I made it clear that homeland security requires the active engagement of all Americans and all branches of government; that we are all stakeholders and must be treated as such. I also advised that the Committee on Appropriations would be a partner as the Department sought to secure our homeland, that we would not be casual bystanders willing to sign a blank check. I have consistently

and repeatedly told the Department that we would require accountability and cooperation, that we would expect them to establish and meet specific milestones, that we would watch and measure their progress. We have done that, exactly that. And, frankly, Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed.

I have come to the conclusion that there are two fundamental challenges within this Department. First, DHS has been slow to build its internal capabilities. The information technology infrastructure has not been integrated. There is no system in place to develop, certify, and transfer homeland security technologies. A financial management system that tracks where the money goes does not exist, and there is only a limited capacity to put first responder funds out on the street based on standards and minimum levels of preparedness.

Second, the Department has not been successful at revising missions and assets of legacy organizations in a way that reflects the post-9/11 homeland security environment. All too many examples come to mind: the Coast Guard, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Border Protection, and Transportation Security. In too many cases it is just business as usual. Missions and threats have changed, but the Department has not. This is unacceptable. The "business as usual" mentality has to go.

The bill before us is anything but business as usual. The Department has been a reluctant partner and has ignored requests for information and direction to move expeditiously in the implementation of important national policies and goals.

This became all too obvious this year when the Department ignored Congressional requests for comprehensive information on the Coast Guard's important Deepwater program. The Department will find that that lack of information has cost them. Absent a revised baseline that reflects post-9/11 mission requirements for the Coast Guard, Deepwater is being funded at pre-9/11 levels, \$500 million. That is \$466 million below the request. It is a simple equation, Mr. Chairman: No information equals no money.

□ 1200

Throughout this bill, we will see this equation applied. There are more than \$485 million in cuts because the Congress did not get the information we needed to make informed decisions about programs and operations. There is also more than \$310 million in fenced funding, until the Department performs certain actions, including implementation of new air cargo screening methods and standards, an immigration and border security enforcement strategy, and a plan to deploy explosive detection technologies to our Nation's airports.

Within this bill, first responders are funded at the President's requested level of \$3.6 billion. I would like to

point out that there continues to be problems at the local, State, and Federal levels in terms of getting money actually out to first responders. We have recently learned, Mr. Chairman, that only 30 percent of the funds that we have appropriated since 2002, have been spent. Including the 2005 grant money, there is \$6.8 billion in the grant pipeline.

Mr. Chairman, that is unacceptable.

The bill does not propose any changes to the current formula as to how those monies are dealt out, but it does recognize that legislation which passed this Chamber last week is moving through the process. The appropriations bill will allow 2006 funding to go out based on any formula change that may be signed into law. The bill also presumes that if new formulas do not go into effect, the Department would maintain the minimum allocation for States of .75 percent. The balance of that fund, though, would go out based on risk, threat, and need; not, as it has in the past, based solely on population. That is a fundamental change in the way first responder monies would go out.

The bill also includes a significant increase for border security and immigration enforcement. A total of \$1.2 billion is added for the Customs and Border Patrol and the Immigration and Customs Enforcement branches. That funding is on top of the \$550 million that was provided in the emergency supplemental just signed. Between that supplemental and this bill, we will be providing the Department with the resources to hire an additional 1,500 border patrol agents and 568 ICE officers throughout the country. Funds are also available to add some 3,870 detention beds, which would be roughly a 20 percent increase over current levels. Also, funds are available for new radiation portal monitors and air assets.

These funds, though, Mr. Chairman, would come with strings attached. Our immigration enforcement strategy needs an overhaul. Despite more than tripling spending on border security and immigration enforcement in the last 10 years, the number of illegal immigrants in the U.S. has more than doubled, an unbelievable 11 million estimated illegal aliens in the country; and that number is growing by a half a million a year, by conservative estimates.

And of that total, there are more than 465,000 absconders, people who have been caught, brought to court, released on their own recognizance to report at a later date, which they fail to do. And of those, 80,000 of them have criminal records. Those numbers, Mr. Chairman, will only get worse unless we act.

Immigration enforcement is one of the most critical components of homeland security, yet the Department's current strategy has changed little since the days of the old Immigration and Naturalization Service. In order to inspire change, the bill includes lan-

guage requiring the Secretary to submit an immigration enforcement strategy to reduce the number of undocumented aliens by 10 percent per year. The bill withholds \$20 million of the Secretary's office funds until we receive that strategy.

Finally, for transportation security, the bill includes \$6.4 billion, partially offset by fees, which is an increase of \$344 million above the current year. The bill includes several provisions that address years of frustration in dealing with the Transportation Security Administration. For too long, TSA and others have ignored congressional direction regarding general aviation at Reagan National Airport. A legislative provision is included, after these 3 or 4 years of discussions, requiring the Secretary to open Reagan National Airport to general aviation within 90 days of enactment of this act.

The committee also has repeatedly asked for a plan as to how TSA would be installing the explosive detection systems, the so-called x-ray machines, at our airports. Again, TSA has ignored the Congress. In addition to providing \$495 million for the purchase and installation of these x-ray machines, the committee fences \$50 million of the administrator's funds until an installation plan is provided to the Congress.

Finally, the bill provides \$100 million for cargo security in passenger planes. TSA has ignored congressional directions to triple the screening of air cargo on passenger aircraft. As a result, the committee reduces the appropriation for TSA headquarters by \$100,000 for each day that the tripling of air cargo is not implemented. The bill also fences another \$10 million until new cargo screening standards and protocols are implemented.

These next few years, Mr. Chairman, will define the Department's place in history. This bill may be tough, and I admit that it is, but I hope it is a wakeup call. It is time to take strong action to ensure that the Department's place in history and our safety will be one of success and leadership in securing our homeland and not one of government bureaucracy and failed opportunities. It is now time for action.

I appreciate that the bill includes several tough provisions. I am aware that the new Secretary is in the process of completing what he calls a second-stage review of the Department's programs and operations. I am pleased about that. While I have great respect and confidence in the Department's new leadership, and we look forward to receiving any recommendations the Secretary may have to move the Department forward, we cannot ignore the fundamental problems that we have been experiencing with this Department since its creation. I urge my colleagues to support the measure.

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2006 (H.R. 2360)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY					
TITLE I - DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS					
Departmental Operations					
Office of the Secretary and Executive Management:					
Immediate Office of the Secretary.....	2,141	2,393	2,393	+252	---
Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary.....	1,112	1,132	1,132	+20	---
Office of Security.....	21,424	61,278	51,278	+29,854	-10,000
Chief of Staff.....	5,240	4,103	4,103	-1,137	---
Executive Secretary.....	3,500	5,491	5,400	+1,900	-91
Office of Policy, Planning and International Affairs.....					
Special Assistant to the Secretary/Private Sector.....	3,781	4,181	4,181	+400	---
Office for National Capital Region Coordination...	688	1,072	982	+294	-90
Office of International Affairs.....	1,200	---	---	-1,200	---
Office of Public Affairs.....	8,120	9,312	9,172	+1,052	-140
Office of Legislative Affairs.....	5,400	6,182	5,500	+100	-682
Office of General Counsel.....	10,821	11,947	11,800	+979	-147
Office of Civil Rights and Liberties.....	13,000	13,000	13,000	---	---
Citizenship and Immigration Services Ombudsman....	3,546	3,652	3,652	+106	---
Homeland Security Advisory Committee.....	1,287	---	---	-1,287	---
Privacy Officer.....	3,774	3,981	4,381	+607	+400
Regions.....	---	49,895	---	---	-49,895
Operation Integration Staff.....	---	9,459	7,495	+7,495	-1,964
<hr/>					
Subtotal, Office of the Secretary and Executive Management.....	85,034	195,848	133,239	+48,205	-62,609
Office of the Under Secretary for Management:					
Under Secretary for Management.....	1,434	1,867	1,822	+388	-45
Business Transformation Office.....	920	948	948	+28	---
Office of the Chief Procurement Officer.....	7,350	9,020	9,020	+1,670	---
Office of the Human Resources.....	7,200	---	---	-7,200	---
Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer:					
Salaries and expenses.....	---	8,996	8,951	+8,951	-45
MAX - HR System.....	---	53,000	53,000	+53,000	---
Subtotal, Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer.....	---	61,996	61,951	+61,951	-45
Office of Administration.....	27,270	---	---	-27,270	---
Office of the Chief Administrative Officer:					
Salaries and expenses.....	---	40,731	40,286	+40,286	-445
Nebraska Avenue Complex (NAC-DHS Headquarters)	---	26,070	26,070	+26,070	---
Subtotal, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.....	---	66,801	66,356	+66,356	-445
Immigration statistics.....	5,898	5,987	5,987	+89	---
Headquarters.....	65,081	---	---	-65,081	---
Human resources system.....	36,000	---	---	-36,000	---
<hr/>					
Subtotal, Office of the Under Secretary for Management.....	151,153	146,619	146,084	-5,069	-535
Office of the Chief Financial Officer.....	13,000	18,505	18,505	+5,505	---
Office of the Chief Information Officer:					
Salaries and expenses.....	67,270	75,756	75,756	+8,486	---
Information technology services.....	91,000	110,944	110,944	+19,944	---
Security activities.....	31,000	31,000	31,000	---	---
Wireless program.....	86,000	86,000	86,000	---	---
<hr/>					
Subtotal, Office of the Chief Information Officer.....	275,270	303,700	303,700	+28,430	---
<hr/>					
Total, Departmental operations.....	524,457	664,672	601,528	+77,071	-63,144

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2006 (H.R. 2360)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Office of Inspector General</b>					
Operating expenses.....	82,317	83,017	83,017	+700	---
Total, Office of Inspector General.....	82,317	83,017	83,017	+700	---
Total, title I, Departmental Management and Operations.....	606,774	747,689	684,545	+77,771	-63,144
<b>TITLE II - SECURITY, ENFORCEMENT, AND INVESTIGATIONS</b>					
Office of the Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security.....	9,617	10,617	10,617	+1,000	---
U.S. Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology	340,000	---	---	-340,000	---
<b>Automation Modernization</b>					
U.S. Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology.....	---	---	390,232	+390,232	+390,232
FAST.....	---	---	7,000	+7,000	+7,000
NEXUS/SENTRI.....	---	---	14,000	+14,000	+14,000
Total, Automation Modernization.....	---	---	411,232	+411,232	+411,232
<b>Office of Screening Coordination Operations:</b>					
U.S. Visitor and Immigrant Status Indicator Technology.....	---	390,232	---	---	-390,232
SecureFlight.....	---	94,294	---	---	-94,294
FAST.....	---	7,000	---	---	-7,000
NEXUS/SENTRI.....	---	14,000	---	---	-14,000
Credentialing/Startup.....	---	20,000	---	---	-20,000
<b>Fee Funded Program:</b>					
TWIC/TSA Credentialing.....	---	(100,000)	---	---	(-100,000)
Registered Traveler.....	---	(20,000)	---	---	(-20,000)
HAZMAT.....	---	(50,000)	---	---	(-50,000)
Alien Flight School (By transfer).....	---	(10,000)	---	---	(-10,000)
Total, Office of Screening Coordination Operations.....	---	(705,526)	---	---	(-705,526)
Appropriations.....	---	(525,526)	---	---	(-525,526)
(Fee funded programs).....	---	(180,000)	---	---	(-180,000)
<b>Customs and Border Protection</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,172,838	---	---	-1,172,838	---
<b>Salaries and expenses:</b>					
Management and administration, border security inspections and trade facilitation.....	---	656,826	656,826	+656,826	---
Management and administration, border security and control between port of entry.....	---	593,207	593,207	+593,207	---
Subtotal, Headquarters management and administration.....	1,172,838	1,250,033	1,250,033	+77,195	---
<b>Border security inspections and trade facilitation:</b>					
Inspections, trade, and travel facilitation at ports of entry.....	1,242,800	1,274,994	1,274,994	+32,194	---
Harbor maintenance fee collection (trust fund)	3,000	3,000	3,000	---	---
Container security initiative.....	126,096	138,790	138,790	+12,694	---
Other international programs.....	57,300	8,629	8,629	-48,671	---
Customs trade partnership against terrorism/ Free and secure trade.....	37,828	54,268	54,268	+16,440	---
Inspection and detection technology investments.....	145,159	188,024	188,024	+42,865	---
Automated targeting systems.....	29,800	28,253	28,253	-1,547	---

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2006 (H.R. 2360)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
National Targeting Center.....	16,100	16,697	16,697	+597	---
Other technology investments, including information technology.....	1,000	1,018	1,018	+18	---
Training.....	23,800	24,351	24,351	+551	---
Subtotal, Border security inspections and trade facilitation.....	1,682,883	1,738,024	1,738,024	+55,141	---
Border security and control between ports of entry:					
Border security and control.....	1,413,800	1,464,989	1,614,989	+201,189	+150,000
Air program operations.....	37,300	57,971	57,971	+20,671	---
Unmanned aerial vehicles.....	10,000	10,180	10,180	+180	---
America Shield Initiative (ASI) procurement...	64,162	51,084	51,084	-13,078	---
Training.....	21,700	22,203	22,203	+503	---
Subtotal, Border security and control between ports of entry.....	1,546,962	1,606,427	1,756,427	+209,465	+150,000
Air and marine operations, personnel compensation and benefits.....	131,436	136,060	141,060	+9,624	+5,000
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses (gross).....	4,534,119	4,730,544	4,885,544	+351,425	+155,000
Appropriations.....	(4,534,119)	(4,730,544)	(4,885,544)	(+351,425)	(+155,000)
Rescission (P.L. 108-11).....	(-63,010)	---	---	(+63,010)	---
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses (net).....	4,471,109	4,730,544	4,885,544	+414,435	+155,000
Automation modernization:					
Automated commercial environment/International Trade Data System (ITDS).....	321,690	321,690	321,690	---	---
Automated commercial system and legacy IT costs...	128,219	136,319	136,319	+8,100	---
Subtotal, Automation modernization.....	449,909	458,009	458,009	+8,100	---
Air and marine operations:					
Operations and maintenance.....	196,535	230,682	240,682	+44,147	+10,000
Procurement.....	61,000	62,098	107,098	+46,098	+45,000
Subtotal, Air and marine operations.....	257,535	292,780	347,780	+90,245	+55,000
Construction:					
Construction (Border patrol).....	91,718	93,418	93,418	+1,700	---
Total, Direct appropriations.....	5,270,271	5,574,751	5,784,751	+514,480	+210,000
Fee accounts:					
Immigration inspection user fee.....	(429,000)	(464,816)	(464,816)	(+35,816)	---
Immigration enforcement fines.....	(6,000)	(6,403)	(6,403)	(+403)	---
Land border inspection fee.....	(28,000)	(29,878)	(29,878)	(+1,878)	---
COBRA passenger inspection fee.....	(318,000)	(334,000)	(334,000)	(+16,000)	---
APHIS inspection fee.....	(204,000)	(204,000)	(204,000)	---	---
Puerto Rico collections.....	(89,000)	(97,815)	(97,815)	(+8,815)	---
Small airport user fees.....	(5,004)	(5,234)	(5,234)	(+230)	---
Subtotal, fee accounts.....	(1,079,004)	(1,142,146)	(1,142,146)	(+63,142)	---
Total, Customs and Border Protection.....	(6,349,275)	(6,716,897)	(6,926,897)	(+577,622)	(+210,000)
Appropriations.....	(5,333,281)	(5,574,751)	(5,784,751)	(+451,470)	(+210,000)
Rescission.....	(-63,010)	---	---	(+63,010)	---
(Fee accounts).....	(1,079,004)	(1,142,146)	(1,142,146)	(+63,142)	---

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2006 (H.R. 2360)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Immigration and Customs Enforcement</b>					
<b>Salaries and expenses:</b>					
<b>Headquarters Management and Administration</b>					
<b>(non-Detention and Removal Operations):</b>					
Personnel compensation and benefits, service and other costs.....	96,202	277,572	277,572	+181,370	---
Headquarters managed IT investment.....	120,119	134,571	134,571	+14,452	---
<b>Subtotal, Headquarters management and administration.....</b>	<b>216,321</b>	<b>412,143</b>	<b>412,143</b>	<b>+195,822</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>Investigations:</b>					
Operations.....	1,055,345	1,215,916	1,253,716	+198,371	+37,800
Training.....	15,671	17,932	17,932	+2,261	---
<b>Subtotal, Investigations.....</b>	<b>1,071,016</b>	<b>1,233,848</b>	<b>1,271,648</b>	<b>+200,632</b>	<b>+37,800</b>
<b>Intelligence:</b>					
Headquarters Reporting Center.....	4,882	4,988	4,988	+106	---
Operations/Operations Center.....	55,130	56,834	56,834	+1,704	---
<b>Subtotal, Intelligence.....</b>	<b>60,012</b>	<b>61,822</b>	<b>61,822</b>	<b>+1,810</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>Detention and removal operations:</b>					
Custody management.....	504,221	600,160	690,160	+185,939	+90,000
Case management.....	192,269	166,277	166,277	-25,992	---
Fugitive operations.....	35,242	103,255	119,255	+84,013	+16,000
Institutional removal program.....	33,719	70,104	88,104	+54,385	+18,000
Alternatives to detention.....	14,202	33,406	43,406	+29,204	+10,000
Transportation and removal program.....	311,492	211,266	211,266	-100,226	---
<b>Subtotal, Detention and removal operations..</b>	<b>1,091,145</b>	<b>1,184,468</b>	<b>1,318,468</b>	<b>+227,323</b>	<b>+134,000</b>
<b>Subtotal, Salaries and expenses.....</b>	<b>2,438,494</b>	<b>2,892,281</b>	<b>3,064,081</b>	<b>+625,587</b>	<b>+171,800</b>
Appropriations.....	(2,438,494)	(2,892,281)	(3,064,081)	(+625,587)	(+171,800)
Emergency appropriations.....	---	---	---	---	---
<b>Federal air marshals:</b>					
Management and administration.....	593,552	616,927	626,927	+33,375	+10,000
Travel and training.....	69,348	71,933	71,933	+2,585	---
<b>Subtotal, Federal air marshals.....</b>	<b>662,900</b>	<b>688,860</b>	<b>698,860</b>	<b>+35,960</b>	<b>+10,000</b>
<b>Federal protective service:</b>					
Basic security.....	106,362	109,235	109,235	+2,873	---
Building specific security (including capital equipment replacement/acquisition).....	371,638	377,765	377,765	+6,127	---
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>478,000</b>	<b>487,000</b>	<b>487,000</b>	<b>+9,000</b>	<b>---</b>
Offsetting fee collections.....	-478,000	-487,000	-487,000	-9,000	---
<b>Automation modernization:</b>					
ATLAS/CHIMERA IT connectivity.....	39,605	40,150	40,150	+545	---
Construction.....	26,179	26,546	26,546	+367	---
<b>Total, Direct appropriations.....</b>	<b>3,167,178</b>	<b>3,647,837</b>	<b>3,829,637</b>	<b>+662,459</b>	<b>+181,800</b>
<b>Fee accounts:</b>					
Immigration inspection user fee.....	(90,000)	(91,621)	(91,621)	(+1,621)	---
Breached bond/detention fund.....	(70,000)	(71,260)	(71,260)	(+1,260)	---
Student exchange and visitor fee.....	(40,000)	(66,552)	(66,552)	(+26,552)	---
<b>Subtotal, fee accounts.....</b>	<b>(200,000)</b>	<b>(229,433)</b>	<b>(229,433)</b>	<b>(+29,433)</b>	<b>---</b>

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2006 (H.R. 2360)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Subtotal, Immigration and Customs Enforcement</b>					
(gross).....	(3,845,178)	(4,364,270)	(4,546,070)	(+700,892)	(+181,800)
Offsetting fee collections.....	(-478,000)	(-487,000)	(-487,000)	(-9,000)	---
<b>Total, Immigration and Customs Enforcement.....</b>	<b>(3,367,178)</b>	<b>(3,877,270)</b>	<b>(4,059,070)</b>	<b>(+691,892)</b>	<b>(+181,800)</b>
Appropriations.....	(3,167,178)	(3,647,837)	(3,829,637)	(+662,459)	(+181,800)
(Fee accounts).....	(200,000)	(229,433)	(229,433)	(+29,433)	---
<b>Transportation Security Administration</b>					
<b>Aviation security:</b>					
<b>  Screener operations:</b>					
<b>    Screener workforce:</b>					
Privatized screening.....	129,654	146,151	139,654	+10,000	-6,497
Passenger screener - personnel, compensation, and benefits.....	1,445,486	1,590,969	1,520,000	+74,514	-70,969
Baggage screener - personnel, compensation, and benefits.....	848,860	931,864	884,000	+35,140	-47,864
<b>Subtotal, Sceener workforce.....</b>	<b>2,424,000</b>	<b>2,668,984</b>	<b>2,543,654</b>	<b>+119,654</b>	<b>-125,330</b>
<b>    Screening training and other:</b>					
Passenger screeners, other.....	140,614	---	20,952	-119,662	+20,952
Baggage screeners, other.....	203,660	---	---	-203,660	---
Screener training.....	---	91,004	85,004	+85,004	-6,000
Screener other.....	---	170,246	126,294	+126,294	-43,952
<b>Subtotal, Screening training and other</b>	<b>344,274</b>	<b>261,250</b>	<b>232,250</b>	<b>-112,024</b>	<b>-29,000</b>
Human resource services.....	150,000	207,234	207,234	+57,234	---
CAPPS II.....	34,919	---	---	-34,919	---
Crew vetting.....	10,000	---	---	-10,000	---
Registered traveler.....	15,000	---	---	-15,000	---
Checkpoint support.....	123,500	157,461	157,461	+33,961	---
<b>    EDS/ETD Systems:</b>					
Purchase.....	180,000	130,000	170,000	-10,000	+40,000
Installation.....	45,000	14,000	75,000	+30,000	+61,000
Maintenance.....	174,940	200,000	200,000	+25,060	---
Operation integration.....	---	23,000	23,000	+23,000	---
<b>Subtotal, EDS/ETD Systems.....</b>	<b>399,940</b>	<b>367,000</b>	<b>468,000</b>	<b>+68,060</b>	<b>+101,000</b>
<b>Subtotal, Screening operations.....</b>	<b>3,501,633</b>	<b>3,661,929</b>	<b>3,608,599</b>	<b>+106,966</b>	<b>-53,330</b>
<b>  Aviation direction and enforcement:</b>					
Aviation regulation and other enforcement....	230,000	238,196	222,416	-7,584	-15,780
Airport management, IT, and support.....	526,890	758,370	655,597	+128,707	-102,773
FFDO and flight crew training.....	25,000	36,289	29,000	+4,000	-7,289
Air cargo.....	40,000	40,000	60,000	+20,000	+20,000
Airport perimeter security.....	---	---	10,000	+10,000	+10,000
Foreign repair stations.....	---	---	6,000	+6,000	+6,000
<b>Subtotal, Aviation direction and enforcement</b>	<b>821,890</b>	<b>1,072,855</b>	<b>983,013</b>	<b>+161,123</b>	<b>-89,842</b>
Flight school checks (by transfer).....	(9,700)	---	---	(-9,700)	---
<b>Subtotal, Aviation security (gross).....</b>	<b>4,323,523</b>	<b>4,734,784</b>	<b>4,591,612</b>	<b>+268,089</b>	<b>-143,172</b>
Offsetting fee collections.....	-1,823,000	-3,670,000	-1,990,000	-167,000	+1,680,000
<b>Total, Aviation security (net).....</b>	<b>2,500,523</b>	<b>1,064,784</b>	<b>2,601,612</b>	<b>+101,089</b>	<b>+1,536,828</b>
<b>Surface transportation security:</b>					
Staffing and operations.....	24,000	---	---	-24,000	---
Surface transportation security staffing.....	---	24,000	---	---	-24,000
Enterprise staffing.....	---	---	24,000	+24,000	+24,000
Transfer to credentialing activities.....	-27,000	---	---	+27,000	---

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2006 (H.R. 2360)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
-----					
TWIC.....	15,000	---	---	-15,000	---
Credentialing start-up.....	5,000	---	---	-5,000	---
Hazardous materials security.....	17,000	---	---	-17,000	---
Hazardous materials truck tracking/training.....	2,000	---	4,000	+2,000	+4,000
Rail security (inspectors).....	12,000	8,000	8,000	-4,000	---
Subtotal, Surface transportation security.....	48,000	32,000	36,000	-12,000	+4,000
Credentialing activities.....	67,000	---	---	-67,000	---
Offsetting fee collections.....	-67,000	---	---	+67,000	---
Transportation Vetting and Credentialing:					
SecureFlight.....	---	---	65,994	+65,994	+65,994
Crew vetting.....	---	---	13,300	+13,300	+13,300
Screening administration and operations.....	---	---	5,000	+5,000	+5,000
Total, Direct appropriations.....	---	---	84,294	+84,294	+84,294
-----					
Fee accounts:					
Registered Traveler Program fees.....	---	---	(20,000)	(+20,000)	(+20,000)
TWIC fees.....	---	---	(100,000)	(+100,000)	(+100,000)
HAZMAT fees.....	---	---	(50,000)	(+50,000)	(+50,000)
Alien Flight School (by transfer from DOJ) - fees.....	---	---	(10,000)	(+10,000)	(+10,000)
Subtotal, fee accounts.....	---	---	(180,000)	(+180,000)	(+180,000)
-----					
Subtotal, Transportation Vetting and Credentialing (gross).....	---	---	(264,294)	(+264,294)	(+264,294)
-----					
Transportation security support:					
Intelligence.....	14,000	21,000	21,000	+7,000	---
Administration:					
Headquarters administration.....	267,382	302,781	309,916	+42,534	+7,135
Mission support centers.....	5,000	3,051	---	-5,000	-3,051
Information technology.....	240,470	210,092	210,092	-30,378	---
Corporate training.....	7,000	8,084	---	-7,000	-8,084
Subtotal, Administration.....	519,852	524,008	520,008	+156	-4,000
Research and development:					
Research and development at Tech Center.....	49,000	---	---	-49,000	---
Next generation explosive detection systems and explosive trace detection.....	54,000	---	---	-54,000	---
Air cargo.....	75,000	---	---	-75,000	---
Subtotal, Research and development.....	178,000	---	---	-178,000	---
-----					
Subtotal, Transportation security support.....	711,852	545,008	541,008	-170,844	-4,000
-----					
Aviation security capital fund.....	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	---	---
=====					
Total, Transportation Security Administration (gross).....	5,333,375	5,561,792	5,682,914	+349,539	+121,122
Offsetting fee collections.....	-1,890,000	-3,670,000	-1,990,000	-100,000	+1,680,000
Aviation security capital fund.....	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	---	---
Fee accounts.....	---	---	(180,000)	(+180,000)	(+180,000)
Total, Transportation Security Administration (net).....	3,260,375	1,641,792	3,262,914	+2,539	+1,621,122
=====					
United States Coast Guard					
Operating expenses:					
Military pay and allowances.....	2,807,827	3,011,130	3,009,550	+201,723	-1,580
Civilian pay and benefits.....	456,110	535,836	531,811	+75,701	-4,025
Training and recruiting.....	161,441	178,212	178,212	+16,771	---

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2006 (H.R. 2360)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Operating funds and unit level maintenance.....	924,125	985,309	967,414	+43,289	-17,895
Centrally managed accounts.....	175,438	193,936	193,936	+18,498	---
Coast Guard watch standards.....	9,000	---	---	-9,000	---
Intermediate and depot level maintenance.....	623,279	642,977	642,977	+19,698	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324).....	33,367	---	---	-33,367	---
Unspecified reduction.....	---	---	-23,900	-23,900	-23,900
Subtotal, Operating expenses.....	5,190,587	5,547,400	5,500,000	+309,413	-47,400
Less adjustment for defense function.....	-1,204,000	-340,000	-1,200,000	+4,000	-860,000
Defense function.....	1,204,000	340,000	1,200,000	-4,000	+860,000
Subtotal, Operating expenses.....	5,190,587	5,547,400	5,500,000	+309,413	-47,400
Appropriations.....	(3,953,220)	(5,207,400)	(4,300,000)	(+346,780)	(-907,400)
Defense function.....	(1,204,000)	(340,000)	(1,200,000)	(-4,000)	(+860,000)
Emergency appropriations.....	(33,367)	---	---	(-33,367)	---
Environmental compliance and restoration.....	17,000	12,000	12,000	-5,000	---
Reserve training.....	113,000	119,000	119,000	+6,000	---
Acquisition, construction, and improvements:					
Vessels:					
Great Lakes Icebreaker (GLIB) replacement.....	7,750	---	---	-7,750	---
Response boat medium (41ft UTB and NSB replacement).....	12,000	22,000	22,000	+10,000	---
Subtotal, Vessels.....	19,750	22,000	22,000	+2,250	---
Aircraft:					
Armed helicopter equipment (Phase I) (legacy asset).....	2,500	19,902	19,902	+17,402	---
Covert surveillance aircraft.....	---	---	10,000	+10,000	+10,000
C-130J Missionization.....	---	5,000	---	---	-5,000
Subtotal, Aircraft.....	2,500	24,902	29,902	+27,402	+5,000
Other equipment:					
Automatic identification system.....	24,000	29,100	29,100	+5,100	---
National distress and response system modernization (Rescue 21).....	134,000	101,000	91,000	-43,000	-10,000
HF Recap.....	---	10,000	10,000	+10,000	---
Rescission (P.L. 108-90).....	-16,000	---	---	+16,000	---
Subtotal, Other equipment.....	142,000	140,100	130,100	-11,900	-10,000
Personnel compensation and benefits:					
Core acquisition costs.....	500	500	500	---	---
Direct personnel cost.....	72,500	75,950	75,950	+3,450	---
Subtotal, Personnel compensation and benefits.....	73,000	76,450	76,450	+3,450	---
Integrated deepwater systems:					
Aircraft:					
Aircraft, other.....	86,250	125,900	---	-86,250	-125,900
HH-65 re-engining.....	99,000	133,100	---	-99,000	-133,100
Subtotal, Aircraft.....	185,250	259,000	---	-185,250	-259,000
Surface ships.....	364,300	522,400	---	-364,300	-522,400
C4ISR.....	53,600	74,400	---	-53,600	-74,400
Logistics.....	39,800	25,200	---	-39,800	-25,200
Systems engineering and integration.....	43,000	45,000	---	-43,000	-45,000
Government program management.....	38,000	40,000	---	-38,000	-40,000
Miscellaneous.....	---	---	500,000	+500,000	+500,000
Subtotal, Integrated deepwater systems.....	723,950	966,000	500,000	-223,950	-466,000
Shore facilities and aids to navigation:					
Shore operational and support projects.....	1,000	5,000	5,000	+4,000	---
Shore construction projects.....	1,600	3,000	3,000	+1,400	---
Small arms range at ISC Honolulu, HI.....	1,600	---	---	-1,600	---

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2006 (H.R. 2360)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Renovate USCGA Chase Hall Barrack, Phase I....	---	15,000	15,000	+15,000	---
Replace multi-purpose building - Group Long Island Sound.....	---	10,000	10,000	+10,000	---
Construct breakwater - Station Neah Bay.....	---	2,800	2,800	+2,800	---
Waterways aids to navigation infrastructure...	800	3,900	3,900	+3,100	---
Subtotal, Shore facilities and aids to navigation.....	5,000	39,700	39,700	+34,700	---
Subtotal, Acquisition, construction, and improvements (net).....	966,200	1,269,152	798,152	-168,048	-471,000
Appropriations.....	(982,200)	(1,269,152)	(798,152)	(-184,048)	(-471,000)
Rescissions.....	(-16,000)	---	---	(+16,000)	---
Alteration of bridges.....	15,900	---	15,000	-900	+15,000
Research, development, test, and evaluation.....	18,500	---	---	-18,500	---
Subtotal, U.S. Coast Guard discretionary.....	6,321,187	6,947,552	6,444,152	+122,965	-503,400
Retired pay (mandatory).....	1,085,460	1,014,080	1,014,080	-71,380	---
Total, United States Coast Guard.....	7,406,647	7,961,632	7,458,232	+51,585	-503,400
Appropriations.....	(7,389,280)	(7,961,632)	(7,458,232)	(+68,952)	(-503,400)
Emergency appropriations.....	(33,367)	---	---	(-33,367)	---
Rescissions.....	(-16,000)	---	---	(+16,000)	---
<b>United States Secret Service</b>					
<b>Salaries and expenses:</b>					
<b>Protection:</b>					
Protection of persons and facilities.....	571,640	572,232	583,652	+12,012	+11,420
National special security event fund.....	5,000	5,000	10,000	+5,000	+5,000
Protective intelligence activities.....	53,989	55,561	57,061	+3,072	+1,500
White House mail screening.....	16,365	16,365	16,365	---	---
Subtotal, Protection.....	646,994	649,158	667,078	+20,084	+17,920
<b>Field operations:</b>					
Domestic field operations.....	221,489	238,888	238,888	+17,399	---
International field office administration, operations and training.....	19,208	19,768	22,168	+2,960	+2,400
Electronic crimes special agent program and electronic crimes task forces.....	34,536	35,600	43,600	+9,064	+8,000
Subtotal, Field operations.....	275,233	294,256	304,656	+29,423	+10,400
<b>Administration:</b>					
Headquarters, management and administration...	197,747	203,232	203,232	+5,485	---
National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.....	7,100	7,100	7,678	+578	+578
Subtotal, Administration.....	204,847	210,332	210,910	+6,063	+578
<b>Training:</b>					
Rowley training center.....	45,051	46,337	46,337	+1,286	---
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses.....	1,172,125	1,200,083	1,228,981	+56,856	+28,898
Operating expenses (rescission) (P.L. 108-11).....	-750	---	---	+750	---
Acquisition, construction, improvements and related expenses (Rowley training center).....	3,633	3,699	3,699	+66	---
Total, United States Secret Service.....	1,175,008	1,203,782	1,232,680	+57,672	+28,898

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2006 (H.R. 2360)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<hr/>					
Total, title II, Security, Enforcement, and Investigations:					
New budget (obligational) authority.....	20,629,096	20,565,937	21,990,063	+1,360,967	+1,424,126
Appropriations.....	(20,675,489)	(20,565,937)	(21,990,063)	(+1,314,574)	(+1,424,126)
Emergency appropriations.....	(33,367)	---	---	(-33,367)	---
Rescission.....	(-79,760)	---	---	(+79,760)	---
<hr/>					
TITLE III - PREPAREDNESS AND RECOVERY					
Office of State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness					
Management and administration.....	3,546	---	3,546	---	+3,546
State and local programs:					
Salaries and expenses.....	---	3,546	---	---	-3,546
State and local basic formula grants.....	1,100,000	---	750,000	-350,000	+750,000
State Homeland Security Grant Program:					
State and local basic formula grants.....	---	1,020,000	---	---	-1,020,000
Emergency management performance grants.....	---	170,000	---	---	-170,000
Citizen Corps.....	---	50,000	---	---	-50,000
Subtotal, State Homeland Security Grant Pgm	---	1,240,000	---	---	-1,240,000
Law enforcement terrorism prevention grants.....	400,000	---	400,000	---	+400,000
Urban area security initiative:					
High-threat, high-density urban area.....	885,000	1,020,000	850,000	-35,000	-170,000
Targeted infrastructure protection.....	---	600,000	---	---	-600,000
Buffer Zone Protection Program.....	---	---	50,000	+50,000	+50,000
Port security grants.....	150,000	---	150,000	---	+150,000
Rail and transit security.....	150,000	---	150,000	---	+150,000
Trucking security grants.....	5,000	---	5,000	---	+5,000
Intercity bus security grants.....	10,000	---	10,000	---	+10,000
Subtotal, Urban area security initiative....	1,200,000	1,620,000	1,215,000	+15,000	-405,000
Commercial equipment direct assistance program....	50,000	---	50,000	---	+50,000
National programs:					
National domestic preparedness consortium....	135,000	80,000	125,000	-10,000	+45,000
National exercise program.....	52,000	52,000	52,000	---	---
Technical assistance.....	30,000	7,600	20,000	-10,000	+12,400
Metropolitan medical response system.....	30,000	---	40,000	+10,000	+40,000
Demonstration training grants.....	30,000	---	35,000	+5,000	+35,000
Continuing training grants.....	25,000	3,010	30,000	+5,000	+26,990
Citizen Corps.....	15,000	---	40,000	+25,000	+40,000
Evaluations and assessments.....	14,300	14,300	14,300	---	---
Rural domestic preparedness consortium.....	5,000	---	10,000	+5,000	+10,000
Subtotal, National programs.....	336,300	156,910	366,300	+30,000	+209,390
Management and administration.....	---	44,300	---	---	-44,300
Subtotal, State and local programs.....	3,086,300	3,064,756	2,781,300	-305,000	-283,456
Firefighter assistance grants.....	650,000	---	---	-650,000	---
Fire department staffing assistance grants:					
Grants.....	---	500,000	550,000	+550,000	+50,000
Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response (SAFER) Act.....	65,000	---	50,000	-15,000	+50,000
Subtotal, Firefighter assistance grants.....	715,000	500,000	600,000	-115,000	+100,000
Emergency Management Performance Grants.....	180,000	---	180,000	---	+180,000
<hr/>					
Total, Office of State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness.....	3,984,846	3,564,756	3,564,846	-420,000	+90

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2006 (H.R. 2360)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Counterterrorism Fund</b>					
Counterterrorism fund.....	8,000	10,000	10,000	+2,000	---
<b>Emergency Preparedness and Response</b>					
Office of the Under Secretary for Emergency Preparedness and Response.....	4,211	4,306	2,306	-1,905	-2,000
Preparedness, mitigation, response and recovery:					
Operating activities.....	209,499	228,499	242,499	+33,000	+14,000
Urban search and rescue teams.....	30,000	7,000	7,000	-23,000	---
Subtotal, Preparedness, mitigation, response and recovery.....	239,499	235,499	249,499	+10,000	+14,000
Operating expenses (rescission).....	-5,000	---	---	+5,000	---
Administrative and regional operations.....	202,939	170,441	177,441	-25,498	+7,000
Defense function.....	---	48,000	48,000	+48,000	---
Subtotal, Administrative and regional operations	202,939	218,441	225,441	+22,502	+7,000
Public health programs:					
National disaster medical system.....	34,000	34,000	34,000	---	---
Subtotal, Public health programs.....	34,000	34,000	34,000	---	---
Radiological emergency preparedness program.....	-1,000	-1,266	-1,266	-266	---
Biodefense countermeasures:					
Advance appropriations, FY 2005 (P.L. 108-324)....	2,507,776	---	---	-2,507,776	---
Subtotal, Biodefense countermeasures.....	2,507,776	---	---	-2,507,776	---
Disaster relief.....	2,042,380	2,140,000	2,023,900	-18,480	-116,100
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324).....	6,500,000	---	---	-6,500,000	---
Subtotal, Disaster Relief.....	8,542,380	2,140,000	2,023,900	-6,518,480	-116,100
Disaster assistance direct loan program account: (Limitation on direct loans).....	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	---	---
Administrative expenses.....	567	567	567	---	---
Flood map modernization fund.....	200,000	200,068	200,000	---	-68
National flood insurance fund:					
Salaries and expenses.....	33,336	36,496	36,496	+3,160	---
Severe repetitive loss mitigation.....	---	---	40,000	+40,000	+40,000
Repetitive loss mitigation.....	---	---	10,000	+10,000	+10,000
Flood mitigation.....	79,257	87,358	99,358	+20,101	+12,000
Offsetting fee collections.....	-112,593	-123,854	-185,854	-73,261	-62,000
(Transfer to National flood mitigation fund).....	(-20,000)	(-28,000)	(-40,000)	(-20,000)	(-12,000)
National flood mitigation fund (by transfer).....	(20,000)	(28,000)	(40,000)	(+20,000)	(+12,000)
National pre-disaster mitigation fund.....	100,000	150,062	150,000	+50,000	-62
Emergency food and shelter.....	153,000	153,000	153,000	---	---
Total, Emergency Preparedness and Response (net)	11,978,372	3,134,677	3,037,447	-8,940,925	-97,230
Appropriations.....	(2,975,596)	(3,134,677)	(3,037,447)	(+61,851)	(-97,230)
Rescission.....	(-5,000)	---	---	(+5,000)	---
Emergency appropriations.....	(6,500,000)	---	---	(-6,500,000)	---
Advance appropriations.....	(2,507,776)	---	---	(-2,507,776)	---
Total, title III, Preparedness and Recovery:					
New budget (obligational) authority.....	15,971,218	6,709,433	6,612,293	-9,358,925	-97,140
Appropriations.....	(6,968,442)	(6,709,433)	(6,612,293)	(-356,149)	(-97,140)
Advance appropriations.....	(2,507,776)	---	---	(-2,507,776)	---
Emergency appropriations.....	(6,500,000)	---	---	(-6,500,000)	---

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2006 (H.R. 2360)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Rescissions.....	(-5,000)	---	---	(+5,000)	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	---	---
(Transfer out).....	(-20,000)	(-28,000)	(-40,000)	(-20,000)	(-12,000)
(By transfer).....	(20,000)	(28,000)	(40,000)	(+20,000)	(+12,000)
=====					
<b>TITLE IV - RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, TRAINING, ASSESSMENTS, AND SERVICES</b>					
Citizenship and Immigration Services					
Backlog reduction initiative:					
Contracting services.....	120,000	70,000	70,000	-50,000	---
Other.....	20,000	10,000	10,000	-10,000	---
Digitization.....	20,000	---	40,000	+20,000	+40,000
Subtotal, Backlog reduction initiative.....	160,000	80,000	120,000	-40,000	+40,000
Adjudication services (fee account):					
Pay and benefits.....	(580,000)	(607,000)	(607,000)	(+27,000)	---
Operating expenses:					
District operations.....	(293,000)	(389,000)	(389,000)	(+96,000)	---
Service center operations.....	(233,000)	(260,000)	(260,000)	(+27,000)	---
Asylum, refugee and international operations..	(73,000)	(74,000)	(74,000)	(+1,000)	---
Records operations.....	(65,000)	(66,000)	(66,000)	(+1,000)	---
Subtotal, Adjudication services.....	(1,244,000)	(1,396,000)	(1,396,000)	(+152,000)	---
Information and customer services (fee account):					
Pay and benefits.....	(78,000)	(80,000)	(80,000)	(+2,000)	---
Operating expenses:					
National Customer Service Center.....	(46,000)	(47,000)	(47,000)	(+1,000)	---
Information services.....	(14,000)	(14,000)	(14,000)	---	---
Subtotal, Information and customer services.....	(138,000)	(141,000)	(141,000)	(+3,000)	---
Administration (fee account):					
Pay and benefits.....	(43,000)	(44,000)	(44,000)	(+1,000)	---
Operating expenses.....	(190,000)	(193,000)	(193,000)	(+3,000)	---
Subtotal, Administration.....	(233,000)	(237,000)	(237,000)	(+4,000)	---
Total, Citizenship and Immigration Services.....					
Appropriations.....	(1,775,000)	(1,854,000)	(1,894,000)	(+119,000)	(+40,000)
(Immigration Examination Fee Account).....	(160,000)	(80,000)	(120,000)	(-40,000)	(+40,000)
(H-1B and L Fraud Prevention and Detection Fee Account).....	(1,571,000)	(1,730,000)	(1,730,000)	(+159,000)	---
(H-1B Non-Immigrant Petitioner Fee Account).....	(31,000)	(31,000)	(31,000)	---	---
(13,000)	(13,000)	(13,000)	---	---	
Federal Law Enforcement Training Center					
Salaries and expenses:					
Salaries and expenses.....	177,440	183,362	194,000	+16,560	+10,638
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses.....	177,440	183,362	194,000	+16,560	+10,638
Acquisition, Construction, Improvements and Related expenses:					
Direct appropriation.....	44,917	40,636	64,743	+19,826	+24,107
Subtotal, Acquisition, Construction and Related Expenses.....	44,917	40,636	64,743	+19,826	+24,107
Total, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center..	222,357	223,998	258,743	+36,386	+34,745

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2006 (H.R. 2360)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
-----					
Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection					
Management and administration:					
Office of the Under Secretary for Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection.....	5,864	6,878	6,878	+1,014	---
Other salaries and expenses.....	126,200	197,127	191,322	+65,122	-5,805
Subtotal, Management and administration.....	132,064	204,005	198,200	+66,136	-5,805
Assessments and evaluations:					
Critical infrastructure outreach and partnerships.	106,592	67,177	62,177	-44,415	-5,000
Critical infrastructure identification and evaluation.....	77,861	72,173	77,173	-688	+5,000
National Infrastructure Simulation and Analysis Center (NISAC).....	20,000	16,000	16,000	-4,000	---
Protective actions.....	191,647	91,399	91,399	-100,248	---
Biosurveillance.....	11,000	11,147	10,147	-853	-1,000
Cyber security.....	67,380	73,349	73,349	+5,969	---
NS-EP Telecommunications.....	140,754	142,632	142,632	+1,878	---
Competitive analysis and evaluation.....	4,000	---	---	-4,000	---
Threat determination and assessment.....	21,943	19,900	19,900	-2,043	---
Infrastructure vulnerability and risk assessment..	71,080	74,347	74,347	+3,267	---
Evaluation and studies.....	14,387	34,526	34,526	+20,139	---
Homeland Security Operations Center (HSOC).....	35,000	61,108	56,108	+21,108	-5,000
Information Sharing and Collaboration.....	---	5,482	5,482	+5,482	---
Subtotal, Assessments and evaluations.....	761,644	669,240	663,240	-98,404	-6,000
Total, Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection.....	893,708	873,245	861,440	-32,268	-11,805
-----					
Science and Technology					
Management and administration:					
Office of the Under Secretary for Science and Technology.....	6,315	---	---	-6,315	---
Other salaries and expenses.....	62,271	81,399	81,399	+19,128	---
Subtotal, Management and administration.....	68,586	81,399	81,399	+12,813	---
Research, development, acquisition, and operations:					
Biological countermeasures:					
Operating expenses.....	362,650	23,300	21,000	-341,650	-2,300
Defense function.....	---	339,000	339,000	+339,000	---
Subtotal, Biological countermeasures.....	362,650	362,300	360,000	-2,650	-2,300
Chemical countermeasures.....	53,000	102,000	90,000	+37,000	-12,000
High explosives countermeasures.....	19,700	14,700	54,700	+35,000	+40,000
Threat and vulnerability, testing and assessment..	65,800	47,000	47,000	-18,800	---
Conventional missions in support of DHS.....	54,650	93,650	80,000	+25,350	-13,650
Technology development and transfer.....	---	---	10,000	+10,000	+10,000
Rapid prototyping program.....	76,000	20,900	30,000	-46,000	+9,100
Standards.....	39,700	35,500	35,500	-4,200	---
Emerging threats.....	10,750	10,500	10,500	-250	---
Critical infrastructure protection.....	27,000	20,800	35,800	+8,800	+15,000
University programs/homeland security fellowship..	70,000	63,600	63,600	-6,400	---
National Biodefense Analysis and Countermeasures Center construction.....	35,000	---	---	-35,000	---
Counter MANPADs.....	61,000	110,000	110,000	+49,000	---
Safety act.....	10,000	5,600	10,000	---	+4,400
Cyber security.....	18,000	16,700	16,700	-1,300	---
Interoperability and communications.....	21,000	---	---	-21,000	---
Office of interoperability and compatibility.....	---	20,500	41,500	+41,500	+21,000
Research and development consolidation.....	---	116,897	116,897	+116,897	---
Radiological and nuclear countermeasures.....	122,614	19,086	19,086	-103,528	---

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2006 (H.R. 2360)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Domestic nuclear detection office.....	---	227,314	127,314	+127,314	-100,000
Subtotal, Research, development, acquisition, and operations.....	1,046,864	1,287,047	1,258,597	+211,733	-28,450
Total, Science and Technology.....	1,115,450	1,368,446	1,339,996	+224,546	-28,450
Total, title IV, Research and Development, Training Assessments, and Services: New budget (obligational) authority.....	2,391,515	2,545,689	2,580,179	+188,664	+34,490
=====					
TITLE V - GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Sec. 526:					
Rescission, 110-to-123 Conversions (P.L.108-90 and P.L. 108-334).....	---	---	-84,000	-84,000	-84,000
110ft Island Class Patrol Boat procurement or refurbishment.....	---	---	84,000	+84,000	+84,000
Sec. 531:					
Rescission, Working Capital Fund.....	---	---	-7,000	-7,000	-7,000
Total, title V, General Provisions: New budget (obligational) authority.....	---	---	-7,000	-7,000	-7,000
=====					
Grand total, Department of Homeland Security:					
New budget (obligational) authority.....	39,598,603	30,568,748	31,860,080	-7,738,523	+1,291,332
Appropriations.....	(30,642,220)	(30,568,748)	(31,951,080)	(+1,308,860)	(+1,382,332)
Advance appropriations.....	(2,507,776)	---	---	(-2,507,776)	---
Emergency appropriations.....	(6,533,367)	---	---	(-6,533,367)	---
Rescissions.....	(-84,760)	---	(-91,000)	(-6,240)	(-91,000)
Fee funded programs.....	(2,894,004)	(3,325,579)	(3,325,579)	(+431,575)	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(25,000)	(25,000)	(25,000)	---	---
(Transfer out).....	(-20,000)	(-28,000)	(-40,000)	(-20,000)	(-12,000)
(By transfer).....	(20,000)	(28,000)	(40,000)	(+20,000)	(+12,000)
=====					

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2006 (H.R. 2360)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
-----					
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP					
Scorekeeping adjustments:					
Less emergency appropriations.....	-6,533,367	---	---	+6,533,367	---
Total, scorekeeping adjustments.....	-6,533,367	---	---	+6,533,367	---
Total (including adjustments).....	33,065,236	30,568,748	31,860,080	-1,205,156	+1,291,332
Amount in this bill.....	(39,598,603)	(30,568,748)	(31,860,080)	(-7,738,523)	(+1,291,332)
Scorekeeping adjustments.....	(-6,533,367)	---	---	(+6,533,367)	---
Total mandatory and discretionary.....	33,065,236	30,568,748	31,860,080	-1,205,156	+1,291,332
Mandatory.....	(1,085,460)	(1,014,080)	(1,014,080)	(-71,380)	---
Discretionary.....	(31,979,776)	(29,554,668)	(30,846,000)	(-1,133,776)	(+1,291,332)
Discretionary Function Recap:					
Non-defense.....	30,775,776	28,827,668	29,259,000	-1,516,776	+431,332
Defense.....	1,204,000	727,000	1,587,000	+383,000	+860,000
Total.....	31,979,776	29,554,668	30,846,000	-1,133,776	+1,291,332

Homeland Security Appropriations Act - FY 2006 (H.R. 2360)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY SUMMARY</b>					
<b>TITLE I - DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS</b>					
Departmental operations.....	524,457	664,672	601,528	+77,071	-63,144
Office of Inspector General.....	82,317	83,017	83,017	+700	---
Total, title I.....	606,774	747,689	684,545	+77,771	-63,144
<b>TITLE II - SECURITY, ENFORCEMENT, AND INVESTIGATIONS</b>					
Office of the Under Secretary for Border and Transportation Security.....	9,617	10,617	10,617	+1,000	---
U.S. Visitor and Immigrant Status Indication Technology Automation Modernization.....	340,000	---	---	-340,000	---
Office of Screening Coordination Operations.....	---	---	411,232	+411,232	+411,232
Office of Screening Coordination Operations.....	---	525,526	---	---	-525,526
Customs and border protection.....	6,349,275	6,716,897	6,926,897	+577,622	+210,000
Direct appropriations.....	(5,333,281)	(5,574,751)	(5,784,751)	(+451,470)	(+210,000)
Fee accounts.....	(1,079,004)	(1,142,146)	(1,142,146)	(+63,142)	---
Immigration and customs enforcement.....	3,367,178	3,877,270	4,059,070	+691,892	+181,800
Direct appropriations.....	(3,645,178)	(4,134,837)	(4,316,637)	(+671,459)	(+181,800)
Offsetting fee collections.....	(-478,000)	(-487,000)	(-487,000)	(-9,000)	---
Fee accounts.....	(200,000)	(229,433)	(229,433)	(+29,433)	---
Transportation Security Administration.....	3,260,375	1,641,792	3,262,914	+2,539	+1,621,122
Direct appropriations.....	(5,083,375)	(5,311,792)	(5,432,914)	(+349,539)	(+121,122)
Offsetting fee collections.....	(-1,890,000)	(-3,670,000)	(-1,990,000)	(-100,000)	(+1,680,000)
United States Coast Guard.....	7,406,647	7,961,632	7,458,232	+51,585	-503,400
United States Secret Service.....	1,175,008	1,203,782	1,232,680	+57,672	+28,898
TOTAL, title II, direct appropriations.....	20,629,096	20,565,937	21,990,063	+1,360,967	+1,424,126
<b>TITLE III - PREPAREDNESS AND RECOVERY</b>					
Office of State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness.....	3,984,846	3,564,756	3,564,846	-420,000	+90
Counterterrorism fund.....	8,000	10,000	10,000	+2,000	---
Emergency preparedness and response.....	11,978,372	3,134,677	3,037,447	-8,940,925	-97,230
Direct appropriations.....	(2,975,596)	(3,134,677)	(3,037,447)	(+61,851)	(-97,230)
Emergency appropriations.....	(6,500,000)	---	---	(-6,500,000)	---
Offsetting fee collections.....	(-112,593)	(-123,854)	(-185,854)	(-73,261)	(-62,000)
Biodefense countermeasures advance appropriations.....	(2,507,776)	---	---	(-2,507,776)	---
Total, title III.....	15,971,218	6,709,433	6,612,293	-9,358,925	-97,140
<b>TITLE IV - RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, TRAINING, ASSESSMENTS, AND SERVICES</b>					
Citizenship and immigration services.....	1,775,000	1,854,000	1,894,000	+119,000	+40,000
Direct appropriations.....	(160,000)	(80,000)	(120,000)	(-40,000)	(+40,000)
Fee accounts.....	(1,615,000)	(1,774,000)	(1,774,000)	(+159,000)	---
Federal law enforcement training center.....	222,357	223,998	258,743	+36,386	+34,745
Information analysis and infrastructure protection....	893,708	873,245	861,440	-32,268	-11,805
Science and technology.....	1,115,450	1,368,446	1,339,996	+224,546	-28,450
Total, title IV, direct appropriations.....	2,391,515	2,545,689	2,580,179	+188,664	+34,490
<b>TITLE V - GENERAL PROVISIONS</b>					
General provisions.....	---	---	-7,000	-7,000	-7,000
Total, title V, General provisions.....	---	---	-7,000	-7,000	-7,000
Scorekeeping adjustments.....	-6,533,367	---	---	+6,533,367	---
TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.....	33,065,236	30,568,748	31,860,080	-1,205,156	+1,291,332

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. Chairman, I submit the following exchange of letters for the RECORD.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,  
Washington, DC, May 17, 2005.

Hon. BILL THOMAS,  
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you for your letter regarding H.R. 2360, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2006. As you have noted, the bill is scheduled for floor consideration on Tuesday, May 17, 2005. I appreciate your agreement to expedite the passage of this legislation although it contains a provision involving overtime pay that falls within your Committee's jurisdiction. I appreciate your decision to forgo further action on the bill and acknowledge that it will not prejudice the Committee on Ways and Means with respect to its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

Our committees have worked closely together on this important initiative, and I am very pleased we are continuing that cooperation. I appreciate your helping us to move this legislation quickly to the floor. Finally, I will include in the Congressional Record a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter. Thank you for your assistance and cooperation. We look forward to working with you in the future.

Best regards,

HAROLD ROGERS,  
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,  
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, May 16, 2005.

Hon. HAROLD ROGERS,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Homeland Security,  
Committee on Appropriations,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROGERS: I am writing concerning H.R. 2360, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006 which is scheduled for floor consideration on Tuesday, May 17, 2005.

As you know, the Committee on Ways and Means has jurisdiction over matters concerning customs and Title 19, U.S.C. 267(c)(1). There is a provision within the bill which involves overtime pay for U.S. Customs and Border Protection employees and thus falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

However, in order to expedite this legislation for floor consideration, the Committee will forgo action on this bill. This is being done with the understanding that it does not in any way prejudice the Committee with respect to exercising its jurisdictional prerogatives on this or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter, confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 2360 and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration.

Best regards,

BILL THOMAS,  
Chairman.

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) for his cooperation and good work in bringing this bill to the House. This bill, in its current form, represents a substantial improvement over the President's budget request.

My comments are related to the bill as it stands. I am not sure, after all the points of order are made today, what will remain in the bill; but as the bill stands, there are many good things in this bill, including better funding for border enforcement and separate programs for transit and port security grants. I appreciate that the chairman worked with us to toughen up the bill on air cargo screening, chemical plant security, and privacy safeguards.

The Department has a long way to go in these areas. However, this bill pushes them to improve operations and better secure our Nation. I would especially like to point out the air cargo screening provisions in this bill. One of these provisions penalizes TSA for not complying with last year's law which required a threefold air cargo screening increase. Another provision mandates that TSA utilize their equipment to screen air cargo during the downtime in checked baggage screening. This should help raise the screened percentage of air cargo even further. Last, the bill includes \$30 million for three air cargo screening pilot programs, two at passenger operations and one at an all-cargo operation.

The report accompanying this bill directs the Secretary to ensure that all DHS contracts with companies that collect personal information, such as ChoicePoint, will require the companies to have security procedures to properly notify individuals if their personal information is lost or stolen. The personal data of hundreds of thousands of people have been compromised in recent months. For 49 States, there is no requirement for companies to notify the affected people. We should require notification government-wide, and this provision takes an important step in the right direction.

The bill also demands that the Department get its act together to develop proper standards and processes for designating the information as "security-sensitive." Today, TSA has no meaningful procedures to designate "security sensitive" documents. This has led, I believe, to TSA withholding information from the public that should be disclosed. This bill directs the Department to limit the number of people who can designate such information to establish internal controls to audit these designations.

I do have reservations about some parts of this bill, especially the funding levels for fire grants and the State homeland security formula grants. We will have an amendment relating to fire grants later. I happen to be in probably a small minority who thinks it is a mistake to distribute a portion of the State formula grant based on risk and vulnerability versus population.

Let us be clear. The urban initiative grant is distributed on a discretionary basis. My observation over the last several years, when trying to get information from the Department on how they made those judgments, we rarely get

good answers; at periods of time, no answers; and at other times, very ineffective answers. I have no problem with whatever the judgment of the Congress is in adjusting the minimum grant that goes to particular States. However, I think when we assume that this Department has the capacity to make risk judgments on allocating funds to all 57 States and territories, I think we overestimate their capacity to make such judgments.

They have made mistakes in the past, and I just do not think they have developed the needed expertise to make the kinds of judgments we are assuming they can. If they had that capacity, then I think we might be headed in the right direction; but there is no evidence that they have that capacity today.

In conclusion, however, I must say that I think we must measure this homeland security bill by asking whether the bill helps close the gaps that exist today. I think the bill does that. I think it makes substantial improvements in how the Department would operate, and I am proud to support the bill as it stands today.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished ranking Democrat on the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

□ 1215

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, there are two problems that we face in dealing with this bill. The first is that we have an agency which is essentially incompetent and dysfunctional. We are trying to protect the Nation's security by working through an agency which is gargantuan, which is bureaucratic, to say the least, which is filled with inertia, and filled with people working at cross purposes. Outside of that it does a terrific job.

And the chairman and the ranking member of the subcommittee have tried to do their dead level best to provide the kind of Congressional oversight that is necessary if you are going to help bring this agency out of its troubles and put that agency in a posture where it can be a trusted repository of the responsibilities that we have given to it.

The second problem we have is that we still have not faced up to the need. Even though the agency which we must go through in order to deal with this problem is a mess, we still have not faced up to the fact that we need more resources.

We still only inspect a tiny percentage of the container cargo which comes into this country every day. We still inspect an infinitesimal percentage of cargo on passenger airplanes. Mr. SABO has focused on that issue many times.

We, despite all of our posturing, and despite every Member of Congress who

has gone on the Lou Dobbs Show and talked about the need to secure our borders, we still are incredibly short in terms of the number of border guards, in terms of the number of immigration inspectors. And then, in addition to that, the Congress on the supplemental appropriation bill added an entirely extraneous provision which set up this new complicated, convoluted Rube Goldberg operation that every citizen is going to have to go through in order to renew their driver's license.

And the cost of that program is indeterminate, but we are being told by the Congressional Budget Office that it will cost at least \$100 million, which will be laid onto State and local governments. We are told by the National Council of State Legislative Leaders that it will cost about \$500 million, and we have laid that responsibility on State and local governments.

So, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that even with our doubts about the agency there are certain functions that we ought to be providing more money for unless we are determined to create yet another unfunded mandate. The committee has not been able to provide additional money, not because of any defect in the committee but for one simple reason: This House has decided to make as a higher priority providing very large tax cuts for the next 10 years, and a huge percentage of those tax cuts have gone to the most blessed persons in this society. Let me put it that way.

The reality is that if you make over a million dollars this year, you could expect, on average, to get a \$140,000 tax cut. We could plug all of the holes I have just mentioned in our homeland security activities if we simply limited that \$140,000 average tax cut to \$138,000.

And that is what the amendment would do that I intend to offer at a later point in the proceedings. The Rules Committee did not make that amendment in order, while they did make in order, or they did make it possible for any single Member to walk onto this floor and wipe out 15 pages of this bill that provide needed resources for numerous security activities.

So we are in the situation where the Rules Committee has precluded me from offering an amendment which can be voted on by the entire body, and yet the Rules Committee has said we are going to allow a single Member from a committee that has never produced a bill that has gone into law, we are going to allow them to walk in here and shred this bill.

That makes no sense to me. So I just think the Rules Committee has failed in its stewardship responsibility, and I think we are failing our responsibilities to our constituents if we do not provide more resources than this bill provides.

Having said that, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) for doing the best job that he could under the circumstances. I had intended to vote for this bill until they

took it and shredded it. Whether I will vote for it in the end will be determined by just how irresponsible people are when they come to the floor and knock out provisions of this bill just because their committee did not happen to think of them.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the very distinguished and very able chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate my chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), for yielding me whatever time I might consume. I really rise because I want the House to know that this bill is perhaps one of the most positive reflections of what our Appropriations Committee can do at the subcommittee level when we work in a very professional and highly non-partisan manner to address major problems that face our country.

The question of homeland security and the need for expanding effectively our work in this arena is obvious. Both the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) have done a fabulous job of working together.

The staffs are not just outstanding, they have produced a product of which we can all be proud. Indeed, as we go through the process today it is conceivable this product may change because of untoward circumstances. But I must say in the arena that involves homeland security we do have a new authorizing committee that has been put together. They have yet to produce their first product this year, but they are working diligently to try to move in that direction.

It is our desire to help them be successful. And over time I am certain that we will be able to help them be successful. If money has anything to do with this process we hope to have a very positive influence.

In turn, the bill as it is currently formed is being used effectively for oversight. We all know that this department is something much different than an elephant or a hippopotamus or a donkey combined. It is the merging of some 22 agencies, an attempt to put together the homeland security department.

As we attempt to massage the process to make sure this agency can operate effectively, clearly the Appropriations Committee has a role to play. In their attempt to provide effective oversight, before oversight has been done by way of the authorizing committee, for they have not had a chance to do that yet, it is very important that dollar pressure get the attention of this organization.

Let me just mention one area in the area of the Coast Guard's work, in the Deepwater arena. Preceding 9/11 they were on a plan for working and developing their responsibilities in Deepwater efforts. Subsequent to 9/11, the

chairman has been pushing them to move in the direction of remodeling their plan to reflect this new world that we are living in.

And the chairman has worked, by way of language in past bills, he has worked by communication with the leadership of the new agency, he has done everything he can to have them be responsive to a plan that is not just a 5-year, but a 20-year plan that tells us where these sizeable number of dollars are going to be spent to impact that piece of our security.

And indeed the lack of response from the Coast Guard is astonishing to me. I mean, indeed, you would think perhaps that this subcommittee did not exist because they presume that money for them would be automatic around this place.

Well, the Chairman has done a great job of trying to send a message that says, we expect you to have a real world plan that reflects post-9/11 realities. And that language is important to our ability to provide oversight in the months that are just ahead.

I would hope that all of us working together would recognize that sometimes you use the vehicle that is available to have oversight that will impact an agency whose attention we absolutely must get. Otherwise we could waste not just 6 months or a year, we could waste 2 or 3 years while we are getting our act together.

Indeed, let me return to my original point; that is, this subcommittee has done a fabulous job. If you will just read this bill and look at the care that has been taken in every section, staffs on both sides of the aisle indeed should be applauded for their effort at causing both the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) and my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), for doing a fabulous job on behalf of our Nation's security.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to a distinguished member of our subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, first off I would like to compliment the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), for their hard work on this bill.

The bill's top line total is \$1.3 billion, or 4 percent above the President's request, and \$1.7 billion, nearly 6 percent above this year's enacted level. The bill achieves these numbers without conceding to the President's request to increase the Federal security surcharge on airline tickets by \$3.

Mr. Chairman, I want to strongly state my support for the efforts of the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) in this bill to ensure accountability, which is long overdue. I understand that the top management at DHS

has had a very difficult management task on their plate from day 1, pulling together all of these different agencies and making sure that they play and work well together.

I believe, however, that these challenges are cause for more, not less oversight on the part of the Congress. After September 11, Congress voted to grant the Department of Homeland Security a broad scope of authorities. This means that if managed properly, the Department is uniquely positioned to protect us from terrorism.

On the other hand, if managed improperly, it is also uniquely positioned to do great harm. For instance, since the PATRIOT Act and the Homeland Security Act, I, along with many others in this body, have spoken out constantly on the need for our antiterrorist agencies to safeguard our constitutional rights and civil liberties.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that if in the process of getting the bad guys we step and throw away the Constitution, eventually it is the terrorists who would have won the battle. Congress is the most essential body for protecting Americans from these types of excesses and missteps by the Department.

Furthermore, the American people have also charged us with ensuring that every dollar that the government spends, especially on something like homeland security, is spent in a way that yields the most benefit. The most significant way that we in Congress carry out this vital task is by controlling the way the money is spent, and that is what the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) has spoken to for so many times with the support of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO).

We cannot just open up this new part of our funding, if you will, in this Congress and dole out all of these dollars without having some accountability. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) and especially the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) well understand that this is not our personal money, this is the taxpayers' dollars, and the taxpayers complain a lot about how we spend the money. This time we have a new department, new agency, new spending sources, new funding levels, and we can from day 1 try to pull the strings in and have some control.

So I would hope that today, during this debate, those who may be officially or personally offended about how some things happen around here understand that there is a greater task; that is, the protection of the people and the protection of the taxpayer.

First off, I would like to commend Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member SABO for their hard work on this bill.

The bill's top line total is \$1.3 billion (4 percent) above the president's request and \$1.7 billion (nearly 6 percent) above this year's enacted level.

The bill achieves these numbers without conceding to the President's request to increase the federal security surcharge on airline tickets by \$3.

I am strongly supportive of Chairman ROGERS' efforts in this bill to ensure accountability at DHS, which is long overdue.

I understand that the top management of DHS has had a difficult management task on their plate from day one: pulling together all these agencies and making sure that they play well together.

I believe, however, that these challenges are cause for more—not less—oversight on the part of this Congress.

After Sept. 11, Congress voted to grant the Department of Homeland Security a broad scope of authorities. This means that, if managed properly, the Department is uniquely positioned to protect us from terrorism. On the other hand, if managed improperly, it is also uniquely positioned to do great harm.

For instance, since the Patriot Act and the Homeland Security Act, I, along with many others in this body, have spoken out constantly on the need for our antiterrorist agencies to safeguard our Constitutional rights and civil liberties.

Congress is the most essential body for protecting Americans from these types of excesses and missteps by the Department.

Furthermore, the American people have also charged us with ensuring that every dollar that the government spends—especially on something like Homeland Security—is spent in a way that yields the most benefit.

The most significant way that we in Congress carry out this vital task is by controlling the way money is spent—and, if necessary, denying the Administration requests if they are unable or unwilling to respond to our concerns.

Chairman ROGERS recognized this point when he built accountability into this bill.

I would also like to take a moment to highlight some of the funding levels in the bill that I believe are inadequate.

I understand that when it comes to something like our safety and security from terrorist attacks, any final amount of funding means that tough choices must be made.

One important area that suffers a severe cut in this bill, however, is funding to our state and local programs, which the bill reduces by 11 percent from this year.

The Administration and many on our committee have noted that this cut is in response to the sluggish pace at which the Department and states move these funds out to local agencies, so that they can be spent.

But I don't believe that slashing funding for these essential programs is the right approach to making them work better.

These state and local governments are on the front lines in our struggle against terrorism, and still have many needs that are going unmet.

Most notably, fire grants, which, as the Ranking Member notes, are the most successful grant program at DHS—are reduced by \$115 million from current levels—16 percent—even as we are finding that our firefighters are still largely unprepared to respond to catastrophic terrorist acts.

In addition, State homeland security formula grants, local law enforcement terrorism pre-

vention grants, and urban area security grants, all of which are especially important to my district and other high risk areas, are reduced by 14 percent.

As the bill moves to Conference, I am hopeful that we can find a way to address some of these deficiencies, and I look forward to working with the Chairman and Ranking Member on these issues.

In closing, I believe overall that this is a good start to tackling many of the problems that have plagued the Department from its inception, and I urge all my colleagues to support it.

□ 1230

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), another distinguished member of our subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) has 1½ minutes remaining.

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to my colleagues, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), for their conscientious and cooperative efforts in writing this bill.

The bill would provide much-needed additional funding to protect our borders. It would also boost the Department of Homeland Security's efforts to track down potential terrorists and criminal aliens that are already in this country.

It would shorten the backlog for people seeking to legally live in this country as permanent residents or citizens. It would help protect our ports and our chemical and nuclear facilities. And as the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), my colleague, just stressed, it focuses on accountability, much-needed accountability, at the Department, and I commend the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) in particular for that.

Given the limited funds the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) had to start with, theirs was not an easy or enviable task, and they have done an exceptional job with the poor hand they were dealt. But I have said this before and I will say it again: we can do better. This bill could and should be better. We would do better if we made better budget choices at the front end of this process.

This vote today is not occurring in a vacuum. During recent funding debates, we have heard the Republican leaders say over and over, there simply are no funds available to provide what

is needed. I suspect we are going to hear that again today.

What we do not hear as often is that since 9/11, we have spent 20 times as much on tax cuts, mainly benefiting the wealthiest people in this country, as we have on protecting the American people from terrorist attacks. Just the other week, we passed another tax cut that will only benefit people inheriting estates that are worth millions of dollars.

So we go over the cliff fiscally, and our Republican friends try to pin the blame on discretionary domestic spending, including spending for security. We pass budget resolutions that fall far short, so that by the time we try to write appropriations bills within the limits in these resolutions, we have nothing left to talk about. All we can do is lamely speak of the things we just are not able to do, in this bill and other bills, because we do not have the funds.

Well, we chose not to have the funds. To name one conspicuous example, for the second year in a row, we are going to cut the Fire grant program, one of the most successful Federal programs we have.

Despite the fact that a recent FEMA study showed that two-thirds of our fire departments operate with staffing levels that do not meet the minimum safe staffing levels required by OSHA and the National Fire Protection Association, we are again under-funding the SAFER program, which assists understaffed departments in hiring additional personnel.

Mr. Chairman, we pass bills authorizing first-responder support, but when it comes time to pay for these programs, we would rather put the country's money toward tax breaks for the wealthy than for police officers who are protecting our communities. Trillion-dollar tax cuts get rammed through this Congress, but in this bill, the leadership says we have "no choice" but to cut State block grants by 14 percent.

Today, our choices are indeed limited, although I am hopeful we can make some improvements at the margins, for example, by passing the gentleman from Minnesota's (Mr. SABO) first responder amendment.

At the end of the day, we should pass this bill, and I am hopeful that colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support it. But we should understand why this bill, despite our subcommittee's best efforts, does fall short. We should resolve to fix this country's budget policy so that at long last our Nation's people and their security can come first.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding me time, for his leadership, and also to the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) for his

diligence, hard work, and leadership in bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, last month the port of Oakland in my district in California became the very first port in the Nation to fully install radiation portal monitors at every one of its international marine terminals. That means that every single container exiting the port of Oakland will be screened for nuclear weapons. As the fourth largest port in the Nation, that is almost 700,000 screened containers a year.

While Oakland can detect and prevent the entry of nuclear weapons into our country now, other ports around the Nation, unfortunately, cannot. We know that terrorist organizations are actively seeking nuclear weapons; but under this bill, our Nation's ports would not be fully equipped with radiation portal monitors until 2009. That is unacceptable.

The fact is this administration has consistently underfunded port security for years. The Coast Guard estimated in 2002 that we needed \$7 billion for port security. In the last 4 years, Congress has only provided about \$737 million, and this bill would add a meager \$150 million.

So, Mr. Chairman, we cannot wait until a real attack occurs, and we need more money for port security now. So I hope that we make this commitment today as this bill moves forward.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for the time.

I thank the chairman of the subcommittee and as well the chairman and ranking member of the full committee. If there is ever a challenge, Mr. Chairman, it is a challenge of trying to get one's hands around the massiveness of homeland security.

I think if we have ever realized the importance of the work of the subcommittee on appropriations, and also the authorizing committee, it was last Wednesday, just less than a week ago, when masses of people in this area were told to evacuate and Members of Congress were seen fleeing, as others stood by watching them.

We have, if you will, a crisis more or less in the way that we handle homeland security issues, and the focus in terms of resources could not be more important and could not be more immediate.

First of all, I would like to acknowledge the dollars that are in this particular legislation dealing with Customs and border protection and immigration and Customs enforcement. I would like to see more. I do believe that the lack of dollars in the Fire grants is something that we need to improve.

What I would like to focus on, in particular, is the need to, one, I hope over time eliminate aspects of the REAL ID bill but to emphasize that it is seemingly unwieldy to suggest that States

have to implement the REAL ID bill with a national ID card and no dollars, and I believe that this bill falls short of the amount of money needed to implement the REAL ID bill.

Then look at those of us who are border States, Texas, California, Mexico and Arizona, facing the likes of the Minutemen. On May 1, the Houston Chronicle said that the Minutemen are headed for Texas. We are patriots but we can handle our own business, but the Federal Government needs to handle immigration business.

I believe that we need more resources at the border for Customs and border patrol protection agents, more dollars for enforcement technology, more dollars to be able to protect the border, more dollars to ward off inappropriate, unauthorized militia on our borders. The reason why Americans are taking up immigration in their own hands is because we have failed them.

Mr. Chairman, we need enforcement with respect to employer sanctions. We need enforcement with respect to promoting American jobs. We need enforcement as it relates to protecting our borders, north and south; and yes, Mr. Chairman, we need comprehensive immigration reform.

I have introduced the Save America Comprehensive Immigration Act of 2005, which has to do with reuniting families, legalization for long-time residents, protecting women against violence and the border protection, as well as dealing with American jobs. I hope that we will have an opportunity in appropriations and authorization to look at immigration reform.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on the appropriations process for fiscal year 2006 and the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill in particular. This is the first appropriations bill to be considered under the fiscal year 2006 budget resolution. The bill also provides for what we all agree is one of our Nation's highest priorities: protecting Americans at home.

The budget resolution provides a total allocation for discretionary appropriations of \$843 billion in fiscal year 2006. This represents a 0.8 percent reduction for fiscal year 2006 in total non-defense, non-homeland security spending. I recognize the challenge this poses to the Appropriations Committee.

With respect to H.R. 2360, the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2006, this is the first appropriations bill we are considering for fiscal year 2006, and the first to be reported by the Homeland Security subcommittee of the restructured Appropriations Committee.

I am pleased to report that it is consistent with the levels established in H. Con. Res. 95, the House concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006, which Congress adopted as its fiscal blueprint on April 28.

H.R. 2360 provides \$30.8 billion in appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2006, which is \$1.1 billion below the fiscal year 2005 level. Excluding the \$2.5 billion in one-time appropriations provided in fiscal year 2005 for Project BioShield, the bill actually represents a \$1.4 billion, or 4.7 percent, increase in budget authority above

last year's level and is \$1.3 billion above the President's fiscal year 2006 request.

The bill provides increases in border protection, immigration enforcement, first responders, transportation security, and science and technology broadly consistent with the President's request, but exceeds it largely because of the rejection of the Administration's proposed \$1.7 billion increase in aviation security fees for the Transportation Security Administration. The bill's funding level is partly offset by slowing spending for the replacement of the Coast Guard fleet and by a reduction in non-defense, non-homeland security spending. With total fiscal year 2006 appropriations equal to its allocation, the bill conforms with the budget resolution.

H.R. 2360 does not contain any emergency-designated BA, which is exempt from budget limits. The bill contains one rescission of \$84 million in previously enacted discretionary BA for the Coast Guard; the same amount is appropriated for replacement or maintenance of the current patrol boat fleet.

The bill complies with section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which prohibits consideration of bills in excess of an Appropriations subcommittee's 302(b) allocation of budget authority and outlays established in the budget resolution.

As we enter the appropriations season, I wish Chairman LEWIS and our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee the best as they strive to meet the needs of the American public within the framework established by the budget resolution.

In conclusion, I express my support for H.R. 2360.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the FY 2006 Homeland Security Appropriations bill. This is not a perfect bill, but it provides much needed funds to make our country safer.

Total funding in the bill is increased from this year's levels, with significant increases over the requested levels for immigration and for customs enforcement and border protection. Funding for port, transit and aviation security is also much improved over the president's budget request.

Still, I'm concerned about shortfalls in the bill. It cuts fire grants by 16 percent, even as a recent survey found that fire departments all over the country are not prepared to respond to a haz-mat incident and lack equipment. The bill cuts State homeland security formula grants, local law enforcement terrorism prevention grants, and urban area security grants by 14 percent. The bill does provide additional funding for border patrol, but the number of agents still falls 500 short of the 2,000 called for in the Intelligence Reform bill. Since September 11, just 965 additional border patrol agents have been hired—less than a 10 percent increase in 4 years.

I am pleased that the House adopted an amendment offered by Mr. OBEY of Wisconsin to provide funding to help States comply with the REAL ID Act. Estimates are that complying with the Act will cost the States between \$100 million and \$500 million over the next 4 years. Since the majority saw fit to push the REAL ID provisions through Congress, it is important that Congress also provide funding to do the job.

I opposed the amendment offered by Mr. TANCREDO which would block any Homeland Security funding from going to State and local

governments if their law enforcement is prohibited from reporting immigration information to the Federal Government.

I believe that linking this provision to vital homeland security funds could have unintended consequences for our national security. Since 9/11, national security has become a national priority, and State and local governments play an essential role in assisting the Department of Homeland Security to improve the security in this country.

Under current law passed in 1996, it is already illegal for law enforcement to restrict the reporting of immigration information to the Federal Government. I support this law, and believe it should be fully enforced. The efforts of State and local governments to enhance our security should not be undermined because the Federal Government has not properly enforced immigration law.

We should be providing States with resources to improve security, not taking these resources away. By underfunding and allowing the weakening of security in some States and localities due to their lack of reporting illegal immigrants to immigration officials, the Federal Government would in effect be contributing to the weakening of our national security.

Mr. Chairman, much remains to be done to improve our defenses against terrorism, but this bill is an important step, and I will vote for it.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of this bill, which includes critically important funding for Oregon and the rest of the country.

I especially appreciate funding for prevention measures to reduce the damage done by floods and other natural disasters, and I would like to thank the Chairman and Ranking Member for fully funding the Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2004. The Act, which this House passed overwhelmingly last year, extends the authorization of the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) and provides new resources to address severe repetitive loss properties.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) reports that repetitively flooded properties, which make up just 1 percent of the insured properties, account for 25 percent of NFIP claims dollars. Mitigating these properties will not only keep people out of harm's way, but will also save other flood insurance program policyholders thousands of dollars.

Fully funding the program this year would allow us to move more than 1000 families out of harm's way. It will also save the Federal government millions of dollars in money that would otherwise be spent on flood damages and disaster relief. FEMA reports that mitigation and building standards already in place have resulted in over \$1 billion annually in reduced flood losses.

I appreciate the strong support of Financial Services Chairman MIKE OXLEY, Ranking Member BARNEY FRANK, and their staff, who have worked tirelessly to ensure that the Flood Insurance Reform Act is implemented.

The Homeland Security bill also includes crucial local preparedness grants, which are an important part of the Federal government's responsibility to be a good partner to local communities. I am pleased that these grants will be distributed, after a state minimum guarantee, on the basis of risk, as the 9/11 Commission recommended.

However, I am disappointed that three and a half years after the terrorist attacks of Sep-

tember 11, our homeland security budget continues to under-fund some of our most pressing needs, from border security to infrastructure security to first responders. But this shortfall stems not from the appropriations bill, but from unfortunate budget choices and the resulting inadequate allocations.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time and I yield back my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time as well, and I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2360

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENTAL  
MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY AND EXECUTIVE  
MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Homeland Security, as authorized by section 102 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 112), and executive management of the Department of Homeland Security, as authorized by law, \$133,239,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$40,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That of the amounts appropriated under this heading, \$20,000,000 shall not be available for obligation until the Secretary of Homeland Security submits to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives an immigration enforcement strategy to reduce the number of undocumented aliens, based upon the latest United States Census Bureau data, by 10 percent per year: *Provided further*, That of the amounts appropriated under this heading, \$10,000,000 shall not be available for obligation until section 525 of this Act is implemented: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall submit all reports requested by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives for all agencies and components of the Department of Homeland Security, as identified in this Act and the House report accompanying this Act, by the dates specified: *Provided further*, That the content of all reports shall be in compliance with the direction and instructions included in this Act and the House report accompanying this Act by the dates specified: *Provided further*, That, of the amounts appropriated under this heading, \$20,000,000 may not be obligated until the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives has received all final reports in compliance with such direction and instructions.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HOSTETTLER

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOSTETTLER:

Page 2, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(decreased by \$500,000)”.

Page 4, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(decreased by \$5,505,000)”.

Page 12, line 20, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by \$193,200,000)”.

Page 16, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(decreased by \$21,156,000)”.

Page 19, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(decreased by \$47,500,000)”.

Page 34, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(decreased by \$180,000,000)”.

Page 37, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(decreased by \$60,000,000)”.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER) is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the combination of the three amendments I will offer today. It would supply funds for the shortfall of ICE agents, or Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents, border patrol agents and detention beds that have not yet been funded by this Congress. This shortfall occurs as a result of the difference between authorized levels due to last year's National Intelligence Reform Act and a combination of this year's appropriations bills, this appropriations bill and the recently passed supplemental.

Immigrations and Customs Enforcement is the agency tasked with enforcing immigration laws internally within the United States. It is critical that ICE, Immigrations and Customs Enforcement, receive the resources necessary to successfully complete its mission.

The 9/11 Commission recognized the great importance of adequately securing our Nation's borders against the potential threats. We must make up the shortfall in funding and provide funding for the additional 500 border patrol agents who have not yet been funded.

It is also critical that we have adequate detention bed space to house aliens that might otherwise never return for hearings or, worse, might commit crimes if not detained.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment to fully fund critical parts of homeland security and the Bureau of Border Protection, the Immigration and Customs Enforcement, as well as detention beds.

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kentucky insist upon his point of order?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, there is plenty of money in this section of the bill. I think we have put all the money we can into that section, and it is ample.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read. The amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill, and I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order raised by the gentleman from Kentucky?

If not, to be considered en bloc, pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI, an amendment must not propose to increase the levels of budget authority or outlays in the bill. Because the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana proposes a net increase in the level of outlays in the bill, as argued by the chairman of subcommittee on appropriations, it may not avail itself of clause 2(f) to address portions of the bill not yet read. The point of order that the amendment proposes to address portions of the bill not yet read is sustained.

□ 1245

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. SOUDER

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. SOUDER:

Page 2, line 9, after “\$133,239,000” insert “, of which \$6,000,000 shall be for the Office of Counternarcotics Enforcement to carry out its responsibilities under section 878 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as amended”.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment, which would ensure adequate funding for the Office of Counternarcotics Enforcement at the Department of Homeland Security. The office was created by Congress in December of 2004 as part of the 9/11 intelligence reform legislation. It is fully authorized but, to date, has not received sufficient funds to enable it to carry out its mission of overseeing and coordinating DHS' antidrug trafficking efforts.

DHS is the largest single drug enforcement entity in the Federal Government, combining the legacy Customs Service, the Coast Guard, and the Border Patrol. For this reason, Congress specifically made drug interdiction one of its primary responsibilities. Congress has also created the position of Counternarcotics Officer, CNO, in 2002, to oversee drug interdiction activity and facilitate coordination and cooperation within the Department.

Regrettably, the original CNO position did not have the resources or the status necessary to be effective. During a hearing held by the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources, which I chair, we learned that CNO was a detailee from the Drug Czar's office without a dedicated staff or budget.

To remedy this problem, Congress replaced the CNO position with the Office of Counternarcotics Enforcement. The office is responsible for analyzing and reporting to Congress on the Depart-

ment's annual counterdrug budget request, for reporting to Congress on the results and effectiveness of DHS counterdrug operations, and for ensuring the coordination of the Department's counterdrug efforts both internally and with other departments.

Although Congress authorized \$6 million for the office out of the Department's appropriation for departmental management and operations, the administration failed to request any funds for it. The amendment specifically designates \$6 million for the office out of the overall appropriation for the Office of the Secretary and for executive management of the Department.

In closing, I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), chairman of the full committee; and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), chairman of the subcommittee, for bringing this vital legislation before the House. But once again I would like to make it absolutely clear that this does not increase any dollars in the Homeland Security budget. It merely requests, again, that dollars we have authorized be set aside inside this department.

This department has been opposed by the administration before. In the original creation of the Department of Homeland Security, the administration opposed the creation of the Office of Counternarcotics. This House spoke clearly, as did the other body, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker himself, led this being inserted in the bill, but the administration ignored our request. So when we went back to the 9/11 report, this House again changed and added more duties and staff to this office. The other body agreed with us, but the administration opposed this.

The administration has steadfastly opposed narcotics, of which most of the divisions of the Department of Homeland Security work in, yet they have steadfastly opposed making this office anything but superficially irrelevant. They have not allowed the director of it, the current director was first funded by the ONDCP, now he is funded by TSA. He has all detailees in his office, or interns. The minimal budget is at the begging from the Chief of Staff to fund their office.

We need a set-aside office. This body and the other body have spoken in both major bills. It needs to be funded. The administration continues to be negligent in the area of narcotics. They proposed wiping out Byrne grants, they proposed wiping out HIDTA, they proposed getting rid of meth hotspots, and once again they are after the narcotics budget.

The number one crime problem in America is related to narcotics, and it is about time this administration understood that problem. We need to continue to speak out in Congress, because across the board they have been opposing this, and this may be our only chance to go on record to show that we

want this administration to be more aggressive in counternarcotics.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I rise reluctantly in opposition to the gentleman's amendment that would earmark \$6 million for the Office of Counternarcotics Enforcement and the U.S. Interdiction Coordinator out of funds provided for the Office of the Secretary and executive management.

Mr. Chairman, the Department currently has eight people working on counternarcotics issues. In the past 2 years, we funded \$1.86 million for that activity. That is almost half the funding provided for the Chief of Staff of the Department, where the counternarcotics staff are located. A \$6 million earmark for counternarcotics would have the effect of zeroing out all funding for all other activities funded within the Chief of Staff's office, including the development of budget and information technology policies for the secretary.

In fact, this amendment would require additional reductions in the Chief of Staff's office to fund this work. These reductions would mean that the Secretary would hire fewer security staff to focus on classified and security-sensitive issues within the Department, reduce support for the privacy office, or perhaps eliminate most of the newly proposed Office of Policy and also prohibit the hiring of new staff requested in the 2006 budget.

There is no real clear justification why this office should basically triple in one fiscal year from less than \$2 million to \$6 million, or what the appropriate size of the office should be, particularly when they have not even filled all the funded positions they have.

While I support the counterdrug mission of the Department, and in fact wish that the Chief Counternarcotics Officer would take a more prominent role in resolving longstanding issues of interagency coordination of drug interdiction, we cannot appropriate funds without knowing what those funds will be paying for. We just do not write blank checks in this subcommittee. I respect the gentleman's amendment and his intent.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment does not specify that it comes from the Chief of Staff's office, was it? That was not my impression. Because it is in the section of the bill that relates to the Chief of Staff?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Reclaiming my time, that is correct, and this is where the staff is now located. So it would have to come out of the Chief of Staff's operating budget.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will once again yield, I question whether it has to come out of the Chief of Staff's budget, because it

was supposed to be a separate Director of Narcotics. I think the Department of Homeland Security has chosen to fund it through the Chief of Staff's office, which is not necessarily binding. But I would be happy to work with the gentleman in conference to see if we can come up with a figure.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Perhaps the gentleman can withdraw the amendment and we will have a chance to work on it further.

Mr. SOUDER. If the chairman will agree to work with leadership and with the Speaker's Drug Task Force, which has supported this, I will withdraw the amendment on the grounds that the chairman will continue to work with me as we move to conference.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I will be happy to work with the gentleman. He has been a very diligent Member of this body, and I appreciate the information he is providing to us now. We will work with the gentleman to try to get at the problem he describes here.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

The CHAIRMAN. Hearing none, the amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

Page 2, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$15,000,000)".

Page 37, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$15,000,000)".

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentlewoman's amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I hope the distinguished chairman will acknowledge that we believe this is revenue neutral. This amendment is offset by the account out of the Secretary's office and it is not legislating on an appropriation bill, but it is addressing a need that is overwhelming in our offices and throughout America.

If our message to America is that we believe in legalization and we believe in the legal access to immigration, or to legalization, meaning that we want people to come into the United States legally and to secure legal status, then we are doing everything wrong to encourage that proposition.

We know that this country is a land of immigrants and a land of laws, and through the decades, through the centuries immigrants have come first through the Atlantic, through the Statue of Liberty, through Ellis Island, seeking opportunity and seeking legalization. And, Mr. Chairman, we have allowed that to happen. We have had processes in place that would work toward, not against those processes occurring.

Today, ask any Member of Congress what is the largest caseload they have in their office, and it is regarding immigration benefits and access to citizenship. Not illegal access, but legal access. When we look at the documentation we find that there is a steadily increasing number of individuals seeking legal immigrant status. In the years 2001, 7.8 million, 2002, 7.7 million, 2003, 7.1 million. At the same time, we find that there is a lack of access to real immigration rights because we are backlogged.

There is an enormous backlog, even though there are no numerical limits, as reported in this chart, no numerical limits on the admission of aliens who are immediate relatives of U.S. citizens. Such citizens petitioning for their relatives are waiting almost a year, almost a year, and in some parts of the country almost 2 years for the paperwork to be processed.

Citizens and other legal permanent residents petitioning for other non-immediate relatives under family preferences are often waiting several years for the petition to be processed.

This is a crisis, colleagues. We are working against our own philosophies and policies, which is to encourage legal immigration. Right now you can ask any Member of Congress whether they have an elderly constituent who is attempting to beat the clock of life.

Right now in my own office there is a gentleman who loves this country, in his 80s, and he has been trying to become a citizen through legal ways for almost a decade. Right now he is ailing. His family calls me every day. The reason his petition is taking so long is because we are backlogged and cannot seem to get a simple process of fingerprints and documentation together at once.

The additional \$15 million in this amendment will help us in funding the hiring, clearance processes, training, office equipment, and support services for 300 additional full-time CIS adjudicators. The Sensenbrenner-Conyers substitute amended the immigration section 102 in a committee hearing for the immigration customs enforcement legal program for the hiring of an additional 300 attorneys and related training and support cost. This amendment, that I join together with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) in, likewise adds this amount of attorneys and adjudicators into this process to help us along.

The President supports reducing the lengthy backlog of immigration application processing as an important policy objective. Lengthy backlog and interminable processing delays are a disservice to the needs of businesses, keeps families needlessly separated, and undermines the integrity of the system. There is a bipartisan agreement that the Department of Homeland Security must catch up on the backlog it inherited from the INS. The former head of the immigration services, Eduardo Geary, in our own Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims,

submitted a proposal to end the backlog.

Work has been done, but more work has to be done. The report language for this bill earmarks \$120 million for this purpose but it fails to add money where it is needed most by increasing the number of adjudicators who can process the backlogged applications.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a bipartisan amendment, as shown in the bipartisan effort of the work done by both the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS). Together, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and myself now offer these additional dollars and focus on the need for adjudicators and on the need to help with backlog applicants.

Remember what I said. The numbers are increasing every single day and the backlog is increasing every single day. Citizens and LPRs, legal permanent residents, petitioning for nonimmediate relatives under the family preferences are waiting now several years. Mr. Chairman, we can do better. How can we do better? By supporting the Jackson-Lee/Conyers amendment.

For every single Member in this body who has a backlog in their office of those trying to do the right thing, this is the Homeland Security appropriation and what we need to do is understand immigration and fight terrorism. So I ask my colleagues to support my amendment.

□ 1300

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise to state a point of order and in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized on his point of order.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the proposal will likely cause an overage on outlays, and so the amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read. The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI because the amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there Members desiring to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I need a clarification. The amendment is on page 2 line 9, and the offset comes on page 37 line 12. I do not understand what the objection is to the amendment in terms of out of order. I seek a clarification. What is the objection?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I will read it again to the gentleman.

The amendment proposes to amend portions of the bill not yet read. The amendment may not be considered en bloc under clause 2(f) of rule XXI because the amendment proposes to increase the level of outlays in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further Members desiring to be heard on the point of order?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, let me just say I would hope that the chairman would be willing to waive the point of order. I consider this amendment so important that I will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment without prejudice at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas that the amendment be withdrawn?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. LOBIONDO

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 7 offered by Mr. LOBIONDO: In title I, in the item relating to "OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY AND EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT", after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$130,000,000)".

In title I, in the item relating to "OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT", after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$130,000,000)".

In title I, in the item relating to "OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER", after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$16,000,000)".

In title I, in the item relating to "OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER", after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$190,000,000)".

In title II, in the item relating to "UNITED STATES COAST GUARD-ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, AND IMPROVEMENTS", after the first dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$466,000,000)".

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer today with my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT), would restore the \$466 million cut to the Coast Guard's Integrated Deepwater System. I know the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) strongly supports the Coast Guard; and while I disagree with his decision to cut Deepwater, I understand why the gentleman felt the need to do it.

In light of the post-9/11 capability requirement changes, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) asked for a comprehensive implementation plan for the entire life of the program. As the Chair of the Coast Guard authorizing subcommittee, I have also requested the exact same information. Unfortunately, to date, neither the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) nor I have received the information requested. I would say to the Coast Guard, to the Department of OMB, provide Congress with this information and do it now. No more excuses, just do it now.

If the administration continues to ignore this request, the Deepwater program will be devastated. At \$500 million, Deepwater will likely take over 40 years to complete instead of the original 20-year estimation. Thousands of jobs would be lost in a number of States. The total cost to the taxpayer would actually increase substantially

because of the delays; and the delivery of the new, more capable vessels, aircraft and communications equipment will be delayed indefinitely.

Specifically, this cut in funding would likely stop all work on the national security cutter affecting jobs in Mississippi. The break in production would negatively impact the already-troubled shipbuilding industry. It would also defer design work on off-shore patrol cutters and the fast response cutter, again affecting jobs in Mississippi, would stop work on the vertical takeoff unmanned aerial vehicle, and this affects jobs in Texas. It will scale back the mission effectiveness program of the 210- and 270-foot cutters, which is intended to keep these legacy assets afloat and operational. This will affect jobs in Maryland.

Also, Mr. Chairman, it will affect the operation tempos significantly, placing a tremendous strain on the service's aging legacy assets that are doing the job now.

In fiscal year 2004, the United States Coast Guard lost over 700 patrol days due to failing legacy assets. Last year, the cutter fleet operated free of major casualty less than 50 percent of the time. Last year, the service's fleet of C-130, HU-25, and HH-60 aircraft all failed to meet target levels for readiness. And last year, the Coast Guard's main rescue helicopter experienced in-flight engine failures at a rates of 329 mishaps per 1,000 hours of flight.

All of these issues are putting our men and women in uniform in grave danger and jeopardizing our homeland security mission. The GAO testified before my subcommittee that legacy assets are insufficient to meet mission demands and the need to replace or upgrade deteriorating legacy assets is considerable. The Coast Guard commandant calls it a readiness gap or downward readiness spiral.

Whatever we call it, the fact remains without new and better-equipped assets promised under Deepwater, the Coast Guard will not be able to successfully conduct its homeland security and other vital missions. Delaying Deepwater is bad for homeland security. It is also bad news for the budget. Continuing to defer acquisition of new assets causes the service to sink more and more money into rapidly deteriorating legacy assets just to keep them afloat.

The Coast Guard anticipated spending \$20 million annually to keep legacy assets operational; but in 2006 the service expects to spend more than 12 times that much, and that does not take into account the nearly \$60 million it will cost to replace the wing boxes on several of the C-130s or the \$63 million in other unfunded legacy sustainment priorities.

In order to control costs, we need to invest in replacement assets. The new Deepwater assets will cost much less to maintain and will operate with fewer

servicemembers, saving millions in operating expenses and helping our homeland security mission. Deepwater will allow the service to push out the borders and effectively meet the demands of homeland security and other traditional missions.

I urge my colleagues to fully restore the Deepwater funding, and at the appropriate time I intend to withdraw my amendment and hope that the gentleman from Kentucky will have received the information requested from the administration, and work with us as the bill moves forward to restore these desperately needed dollars.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, imagine that your house is on fire, and the first thing you do is call 911; but the fire truck which was purchased during the Eisenhower administration gets a flat tire. The siren is not working, and then the hose springs a leak. Now you have lost your house, all of your possessions, and hopefully not your life.

Now imagine you are at sea. You call for help. The mayday call will be answered by the United States Coast Guard with ships and planes that are called legacy assets. Presumably that is a euphemism for old, really old. In fact, the Coast Guard operates the second oldest naval fleet in the world. The North Korean and Iranian naval fleets are in better shape than the United States Coast Guard.

Many so-called legacy assets are riddled with structural defects, putting Coast Guard personnel and people who call on them for help at risk, like the nine Coast Guard personnel who were aboard the 1942-era cutter *Storis* who nearly died when the davit lowering their lifeboat ripped away from the steel superstructure crashing them into the frigid Bering Sea. The rescuers literally became the rescued.

And remember last year, the Coast Guard's main search and rescue helicopter, the *Jayhawk*, experienced in-flight engine failures at a rate of 329 per 100,000. The FAA acceptable standard is one per 100,000 flight hours. These failures limit the *Jayhawk's* ability to hover over, and place the lives of its crew and passengers and those below in danger.

The undisputable fact is that the demands on the Coast Guard have vastly outpaced its resources. I think we can all agree, there is no margin for error, particularly in this post-9/11 world, when the Coast Guard cannot escort an LNG tanker because the cutter's hull has fractured; when the parents of an overdosed teenager discover that the Coast Guard boats were not fast enough to interdict the drug smugglers; when family members of deceased fishermen discover that the Coast Guard could not have got there sooner because the helicopter had to turn around because of engine problems.

I sincerely appreciate the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. MIKE ROGERS) and

the Committee on Appropriations have been most patient in seeking the answers to the questions that they have posed, but I deeply regret we have come to the point where Congress feels it is necessary to threaten the future, the very existence, honestly, of the Coast Guard; and OMB and the administration should comply sooner rather than later with the request put forward by the chairman so we can put this matter behind us and meet our responsibilities to the brave Coast Guard personnel as well as the American people.

In the end, we should be looking for ways to speed up the Deepwater program and encourage the purchase of additional cutters and aircraft. What the service needs with its multiple missions and increasing responsibilities is not further reduction, but rather increases; increases, not of millions, but of billions, of dollars because it is that critical.

Unless we do not really care about patrolling ports, bridges and power plants, unless the 5,000 lives that the Coast Guard saves on an annual basis are now expendable, and we all know that is not true, that is not the case. But the reality is a crippled Coast Guard means lost property, lost commerce, and lost lives. We can do better.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, first let me thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) for bringing this important amendment to the floor. I think it is very important. I would also like to commend the Subcommittee on Homeland Security and the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) for the great job he has done in doing his job as the chairman of this important subcommittee.

I would like to bring my perspective as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Terrorism and Unconventional Threat and Capabilities on the Committee on Armed Services. I like to look at the war on terror in three parts. We have the part that is taking the fight to the enemy. That is the armed services and the intelligence community. We have the job of gathering information both domestically and internationally in this very difficult war on terror. And third, we have the job, the task of securing the homeland.

□ 1315

We are talking about building block No. 3 today. This year, unfortunately, it has been found necessary for the fiscal year 2006 Homeland Security Appropriations bill to include \$500 million for the Coast Guard's Integrated Deepwater System, cutting the program by \$466 million below the President's request. I think this is a mistake. I do not think there is anything more important today, and I remember Ronald Reagan telling me when I was first elected to Congress 20 years ago that there are many things that the Congress does that are important, but

nothing is more important than providing security to the American people.

Cutting nearly half of the funding will result in huge delays for Deepwater. This is simply unacceptable. If funding remains at this reduced level, it will add an additional 20 years to the program's completion. We cannot wait. This would serve a tough blow not only to this program but to taxpayers who ultimately have to fund the program over the long term.

Continuing to underfund the Deepwater program only puts off the acquisition of new replacement assets and further stresses already failing legacy systems. The gentleman from New Jersey went into some detail on that subject. With reduced resources, the service is forced to sink the majority of its funding into keeping legacy systems literally afloat and literally in the air.

Failure to fully fund the Deepwater program creates a readiness gap that we cannot afford to create. The Coast Guard performs countless critical missions to aid in the war on terror and we must not intentionally reduce or hamper their capabilities.

I understand that the gentleman from New Jersey is going to withdraw this and there will be pending considerations by the chairman of the committee. I thank both gentlemen for their effort in this regard.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from New Jersey bringing this forward and I join with him and my colleague from Massachusetts in regretting that we are at this pass. I understand that the committee is not motivated by any animus against the Coast Guard or any failure to appreciate the need for what it does. While we are going to have this amendment withdrawn at this point, obviously we all fervently hope that the administration will come into compliance with the very reasonable request of the committee so that by the time this bill ultimately is signed into law it includes these necessary funds for the Coast Guard.

I represent the most prosperous fishing port in the United States, the city of New Bedford, town of Fairhaven. The value of the catch there is very significant. They make a significant contribution to the economy, the fishermen do. They also provide a very healthy source of food. At a time when we are worried about the health of what people eat, the health effects, we are worried about obesity, fishing is one source of about the healthiest food people can eat. Unlike most other foods, people do not often realize that the seafood that is brought to their table involves some risk of life. People do not get killed growing vegetables or even herding cattle, but people get killed fishing, particularly out in the deep sea. We have had tragic instances recently in the North Atlantic of these extraordinarily brave men losing their

lives not through their own fault but weather and other factors.

We need to do a lot to deal with that. We need to change regulations that give them incentives to be out at unsafe times. We need to do better training. We need a whole range of things. But no matter how hard we try to avoid accidents, given the nature of fishing, they will happen. Sadly, the Coast Guard today is not as well equipped as it can be and should be to deal with those accidents.

My colleague from Massachusetts alluded to a controversy over a failure of a helicopter at a time when someone needed a rescue. The Coast Guard maintains that it would not have made any difference. We do not know whether it did or did not, but even accepting their argument, we should not be having that debate. Families mourning the loss of a brave fisherman should not be further tormented by the possibility that it was a failure in our own government that led that to happen.

Having the Coast Guard do everything that it physically is capable of doing in these rescue situations is an essential part of an overall safety program, and obviously that cannot happen without there being the funds that we need. I urge the administration strongly to comply with the committee's request because it would be morally unacceptable for us to let this bill get signed into law with this gap still there.

I appreciate the leadership of the committee in trying to get it resolved. They will have our support in doing that. We hope that when this bill is finally signed, those of us who represent fishermen will be able to tell them with some sense of confidence that we are, in fact, doing everything that we can to save them in this difficult situation.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the ships we are talking about today are well over 35 years old. If we were to proceed as scheduled, it is still going to take 2 or 3 years to build them. If we delay, we are talking really no telling how long. Quite frankly, the Navy right now is retiring Block I Aegis class cruisers that are less than 20 years old for maintenance problems. If we are going to retire 20-year-old Navy ships, it is only fair that the people who sail side by side with them, the United States Coast Guard, should have their ships replaced as well.

The gentleman from Kentucky has asked some very legitimate questions. I would hope the administration would be forthcoming with the answers to those questions. It is important to know what sort of financial obligations we are undertaking by replacing these vessels. But the bottom line, Mr. Chairman, is we have no choice but to replace these vessels. They are 35 years old, the newest of them. We are sending young people to sea that are half the

age of the vessels they sail on. If it was my son, your son, I know we would want better than that.

I encourage you to get the answers that you seek, for the Coast Guard to be forthright with the information that you seek, but at the end of the day it is important that these ships that were built in the 1960s and the early 1970s be replaced as quickly as possible.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I really appreciate the action of the gentleman from New Jersey, the chairman of the Coast Guard authorization committee. I really appreciate the gentleman's amendment and the comments that have been made. I think we are all in agreement. There is nothing that hurt me more in this bill than when we were forced to cut back the Deepwater monies until we could get the report of the Coast Guard about what the 20-year plans were.

I am a big supporter of Deepwater. In fact, when I was chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee is when we first funded Deepwater. The gentleman from Minnesota and I served on that subcommittee as well. It is a wonderful program.

But then came 9/11. When 9/11 happened, the mission of the Coast Guard dramatically changed and they never really amended the Deepwater program in view of that very alarming new mission that they became charged with. And then we have continued to fund them for the last 2 years just based on their promise that they would get us the revised plan—a rebaselining. And then as time passed and we began to notice with the help of the gentleman from New Jersey's subcommittee that more and more of the Deepwater monies intended for new equipment was being used to maintain the old equipment, increasingly eating into the Deepwater monies. We felt we had no choice but to try to force the issue.

We have bent over backwards, 15 different ways, with the Coast Guard and with the Department to try to get them to tell us the new 20-year plan, the rebaselined Deepwater, so that we all know where we are going and we know what we are buying.

This subcommittee is not going to be a blank check for anybody. We insist on knowing what the program is. I think that is our duty. As soon as the Coast Guard can get us the 20-year Deepwater spending plan, I think the problem will disappear but not until. The old equation, lack of information means lack of money, applies to the Coast Guard as it does to my personal account.

I appreciate the gentleman from New Jersey's work and his attitude in the subcommittee. He is a great leader of that subcommittee and has done a wonderful job. We have enjoyed working with him. He is easy to work with. He is very firm in his convictions, but he understands what has to be done here.

I hope that this painful period of time will pass. It is up to the Coast Guard and the Department and perhaps, most importantly, the Office of Management and Budget to all finally agree and let us get on with it. I thank the gentleman for offering the amendment.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. The concern of the committee to get a rebaselining of the Coast Guard construction program is not something that has just happened recently. I think we have been working on this for a year and a half, 2 years, something like that, to get the rebaselining. It is not a last-second whim that has occurred, but something that we have been concerned about for an extended period of time and have not gotten a response.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. The gentleman is exactly correct. In fact, in the 2002 period of time we were requesting the new baseline. We did that in 2003. And then in the 2005 bill finally, we wrote it into the law that said you shall furnish the rebaselining on a such and so date. That time has long past gone. We still do not have it. What else can we do? I am open to all ideas, but I think the only weapon we have left is withholding funds.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) for bringing this issue to the attention of the House and my appreciation to Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member SABO for performing the kind of responsible oversight that our branch of government is accountable for.

The gentleman from New Jersey very accurately points out that the Deepwater program is an essential element of homeland security. The Coast Guard's mission has changed dramatically and justifiably since 9/11. For it to carry out that message, its aging and inferior fleet needs to be replaced with a 21st century fleet. I commend the gentleman from New Jersey for taking the lead in making that fleet a reality.

I understand that because of the constraints we are under under this bill, that he will not be able to go forward with his amendment at this time. I obviously support that decision. But I wanted the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO) to know that I would be interested and willing to help in whatever efforts are necessary from this point on so that we can find the optimal and appropriate level of funding for this program so

that we can complete the modernization of the Coast Guard for its very essential new mission.

I again thank the author of the amendment and would urge continued cooperation.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Lobiondo amendment.

The Coast Guard's Deepwater Program will result in a nearly complete recapitalization of the Coast Guard's fleet of vessels, aircraft, and supporting systems.

The Coast Guard's legacy assets are failing at an alarming rate, jeopardizing the success of Coast Guard missions and the lives of Coast Guardsmen.

We must bring the new assets that will be procured through the Deepwater Program online as quickly as possible.

The current bill will not only fail to accelerate the rate at which these assets become available, but it dramatically slows down the delivery of these critical assets.

Following the events of 9/11, the Coast Guard has taken on significant responsibilities to protect maritime homeland security in addition to carrying out its important traditional missions of search and rescue, illegal drug and migrant interdiction, oil spill response and prevention, and fisheries law enforcement.

We must provide the resources necessary to allow the men and women of the Coast Guard to successfully carry out these missions.

The Deepwater Program will provide these assets and I applaud the chairman of the Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation for his amendment to provide funding to procure the assets needed by the Coast Guard.

I thank the chairman.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the LoBiondo amendment to the DHS authorization and I ask my colleagues to support it.

The Coast Guard yard in Baltimore, MD has dedicated coasties and dedicated civilian personnel, all of whom are fighting to keep us safe and secure. So it is disheartening to hear that the DHS authorization is going to cut critical funding for the Coast Guard to the tune of \$466 million.

This in my opinion is a huge mistake. We have asked the Coast Guard to take on an aggressive and daunting role in protecting our coastlines, ports, rivers and waterways, and more importantly keeping our homeland secure. We cannot and should not be cutting their funding. The Coast Guard is moving in a new and exciting direction that will allow for an all encompassing approach including faster, stronger ships along with an aircraft component. At this time we should not be cutting their budget; we should be making sure they have the tools and resources to keep us safe.

It is my understanding that cuts could result in a loss of up to 108 jobs at the Baltimore Yard and I want to let you know that this is completely unacceptable. The Baltimore Coast Guard yard is already scheduled to lose 50 jobs for the MEP program and to add another 108 jobs on top of it would devastate the yard and the proud maritime tradition that Baltimore has.

I support the new direction for the Coast Guard and believe these new capabilities will only make our homeland security stronger. However, losing skilled ship repair and build-

ers is not a good idea. It is hard enough to find trained workers but to keep pushing them aside will only hurt us when we need their help the most.

But aside from that we are cutting the fleet of vessels that are going to be the new line of maritime defense. We cannot let this happen. This Deepwater project is designed around the new cutters, smaller support craft and integrated aircraft fleet. By reducing funding for this program you will hurt the overall effectiveness of the program and we will lose hundreds of jobs of hard working Americans.

I ask my colleagues to stand in support of this amendment.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) for his focused and outstanding leadership, and I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

Page 2, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$18,000,000)".

Page 37, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$15,000,000)".

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I hope that we will have an opportunity to find common ground. Again, I raise the question to my colleagues, how many of you have been overwhelmed by the number of immigration cases in your office and overwhelmed by the fact that these are individuals seeking legal status.

I referred my colleagues to a report on immigration and naturalization petitions pending from 1997 to 2004. The most glaring point is that citizens and legal permanent residents petitioning for other not immediate relatives under the family preferences are often waiting several years for the petitions to be processed.

□ 1330

The normal cycle is 6 months.

This amendment is simple. It would provide relief by providing for funding for the hiring, clearance processes, training, office equipment, and support services for 300 additional full-time CIS adjudicators above the number of adjudicators presently employed by CIS in fiscal year 2005. This means that the backlog elimination plan as offered by the former Director of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, Eduardo Aguirre, could be further implemented, and, also, the report given by the ombudsman presented in the first annual ombudsman report, which talks about the enormous delay and the need for

improving in Citizenship and Immigration Services.

Let me share with my colleagues the long time of waiting in a number of States where these regional service centers are. If one is attempting to get their immediate relatives into the country, in California the waiting started for processing of applications filed in 2003; Nebraska, 2002; Texas, 2002; Vermont, 2003. Unmarried sons and daughters of citizens, these applications are backlogged to July 19, 2001, out of California Regional Center; Nebraska, 2001, Regional Center; Texas, the regional center there, 2001; and Vermont, 1999. If one is a legal permanent resident and they are attempting to get their unmarried son and daughter and they are going to their Congressional office, their petition would be backlogged in California from April 6, 1998; Nebraska, April 13, 2001; Texas, October 30, 1998; and Vermont, January 4, 1999.

Even with the new Department of Homeland Security, Mr. Chairman, it is imperative that we begin to look misdirections. We argue for legal immigration and legal processes, but yet when those individuals try to access the process, they are put in lines that are long and not moving, which frustrates the process, it frustrates our message.

We should promote legalization. We should promote access to legalization. We should promote those who come into this country to seek access to legalization in a legal way, in a way that falls under our laws. But if our processes are broken, then we are not in any way supporting our policies.

This amendment is simple. It provides \$18 million to assure us that these 300 adjudicators can help move the process along. It also, I think, tracks very well with our intent as we have seen a number of legislative initiatives being offered. As I said, I have offered the Save America Comprehensive Immigration Reform Act that deals with border protection, that deals with saving America's jobs, protecting immigrant women who are subject to violence. It also, I believe, provides dollars for border protection.

But the question of immigrant services is, even with the good works of this subcommittee, long overdue to improve. These 300 adjudicators can go a long way in improving that and answering the concerns of many of our colleagues when they go into their office and talk to their caseworkers and see the long list of cases dealing with immigrant concerns.

It also responds to those who are aging on the list. They are trying to secure access to citizenship and legalization. They have put in their paperwork, but they have been delayed. Long years of delay. Right now in my office I have an elderly gentleman who simply wants to pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, put his hand up on his heart and salute the flag of the United States of

America. He has been waiting for years. He is aging. He is ill. He wants to return home to his motherland for some issues that he has to contend with, but he cannot move from the United States because we have been waiting and waiting and waiting and waiting for his citizenship process to go forward.

These are the kinds of crises that Members face all over America. These are the kinds of crises that immigrants face who are seeking to follow the process legally.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment that would allow us to add 300 adjudicators to this process. I believe it is revenue neutral, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would increase the appropriation of funds for the Bureau of Citizenship and Immigration Services, CIS, by \$18 million for the purpose of funding the hiring, clearance processes, training, office equipment and support services for 300 additional full-time CIS adjudicators above the number of adjudicators employed by CIS in Fiscal Year 2005.

The President supports reducing the lengthy backlog for immigration application processing as an important policy objective. Lengthy backlogs and interminable processing delays are a disservice to the needs of business, keep families needlessly separated, and undermine the integrity of the system.

There is bipartisan agreement that the Department of Homeland Security must catch up on the backlog it inherited from the INS. In fact, the report language for this bill earmarks \$120 million for this purpose. But it fails to add money where it is needed most—for increasing the number of adjudicators who can process the backlogged applications.

Just recently, in a bipartisan agreement negotiated between the Chairman and the Ranking Member of the Judiciary Committee, authorization was added during a Judiciary Markup for DHS to hire additional attorneys for the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, ICE, and 300 additional adjudicators for CIS. The amendment before us today is necessary to fund the additional adjudicators and the related training and support costs.

After forging that agreement, and passing it out of the Judiciary Committee, the majority tried to undercut that agreement by requiring that the adjudicators be paid for by an increase in immigration services fees. Simultaneously, they authorized explicit funding for the new ICE attorneys to be drawn out of the total DHS authorization.

These costs should not be born by immigrants. Immigrants should not have to subsidize the administrative failures of our immigration agency. It is an insult to require immigrants to keep paying more and more for slower and shoddier service. These funds should be appropriated by Congress, and Congress should demand better agency management of these funds.

I understand and appreciate the concern of those who would resist moving funds from enforcement functions to adjudications. I do not believe that a reduction of \$15 million in the funds available for enforcement activities would significantly reduce the effectiveness of our enforcement programs. That amount of money would be sufficient, however, to sup-

port 300 additional adjudicators who are desperately needed for backlog reduction in benefits applications.

As to the discussion by the gentleman from Wisconsin, Ranking Member OBEY, regarding his surprise over the submission of this amendment, let me clarify his assumption. This crucial amendment was not intended to broadside anyone. My immigration counsel and someone from Mr. CONYERS' staff met with one of Mr. OBEY's staffers last Friday afternoon to discuss amendments, and this amendment was brought up at that time.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that my colleagues support this amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman continues to reserve his point of order.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, in this bill we double the amount of money that is in the 2005. We double it, \$40 million more than they had in 2005, and it is 50 percent more than what the President requested. I mean we are shoveling money at this office. To shovel more money at them would be, I think, wasteful, to say the very least.

Number two, this proposal would cut the Office of the Secretary. We are already doing a lot of that in this bill, and to cut them any more I think would be counterproductive. That Office of the Secretary is \$133 million plus. This cut would result in a 15 percent reduction from that figure. The office is largely salaries and expenses, and cuts will result in fewer people attempting to meet an increasing workload. Fewer people means the Department will take even more time to respond to our Congressional inquiries.

We have been critical of that office, but it is this office that will ultimately make the changes needed to make this Department work. They are working on the new Secretary's second-stage review even as we speak. It is only now that the office has been fully staffed up. Any cuts would directly affect these positions.

In 2006 we recommended about 90 new positions to address critical needs in the Secretary's Office. These cuts that the gentlewoman proposes would result in reductions in security personnel responsible for classified material. It would reduce the newly expanded privacy office, and it would reduce the newly created policy office, a function that should help eliminate some of the stovepiped functions that we complain about in the Department.

So I would urge Members to reject the amendment. We have already doubled the amount of money in that account in this bill, and it would slash the Office of the Secretary at a very critical time.

I oppose the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding to me.

I appreciate the dilemma that the chairman speaks to, particularly with respect to the very broad needs that we have.

I want to remind my colleagues that this is \$18 million for 300 adjudicators specifically and that what we are talking about is trying to eliminate or bring down the existing 6 million benefit applications that were pending in 2003. As I read to my colleagues, no matter what part of the country they are in, whether they are under the California Regional Service Center, the Nebraska Regional Service Center, the Texas Regional Service Center, the Vermont Regional Service Center, their constituents are facing an enormous backlog. That raises a lot of havoc, Mr. Chairman. In fact, it speaks to security in this country when people are undocumented and do not have the legal papers that would allow them to stay in this country.

It helps young people to age out. One of the issues that we have dealt with is when parents who are trying to bring their children in and the children reach 21 before they are able to even be processed.

This is a crisis. And as one of my colleagues who stood on the floor of the House said, the Department of Homeland Security is huge. This is not an attempt to cause the resources out of the Office of Secretary to be diminished in strategic areas. But I can assure the Members I have great confidence in our new Secretary and those dollars can be effectively moved out of places that would not be damaging to his mission or his work or the work of the Department of Homeland Security.

What we are talking about is providing that \$15 million for 300 adjudicators, and I would welcome the opportunity for us to be able to support this amendment and support this amendment in a way that realizes that it focuses on needs that many of our offices face all over America.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Anyone who serves here any length of time knows that one thing that we really appreciate is if we are not surprised or sandbagged by other Members or other committees.

Earlier today the Committee on Rules provided a sandbag to this committee when, without anyone on this side of the aisle knowing about it, they simply left this bill open to a whole variety of points of order. And they did that after we had worked out some delicate compromises between both sides of the aisle. I strenuously objected to that action. I cannot be credible in objecting to that action if I do not also object to surprises that occur on my side of the aisle.

I made a statement in the whip's meeting last week and asked every member of our caucus to please come to those Members of the House on this side of the aisle whose responsibility it is to run the bill from this side of the

aisle. We asked that they come to us if they had any amendments so we could walk through with them how those amendments might or might not fit into the greater scheme of things. At least we wanted to have a chance to consult with Members.

This amendment is here with no prior notice to me. I do not know if anyone else on this side of the aisle was noticed, but I certainly was not noticed, and I do not appreciate it. The fact is we have our differences between parties, but we try to run these bills in a way which will protect the interests of all Members. We cannot do that if individual Members continually surprise us with amendments so that we have not had an opportunity to try to make certain that they are drafted in such a way that they do not get in the way of what the sponsor is trying to do or get in the way of what we are trying to do.

The gentleman from Kentucky has pointed out that this account has already been increased by a very significant amount. It has and I applaud him for it. The fact is there are some accounts in this bill that do not have a dime in it, and that needs to be corrected before an amendment like this is offered.

So I regretfully have to say that while I wish we had more money for a number of these accounts, as one who has to balance where we put limited amounts of money I have to agree with the gentleman from Kentucky and urge defeat of the amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, far be it from me to attempt to surprise my colleagues. But since we are all equal Members of this body, I consider it my right to approach this issue from the perspective of the knowledge that I have.

I believe in collegiate work, and I believe in working with the collective bodies here, and I do not think I have ever risen to the floor to speak along those lines, but I will do it now. In order to focus on some of the issues that have come to my attention from Members across the aisle on the question of immigrant services, listening to members of the Department of Homeland Security talk about their efforts to ease the burden and knowing the importance of adjudicators which would help, in fact, to ease that burden, I hope that the allotment that has been spoken to both by the ranking member of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee will be designated for these important adjudicators.

The purpose of this amendment is valuable, and I think the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) and I

viewed it as a valuable amendment. I hope that as we move forward that I will be able to see that those dollars allegedly that have been allocated, some \$400 million, will go to easing some of these backlog dates.

I remind my colleagues, 1998, 2001, 2003, all scattered across these service centers. Why? Because they are overburdened. Fingerprints are lost. Applications are lost. So often we hear that in our constituency.

I think the process of appropriations is a complicated process. We attempt to do it in the spirit that is collegiate in this body. We attempt to do it with the knowledge that we have and the research that we do and the work with fellow staff members. If that cannot be done, we move forward.

I hope that we can improve the process because everybody is not in a whip meeting. So therefore I hope that we can improve the process and ensure that when we come to the floor these amendments that we have to be made in order, we have the understanding that they are for a purpose and a reasonable purpose.

□ 1345

Now, I will look forward, as we move toward conference, to monitoring this particular legislation to see whether or not it completely addresses the question of adjudicators, which is what this amendment is all about, the question of adjudicators.

So, Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues that if they are having a backlog in their office, I hope that they will consider that the intent of this amendment was not a malicious intent; it was an intent to work collegially and to help solve the problems, and I hope that we will continue in that spirit, to work toward solving problems, because that is what this particular body is all about, solving problems, Democrats and Republicans working together.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE). The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill, and I congratulate the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman, for taking a firm, strong, aggressive stance to secure our borders, because that is one of the issues that is first and foremost on the minds of Americans, whether they are on the border or whether they live 2,000 miles away.

Since the creation of the Department of Homeland Security, there has been a dramatic increase in the number of non-Mexican illegal immigrants, also known as OTMs, apprehended on our borders. In fact, some border patrol sectors have reported a 300 percent increase in OTMs this year alone. This problem has grown exponentially, in part because the Department of Homeland Security has failed to take a strategic approach to detention and re-

moval that ensures that every illegal immigrant apprehended is properly deported.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONILLA. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, my good friend from Texas is correct. The Department has failed to take corrective action, and that is why this act will withhold \$50 million in funding until the Department submits a detention and removal plan that addresses these issues in a more comprehensive manner. Already this year, the border patrol has apprehended over 75,000 illegals, Other Than Mexicans, more than twice the number of apprehensions compared to this same time last year; and we still have 5 months to go.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the chairman has worked hard to produce a bill that will fund additional enforcement, within budget limitations, and has set forth directions in the report accompanying the bill to get the Department headed toward a solution.

I also want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee for hearing my concerns regarding the so-called "catch-and-release" policy that allows OTMs to be released on their own recognition. Last summer, I was in communication with then-Secretary Ridge and then-Under Secretary Hutchison regarding this issue, and they responded by authorizing expedited removal for all OTMs apprehended by the border patrol. Unfortunately, the Department has implemented expedited removal in only two districts. I am therefore pleased to see this issue is addressed, as well, in this bill.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONILLA. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman first described to me the "catch-and-release" policy and how it has affected the border communities, I was surprised to learn that the Department had not made full use of its authority. I understand that doing so will not only allow the Department to remove OTMs two to three times faster than traditional methods while permitting legitimate asylum claims, but would cut detention costs for such individuals by more than 50 percent.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the chairman is absolutely correct. Expedited removal would allow the Department to save money while addressing the OTM problem. I would also add that taking such enforcement action would help deter OTMs from attempting to immigrate illegally in the first place.

I once again thank the chairman for taking the time to hear the concerns of our border communities and for responding so readily. As a fellow subcommittee chairman, I know the difficulties in finding solutions that meet

budgetary restrictions, and I appreciate the directions he has given to the Department, which will make great strides to ensure that this critical issue is addressed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. MUSGRAVE

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. MUSGRAVE:

Page 2, line 9, insert after the first dollar amount the following: (reduced by \$100,000).

Page 26, line 23, insert after the dollar amount the following: (increased by \$100,000).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 2(f) of rule XXI, the Chair must query whether any Member raises a point of order against provisions of the bill addressed by the amendment, but not yet reached in the reading, wit: page 26, line 19 through page 30, line 8.

Are there any points of order?

If not, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) is recognized for 5 minutes on her amendment.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, according to recent news reports, the Department of Homeland Security has hired former actress Bobbie Faye Furgeson as the new "liaison to the entertainment industry." In other words, the Department of Homeland Security is now hiring actresses to communicate with Hollywood.

In March 2004, the Department of Homeland Security posted an opening on the government Web site, USAjobs.com, stating the salary could top \$136,000, plus benefits. I want to emphasize that this position has not been specifically authorized by Congress.

I believe that Americans take our homeland security very seriously. They see images of 9/11 that will clutch their hearts for their entire lives. They saw in the news just the other day about the incident here on Capitol Hill and saw people frantically trying to get to an area that was safe. Thank God they were not in danger.

But the people of this country have high expectations in regard to our homeland security after we were violated on 9/11, and they realize how vulnerable we are. I would just like to thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) for his excellent work in living up to those expectations that the American people have for us.

However, I would have a very difficult time explaining to my constituents how we would use over \$100,000 in this manner. If people are not aware of what we could do with \$100,000, if we move this money to State and local governments to have grants available for our first responders, that amount of money would buy 694 Quick2000 Escape Hoods. Those are like the very hoods that we keep in our congressional offices. It would buy 558 Emergency PA systems, just like those that were used last week to warn people and to tell them about the evacuation. This one really interests me. It would buy 165 bullet-proof vests. There is a young family member that we have that is a

police officer, and I realize how first responders rely on their lives with these bullet-proof vests. That amount of money would also buy 40 Level A HAZMAT protective suits, something that is really needed by our first responders.

So instead of spending \$100,000-plus on one person who would simply review movie scripts for the government or help identify opportunities for Hollywood outreach and provide resources for TV and movies, we should direct this money to actually help the people who respond and can save lives.

I ask for support of my amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentlewoman. I think this is an excellent amendment. I am delighted that the gentlewoman has been able to ferret this out and bring it to the attention of all of us, and I want to say what a great job the gentlewoman has done and that I am going to vote for the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR  
MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Management, as authorized by sections 701-705 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 341-345), \$146,084,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$3,000 shall be for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That of the total amount provided, \$26,070,000 shall remain available until expended solely for the alteration and improvement of facilities, tenant improvements, and relocation costs to consolidate Department headquarters operations.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SABO

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I and others offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SABO:

Page 3, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$26,100,000)".

Page 30, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$50,000,000)".

Page 30, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$25,000,000)".

Page 30, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by \$25,000,000)".

Page 34, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$23,900,000)".

Mr. SABO (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, our amendment increases the funding for the fire

grant program by \$50 million, \$25 million for the SAFER program, and \$25 million for the regular grant program. With the \$25 million added to the SAFER program, it would be funded at \$75 million, or \$10 million above last year's funding.

With the increase to the regular fire grant program, it would be funded at \$575 million, unfortunately still a \$75 million cut from last year's level. If we had more funding, and more offsets, we would have added it to this program.

I might add that whatever the problems are with the larger local grant program, this is a program that has worked very efficiently and effectively. It is a proven successful program, and grant decisions are made on the basis of independent board review.

The needs of our fire departments are great, and our Federal funding for the fire grant program has decreased in recent years and, actually, as a population that has grown, the number of firefighters nationwide has fallen.

Firefighters still lack basic equipment. The number of firefighters with proper breathing gear and protective clothing has not substantially improved since 9/11.

In 2003, Federal fire grant funding was \$746 million; this year it is \$715 million. This bill, with the amendment, would increase that amount to \$650 million. The offset funding for the new personnel system would be decreased by \$20 million, but still would have an increase of \$17 million, or 47 percent under this mark.

What this amendment does is it is fully funded in offsets and makes minor adjustments in the chairman's bill but, in my judgment, will result in better fire department capabilities in our local communities; and I urge support for this amendment.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as an author of this legislation with the distinguished ranking member and the distinguished chairman, I thank the chairman for working with us on this compromise. The chairman has been one of the tireless advocates in this body on behalf of the first responder community; and I want to tell the gentleman they recognize that. On behalf of the 1.2 million men and women who serve in the 32,000 departments across America, they understand that the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) is listening to them.

Last week, when I approached the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman Rogers) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), our colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), and a whole host of Members on our side of the aisle over here, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and others, it was with a great deal of enthusiasm that the chairman said he would work

with us, and that allows us to bring this amendment forward today.

Last November, Mr. Chairman, I spoke at the memorial service for our fallen firefighters. We paid tribute to 111 brave Americans, most of them volunteers, who paid the ultimate price in protecting America. Each year in this country, we lose over 100 police officers, we lose over 100 firefighters, paramedics, and EMTs. The difference in terms of law enforcement support, and we spend about \$3 billion to \$4 billion a year on local law enforcement at the Federal level, is that 85 percent of our first responders in the fire community are volunteers. They get paid nothing. They serve on behalf of these 32,000 departments while doing their full-time job and then come home on weekends and at nights and serve their communities. It is up to us to make sure they have the proper equipment they need.

Now, Members need to understand there is a distinction between the grant program running through the States and the grant program increased by this amendment. The grant program that this amendment increases is directly accessible to the fire departments. There are no middle people. There is no bureaucracy. There is no overhead. They go on line for 30 days once each year, and they apply directly. The grants are actually reviewed by other firefighters. There is no politics. That is why over 19,000 departments in this country have received one or more grants that have benefited our local towns.

This money is not just for homeland security; it is to better equip those departments who, back in 2000, we recognized need national help.

□ 1400

The second part of this amendment provides additional funding to the SAFER program, a program to encourage cities to hire more paid firefighters, volunteer departments to come up with more creative ways to encourage volunteers, and volunteer departments who may have to hire a full-time driver or a full-time officer, to have some of that funding available through this SAFER bill.

It is a significant increase when the program was appropriated to the level of \$65 million this fiscal year, to add another \$25 million in this amendment to that program.

Let me say just in closing, Mr. Chairman, that we are asking our fire and EMS departments to do more. The recent round of base closings that was announced on Thursday largely closes Guard and Reserve facilities. That is going to put increased pressure for homeland security on those 32,000 fire departments. They are not going to be able to rely on those local Guard and Reserve units, because their facilities are being shut down, so it is all the more reason that this amendment makes sense. It is good policy. It is good fiscal sense. It is paid for.

I commend all of the authors and everybody involved and especially again I

want to thank the chairman for his vision, for his foresight, and for working with the ranking member to make this possible.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) who has done such an extraordinary job in raising the consciousness of the Congress and of the American people with respect to the importance of our volunteer and paid fire fighting community and our emergency medical response teams throughout this country.

I also want to join my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), and I want to join the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) in thanking the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) for his agreement to move this forward and for helping us fashion this amendment.

I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) as well, the chairman of our full committee. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express sincere appreciation to all of those involved, and I particularly want to recognize my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) whose effort was extraordinary in the adoption of the Fire Act, which provides for the basic grant program.

All of us were involved, but no one was more involved and more in the leadership, and of course his bill was the basis for the establishment of this. I would be remiss if I did not also reiterate how important the Fire Service Caucus has been and Bill Webb, who is the Executive Director of the foundation, and their focus on the issues that confront us.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides much needed increases to both the Fire Grant and SAFER programs, and moves us closer to fulfilling our obligations to ensure that our Nation's firefighters have at their disposal every resource possible to not only guarantee their own safety, but also to allow them to better serve each of our communities.

The \$25 million we add to each of these accounts brings the funding in the bill to \$650 million, \$575 million for the Fire Grant program, and \$75 million for SAFER. The SAFER program deals with personnel, the Fire Grant program is a broader application of moneys dealing both with equipment, safety equipment, training and other matters.

This is \$150 million above the level requested by the President and is a reflection of Congress' commitment to ensuring that our fire departments are properly staffed, trained and equipped. But these amounts are still, Mr. Chairman, well below the authorized levels and far from meeting the needs of the fire service.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) pointed out the fact that the Base Closure Commission or the Pentagon has recommended to the

commission the closure of many Guard and Reserve units around the country, and while first responders are critically important now they will be even more so if this action is taken.

The Fire Grant program was established by Congress in 2000, as I said through the leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and so many others, to meet the basic equipment, training and fire fighting safety requirements of America's fire service, and to bring all fire departments to a baseline of readiness to respond to all hazards.

The Fire Grant program has been a tremendous success, providing more than \$3 billion for the infrared cameras, HAZMAT detection devices, modern breathing apparatuses, improved training and physical fitness programs, new turn-out gear, fire trucks and interoperable communications systems, to name but a few of the items that have been provided for by the Fire Act.

The simple fact is that the equipment and training provided by these grants have saved the lives of firefighters and average citizens in communities across America, and I am proud to play a role in this program.

The SAFER Program authorized 2 years ago and funded for the first time last year is a vital compliment to the Fire Grant program, because insufficient staffing, defined by National Fire Protection Association as fewer than four firefighters per apparatus, is a very real problem for far too many of the Nation's career and volunteer fire departments.

Not only does that understaffing put at risk the firefighters but, as I said, it puts at risk those whom the firefighters would save, whether in a very serious automobile accident, in a fire, earthquake or other natural disaster.

Responding with fewer than four firefighters per apparatus prevents the first responder unit from complying with OSHA's two-in/two-out standard for safe fire-ground operations and adds unnecessary risk to the already dangerous job of fire suppression.

Mr. Chairman, the NFPA estimates that an additional 75,000 firefighters are required across the country and the additional funding we provide today will move us a little closer to achieving that goal.

Mr. Chairman, I am in strong support of this legislation. I thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), and I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) and all of those who have been involved in supporting these two vital programs.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to commend the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) and the

ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), for all of the hard work that they have done in bringing this bill to the floor.

Homeland security is a new discipline for this body, and in a relatively short amount of time the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) have provided expertise in the field.

I want to publicly acknowledge the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for the leadership they have displayed, that leadership in enhancing our Nation's security.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is another example of their work to increase our emergency preparedness and response capabilities, and I ask all Members to support it. The challenges of our changed world require us to ask more and more of America's firefighters. Yet, we all know that many of their needs remain unmet. How can we expect our men and women on the front lines to be a real force in the war on terror if we do not deal with their most basic needs?

Like the fact that over 10,000 fire engines are at least 30 years old, or that 27,000 fire stations in the country have no backup power, or that two-fifths of all departments lack Internet access, or the fact that the majority of portable radios firefighters use are not water resistant; the list could go on.

But probably the biggest issue facing the fire service is a lack of manpower. Currently two-thirds of all fire departments, Mr. Chairman, two-thirds throughout America operate with inadequate staffing. And in communities of at least 50,000 people, 38 percent of the firefighters are regularly part of a response that is not sufficient to safely respond to a structure fire because of a lack of staffing. This is unconscionable.

This amendment helps to tackle those problems. It does provide the dollars, as has been pointed out on this floor. It goes without saying that both of these programs, the Fire Grant program, and the SAFER program are of critical importance to our Nation's safety. Fire grants provide funding directly to local fire departments.

In fact, we debated within committee whether or not the Homeland Security Act should provide direct aid to municipalities rather than going through the States, and I think we ought to revisit that subject again and again because of the success of the Fire Act.

And the SAFER Act, which we were able to fund for the first time last year, provides annual grants for the purpose of hiring, recruiting and retaining career and volunteer firefighters. Congress has made great strides, but still we need more. We need more. There is more to do.

Across this great country firefighters and fire departments desperately require more folks on the front lines, more personnel, functioning commu-

nications, radios and protective gear. There is a reason for the Fire Grant program, that it had 20,300 applications containing close to \$3 billion in requested assistance from departments across the country just in this one year.

These are basic needs we are talking about, and at the time the local jurisdictions are facing tough budget decisions in departments, you know, what are the state of our municipalities? All across this country they are laying off firefighters. This amendment could not come at a better time.

So I implore, we listen to the chairman and the ranking member, and we do as we think we should do and pass this amendment. I want to thank both of them for bringing to it the floor.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to add my word of support for the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO's) amendment and commend him for offering it, and also thank the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), for his cooperation in working out this accommodation.

Several steps have led us to this point. The President's budget was sorely deficient in the area of first responder funding. The President proposed to cut the State Homeland Security block grants by 25 percent. He proposed to cut the Department of Homeland Security firefighter grants by 30 percent. He proposed to eliminate funding for the SAFER program.

And then when you look at the Department of Justice, at the programs that our law enforcement agencies depend on, the President proposed even more massive cuts, a 95 percent cut in the COPS program and a 98 percent cut in the Justice Assistance grants.

We will, of course, not be able to deal with all of that here today. We will hope that our colleagues on the subcommittee appropriating for the Justice Department will attend to this and repair some of this damage.

But today we can deal with the Homeland Security portion of the President's budget. Our subcommittee already has made some improvements in the bill brought to the floor today. The first responder funding was brought to a 10 percent cut overall, which in terms of the President's budget was a gain. State and local block grants in the bill before us would be cut 11 percent, fire grants by 15 percent, the SAFER program by 23 percent.

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO's) amendment takes that progression further, and I commend him for it, because it is money that our communities really need. For fire grant funding, half of the committee's cut from the current fiscal year's level would be restored.

SAFER funding would actually be increased \$10 million from the current

fiscal year. State block grant funding would be increased but it would still fall \$400 million short of the current year.

So we are not talking still about generous funding, funding that is anywhere near as generous as it should be, but we are talking about an improvement, and I hope that colleagues on both sides of the aisle will readily agree to this amendment to the committee bill.

Mr. Chairman, all of us, I suspect, have visited and talked with first responders in our districts. I hope and expect that we have thanked them for what they do, because they serve our communities every day. It is important, though, not just to stop with the lip service. It is important to understand that what we are talking about with fire and law enforcement and other first responders is an essential governmental service in which the Federal Government is a crucial partner.

□ 1415

Sometimes that partnership has been in danger of faltering. We have got to make certain that that does not happen. So we need to do more than say thank you. We need to do more than talk about hometown heroes.

We need to put our money where our rhetoric is. This bill is not all that it should be, but with this amendment I believe we will go some distance toward extending to these first responders the kind of support they need. After all, they are being asked to do some new and demanding things in this post-9/11 world. They need some new equipment. They need new communication capacity. They need some new personnel and training.

So we are preparing to extend that assistance, without forgetting that these first responders have been on the frontlines all along.

Traditional disasters, traditional emergencies have not gone away. In fact, the need for a conventional capacity is as strong or stronger than it ever was.

So let us resolve that we are not merely going to pay lip service to these people on the frontline who defend our communities every day. Let us resolve to strengthen the Federal partnership and provide the Federal support that they need and deserve.

Support the Sabo amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I opposed a similar amendment at the full committee level, but that was due largely to the use of IAIP funds to offset this amount. That would have stopped all construction and renovation of that growing directorate.

We have been working with the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), the ranking member, on this particular matter. We found a more suitable offset. We have reduced other first responder grant programs in this bill because of poor guidance and large

unspent balances. However, these grants do go directly to the fire departments. There is no choke point issue involved with these funds, and so I enthusiastically support the amendment on the floor and urge its passage.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, let me just simply thank the chairman for his support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), chairman of the Subcommittee on Homeland Security, for purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to commend the gentleman for his efforts to work with our subcommittee and the Committee on Appropriations, and I regret that the process of coordination did not go more smoothly.

I should acknowledge that the gentleman has indeed only sought to expose to points of order provisions or conditions that are genuinely authorization provisions, not all provisions against which a point of order would lie. Since the exposed provisions and conditions are, in fact, authorizing provisions, I want to assure the gentleman that in the conference negotiations on such provisions, I will follow the will of the authorizing committee in advancing the House position; and the conference report will, to the greatest extent possible, follow the will of the authorizing committee.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, who has been a true leader on homeland security, for his hard work on this bill and his efforts to reach full agreement with the authorizing committee. I regret the fact that rescheduling this bill to earlier in the week deprived us of the time that would have enabled us to accommodate much of these discussions in advance of reaching the floor. But I want to thank the gentleman for his efforts to reach full agreement with the authorizing committee.

Based on the understanding that the conferees will follow the will of the authorizing committee in advancing the House position in the conference negotiations and, to the greatest extent possible, follow the will of the authorizing committee on the provisions and conditions which are, in fact, authorizing, I will not insist on the points of order exposed to objection under the rule that we just adopted today, and I strongly urge my colleagues to do the same.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. MENENDEZ

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 14 offered by Mr. MENENDEZ:

Page 3, line 15, insert “(decreased by \$50,000,000)” after “\$146,084,000”.

Page 26, line 23, insert “(increased by \$50,000,000)” after “\$2,781,300,000”.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, the attacks of September 11 made each of us realize that terrorism had entered a whole new realm, one in which our Nation’s assets, infrastructure, and people could be attacked by those meaning us harm. The district I have the honor of representing contains a vast number of potential targets of terror, such as the largest seaport on the east coast, one of the busiest airports in the country, an area known as the “chemical coastway,” four major chemical plants, and six tunnels and bridges that connect New Jersey to New York City, and if that were not enough, an area in northern New Jersey between Liberty Airport and Port Elizabeth commonly referred to by the FBI and others as the most dangerous 2 miles in America.

The Menendez amendment seeks to address one of the most serious security threats facing our Nation today, and that is the threat of terrorist attacks on chemical plants and facilities.

According to data from the Environmental Protection Agency, there are eight plants in New Jersey where a worst-case release of chemicals could threaten more than 1 million people per attack, and a recent article in the New York Times stated that a chemical plant in my district that possesses chlorine gas poses a potentially lethal threat to 12 million people who live within a 14-mile radius.

So this is obviously a very important matter for the district and State that I come from, but let me make a point here that this is not just simply a New Jersey issue. There are 15,000 chemical plants nationwide, and that same EPA data that I just referenced shows that 123 of these could pose a threat to at least 1 million people each time, if each one of those entities were attacked, if there were a release; 123 times a million, 123 million Americans.

My amendment takes a first step by providing \$50 million to State and local governments in order to enhance the security of those chemical plants. Funds might be used by State and local officials to prepare plants to respond to and possibly even prevent attacks on these facilities. This money could be used to equip and train our first responders who would respond to such an attack. Such funds might be used to provide assistance and guidance to the chemical plant officials to implement best management practices that either improve security or use less caustic chemicals, or perhaps this funding could be used to increase law enforce-

ment’s presence in patrols around chemical plants. These are just by way of description.

According to the threat level set by the Department of Homeland Security, our local law enforcement agencies are then often asked to provide additional security for these plants. I have heard from several mayors and police chiefs about the serious financial burden those additional patrols are costing their cities, and over time, consequently, their ability to meet this challenge is really under siege; and I am sure this is a problem for law enforcement agencies across our country.

In New Jersey, some of these plants are surrounded by residential communities and transportation corridors that make this issue even more critical for us to secure. I believe if we look at that list of the Environmental Protection Agency across the country we will find that is often the case in other States in the Nation.

I strongly believe we must do what we can to protect our constituents from a clear opportunity here in which millions could be affected by what is otherwise a use of a facility for legitimate purposes.

This is not a new issue or one that is brand new for us. The Hart-Rudman report mentioned chemical plant security. Going back to that report, several of these plants are included on the national infrastructure list. So we are well aware of the problem, and we need to take steps to ensure security at these plants.

I very rarely come to the floor to offer amendments, but I feel compelled when we know the nature of the risk and we know the nature of the threat to do something about it.

This amendment is a modest first step. We do need to make these facilities and our constituents living near them safer and more secure, and I would just urge my colleagues to think about who among us would be content with the counsels of patience and delay if they were living within the radius of one of these chemical plants that could literally cause the deaths of millions of people and we did absolutely nothing to protect them.

In that context, I urge my colleagues to support the Menendez amendment.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I rise in support of the Menendez amendment, and I want to mention to the gentleman that I know that he is also familiar with this issue, being the ranking member on the subcommittee on the Committee on Energy and Commerce that has jurisdiction over chemical security; and I would hope that as time goes on that we could in our committee, in the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and specifically in the gentleman’s subcommittee, have a hearing and address this issue in a more comprehensive way because I do think it needs to be addressed.

In the meantime, I agree with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr.

MENENDEZ), my colleague, that we should provide additional funding in this appropriations bill to have our State and local responders try to address this issue in a significant way or at least provide some funding so that they could.

As the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) mentioned, we have a number of facilities in our own State of New Jersey where we know that under this EPA report over 1 million people at each of those facilities could be negatively impacted if there was a terrorist attack on a chemical facility. He mentioned at least eight.

In fact, in a hearing just last week in the United States Senate, Mr. Robert Falkenroth, who was a former Bush official with the Homeland Security Department, actually said before the United States Senate that his biggest fear in terms of another terrorist attack would be an attack on a chemical facility. He knows and we know and the Department of Homeland Security knows that this is the one area in the aftermath of 9/11 that has not been addressed.

We have talked about attacking a nuclear plant. We have talked about attacks on port facilities. We have talked about attacks at airports. In every case, there has been an effort by this body to address a terrorist attack and to deal with security issues at those various facilities, but not so in the case of chemical plants. For whatever reason, we have said to the industry that you are on your own; you voluntarily set your own standards. We have not taken action in the House of Representatives or in the Senate to address the issue, and I think that is a shame.

There have been various occasions in the past, most notably in the case of Bhopal, many of my colleagues just remember we just had the 20th anniversary of the Bhopal disaster. In the case there, Union Carbide owned a plant. It was not a terrorist attack, but the result there was over 20,000 people killed. That was not because of a terrorist attack. That was because of neglect or negligence on the part of Union Carbide. It had nothing to do with a terrorist attack, but the devastation at Bhopal, not the 20,000 that were killed but the hundreds of thousands in the aftermath of that crisis 20 years later, are still suffering, have not received medical attention, the impact on their children and the disorders that they are now seeing with their children, I mean, this is the type of thing that needs to be addressed, and it is not being addressed here.

I think my understanding is that the gentleman from New Jersey's (Mr. MENENDEZ) amendment would shift \$50 million to State and local programs to try to get them to address this issue.

□ 1430

Now, I think we need a comprehensive program. Senator CORZINE and myself have introduced the Chemical Se-

curity Act, myself here in the House, he in the Senate, which basically establishes a nationwide program that would require that chemical plants provide for security. But absent that, because we have not had that, we have not even had a hearing on it in this House, we need our local responders and our State responders, the way my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), has described, to have some money so they can go out and do some things to try to shore up this problem and deal with this problem.

So I just want to say again that this is something we should do. It has been neglected here in the House. Hopefully, we will pass the Menendez amendment. Hopefully, we will have a hearing in our subcommittee, Mr. Chairman, and we can begin the process with this amendment of addressing this very important issue not only for the State of New Jersey but for the Nation as a whole.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I fully sympathize with the concerns the gentleman from New Jersey has brought up, and the other gentleman has, about the issue of safety at chemical plants. We have 77,000 of them in the country and 17,000 of those deal with hazardous materials. So it is a big exposure that we have.

However, I have to respectfully urge the defeat of this amendment for two or three reasons. One, we have included \$50 million in the bill just for critical infrastructure protection, including chemical plants, already. I know the gentleman will be pleased to hear that we do have that amount of money in there: the amount he is requesting is already in the bill.

Number two, we put in some very strong report language directing the Department to continue and complete the vulnerability assessments of all critical chemical facilities in the country. We have already reduced the State and Urban Area grant programs in this bill because of poor guidance, but mainly because they have still got \$6.8 billion that we have appropriated since 2002 in the pipeline. They have only spent 30 percent of all we have appropriated. They have \$6.8 billion left in the Office of Domestic Policy, which makes these grants. So there is plenty of money there. There is no point of putting more, until they draw down on what they already have.

Number three, I have a problem with where the gentleman is taking the money from. We have already hit the Under Secretary for Management's Office big time in this bill already. We have taken \$26 million today, and this is the place where the important work of the Department needs to take place. If you take this \$50 million from the Under Secretary of Management, it could only come from one place without impacting personnel; that is to say, lay off people, and that is the Human Resource System of the Department.

A \$50 million reduction in that system would halt implementation of that human resource system program in its tracks. We would be unable to fund the "pay pool," which would prevent the initial conversion of employees from the General Schedule to the new market-based pay bands and the pay-for-performance programs.

We would also be unable to provide competent program management and evaluation. It would delay the establishment of the Department's Labor Relations Board, as required by the final regulations. We would not be able to access knowledgeable outside experts that understand industry best practices in compensation design sets.

We would be unable to fund the training of managers, supervisors, and employees, and that lack of training would also have profound impacts on the credibility of the program with the employee base and their representatives.

So, Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly oppose the amendment, sympathizing with the gentleman's sentiments. But I think we have plenty of money there now, and I do not want to see us hurt the human resource system that is being put in place even as we speak. So I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I move to strike the last word rather than speaking directly to the amendment is because I have mixed emotions. I think the problem the gentleman from New Jersey presents to us is one of the most important and most profound ones we face in the whole question of homeland security.

His amendment bothers me for two reasons: One, I think there are real problems where the money is coming from; and, secondly, I am concerned that we are transferring this problem from the Federal Government to the State governments. Because dealing with chemical security and the security of chemical plants is truly a national problem and not one that should be the ultimate problem of State governments.

The Department, in my judgment, has been incredibly slow in dealing with the problem. The Congress has been slow in dealing with the problem. A year ago we provided \$3 million to the Department for a study on whether they should require vulnerability assessments and security plans from the chemical plants. The study has not occurred. We do have language in this bill that urges them to do more in the next year. I hope they listen to that more than what they did to the provision of \$3 million last year.

But I would suggest to my friend from New Jersey that the format that we should be following is really what we did in the Maritime Transportation Security Act as it relates to ports. What we required in that bill was for ports to do vulnerability assessments and produce security plans themselves,

and that is what the major chemical plants in this country should be doing. We should not be assessing them, they should be developing their own vulnerability assessments and security plans. And then, as in the Maritime Security Act, where the Coast Guard assesses the plans, that is what we should be doing with chemical plants.

The bulk of the responsibility for implementing those security plans should be with the chemical companies, not with the State. It should not be with the Federal Government, in my judgment, let alone with the States. And I am concerned that we are putting up the assumption that this is now becoming a responsibility we are delegating from the Federal Government to the States.

So the gentleman is absolutely right. This is one of the biggest vulnerabilities that we have. The Department has not been paying attention to it. The Congress has not been willing to deal with the issue of whether this is something we want simply the Federal Government to do or whether we should be requiring the chemical plants, at least the major ones, to have the vulnerability assessments and the security plans and then they submit them to the Department for their evaluation. From there, we can move as to how you remedy the security plans and how you make judgment on the funding you need for local people who might have to respond to an emergency.

So I have mixed emotions about this amendment. I have problems with their premise with the offset and the basic delegation to the States, but the amendment raises, I think, one of the most crucial problems we face in homeland security. And to the other gentleman from New Jersey, who talked about a comprehensive bill he was introducing, I think that is the direction we should be going.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEKS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding to me, and I want to thank both the chairman and the ranking member on their thoughtful observations about this issue.

I understand the constraints under which they are working. I am not unmindful of that, which is why I rarely come to the floor on amendments because I understand that all of us could devise a different bill but you are given the responsibility collectively for us. But I would just need to make some comments in observation of what has been said.

Number one is the government's responsibility to protect its own people is not delegable to anyone, the private sector or any other entity outside of the government itself. We might want

to place responsibilities, and I agree that there are responsibilities that should be placed upon certain legitimate corporate responsibilities, that should be placed upon people who operate in a society and who have a hazardous element to their operation and need to operate in a way and to protect their facilities in such a way that protects the greater good, but ultimately, ultimately the defense of the people is not delegable to any other entity.

The second point is that when I hear the chairman talk about the \$50 million placed in critical infrastructure, I do appreciate that, but that is all critical infrastructure. That is nuclear power plants, that is electric grids, that is everything you can think of that we would develop under the rubric of critical infrastructure. And in that context, while understanding the limitations, it is a relatively small amount when you think about protecting all of the Nation's critical infrastructure.

I do not know, as has been pointed out by law enforcement, as has been pointed out by the Environmental Protection Agency, that this critical infrastructure that we talk about in terms of chemical plants does not come to a higher level, because ultimately the potential attack and emissions and the plumes that come from it can kill literally millions and millions of people. And that, in other respects, I think heightens it among the critical infrastructure that exists.

I understand that people are concerned about the management office, although I will note that that is where we just took money for another critical issue. But if you ask the American people between management and protecting the chemical coastways that are along and throughout the landscape of this country, I think they will tell you I would like to see the chemical coastways protected.

Even if we ultimately ask the private sector, those who operate these chemical plants, to have greater responsibilities, which I concur with, at the end of the day it will be police and firefighters who will respond to an attack. At the end of the day it will be a State policeman who will have to respond. These routes are public in nature. If you run along the New Jersey Turnpike, you can easily have access to that New York Times article and that chlorine plant.

So from a public road, an entity which the private sector would have no responsibility for, an attack could be levied. So, therefore, there are going to be resources necessary for the governmental entities, even with a heightened corporate responsibility, to perform. And that is my concern.

We have had Hart-Rudman talk about chemical plants, we have talked about it in the 9/11 Commission Report, and yet we are nowhere nearer to creating any private responsibility nor are we responding in a public context. Hence, that is my concern, and that is why I offer the amendment.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEKS of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, let me reiterate, or support again what my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), said. And I appreciate the comments from our ranking member, but the problem is that the House has not been willing to take up, even in our subcommittee, this issue. In other words, it would be great if we had the opportunity to bring up a bill, I have mentioned the Chemical Security Act, that would actually mandate that companies do in fact come up with their own assessment plans to respond in the event of a terrorist attack. I agree that would be a great thing. But, again, we are not moving in that direction. We have not even had a hearing in our subcommittee on this issue.

Absent that, what we need is some money going back to the States. Because under the Menendez amendment, if money was going back to the States specifically for a chemical security response, then a State like our own of New Jersey would be able to take that funding and basically do some of the things that we would like the Federal Government to do that they are not doing.

So this would accomplish that goal at least for those States that want to take the initiative; that they would have some money for their State and local programs to make the chemical companies respond and do something about this threat. The problem now, as our ranking member said, this is not happening. It is strictly left up to the voluntary efforts of the chemical plants, and that is not a good response.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

The CHAIRMAN. The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) will be postponed.

□ 1445

Mr. McCAUL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word.

I rise in strong support of this important bill and for the purpose of engaging in a colloquy with the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Homeland Security.

Since the tragic events of 9/11 and the subsequent creation of the Department of Homeland Security, there has been a dramatic increase in the number of undocumented aliens apprehended at our borders. And last year alone, approximately 1.2 million people were apprehended at our southwest border. It is

conservatively estimated by border patrol that three undocumented aliens get past our borders for every one that is caught. It is estimated also that the number of non-Mexican illegal immigrants, also known as OTMs, entering our country has increased tremendously in some border patrol sectors by 300 percent this year.

This group, often not on any watch lists and usually lacking legitimate documentation, should cause us all great concern. Despite the risk these persons present, the problem has grown because courts will not impose detection and because the Department of Homeland Security lacks adequate detention space.

As a former counterterrorism prosecutor in the Justice Department whose jurisdiction included the Mexican border, I know firsthand the threat this poses to our national security. When the border patrol catches individuals who do not fall in the category of mandatory detainees, they often have no choice but to release them on their own recognizance with a notice to appear at an immigration hearing, only to disappear later. It is commonly derided by law enforcement as the "catch-and-release program." This is exactly how Ramzi Yousef, the al Qaeda perpetrator of the 1993 World Trade Center bombings entered this country.

This is why I, along with the support of 44 of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, signed a letter to the Committee on Appropriations asking for full funding of the 2000 border patrol, 800 interior investigators and most importantly, 8,000 detention beds recommended by the 9/11 Commission and authorized by the Intelligence Reform Act.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas is absolutely correct. There is a definite problem with our system that we hope to correct.

The bill before us provides \$690 million, \$90 million more than DHS asked, for an additional 1,920 detention bed spaces; and that combined with what we provided in the supplemental appropriations bill last week will add a total of 3,870 new beds over the current level. In addition, the bill provides \$43 million for alternatives to detention, tripling last year's level and \$10 million more than DHS requested. That will go further to attack the problem of the so-called OTMs who abuse our immigration policies and leave a gaping hole in the integrity of the borders.

I am convinced that the so-called catch-and-release practice signals that our current system is in need of significant reform. This bill is intended to make an effort in that respect.

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. The Chairman has worked hard to produce a bill that will fund additional border security en-

forcement and detention space within budgetary limitations and supports expanding the use of alternatives to detention as a way of compensating for the shortage of bed space and smart solutions to the bigger problem of coping with the numbers of illegal aliens crossing into our country.

I will continue to work with the chairman and the Committee on the Budget to ensure that in the future detention beds authorized by Congress are fully funded.

I thank the chairman, and I commend the gentleman for taking the time to hear the concerns of our border communities and for responding so readily. All of the items provided for in this bill will help keep criminals and terrorists from crossing into the United States and, when they do, ensure that they are detained and removed from our country.

In the post-9/11 world, this is not just an issue related to immigration; it is one of national security.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Chairman ROGERS) of the Subcommittee on Homeland Security for entering into this colloquy regarding a very important issue.

As was the case last year, the administration's budget for fiscal year 2006 proposes to transfer funding for the Coast Guard's research and development program to the Department of Homeland Security Science and Technology Directorate. The Department has justified this proposal by suggesting that such a transfer would reduce duplicative programs within the Department and would increase cooperation between agencies. Now, if the Coast Guard R&D program consisted purely of research related to homeland security, I might be able to understand such a transfer. However, Coast Guard R&D supports research and investigations into methods and procedures to improve the service's ability to carry out many of its traditional missions.

At this time, I would ask the chairman if it is his understanding that the Coast Guard's research, development, test and evaluation program will continue to sponsor research to support the service's traditional missions.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, yes, I agree that the program should focus on both the traditional and homeland security missions of the Coast Guard.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his willingness to address this important issue.

When the Coast Guard was transferred to the Department of Homeland Security, this Congress ensured that the service's unique multi-mission character would be retained. We must maintain the Coast Guard's ability to

carry out its many missions, including search and rescue, illegal drug and migrant interdiction, fisheries law enforcement, and protecting the maritime security.

Tomorrow, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will mark up H.R. 889, the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Act of 2005, which authorizes funding for the Coast Guard's R&D program within the Coast Guard budget.

So I ask the chairman if he will work with me and my colleagues to find a solution to ensure that the Coast Guard retains control over the direction of this funding.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I recognize the gentleman's concerns. We will work with him on this subject if the authorization bill retains R&D funding within the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2006.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his willingness to work with me on this matter. I am satisfied we will be able to work this out.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD statements by the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and the Infrastructure, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG); and the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Coast Guard, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO), in support of this issue.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Simmons-LoBiondo amendment, and I thank my friend from Connecticut for bringing this important amendment to the floor.

This amendment will maintain the integrity of the Coast Guard as a distinct entity within the Department of Homeland Security.

Section 888 of the Homeland Security Act states that the Coast Guard shall be maintained intact with all of the Service's authorities, functions, and capabilities.

The Coast Guard's research and development program has in the past concentrated on the development of strategies and resources aimed to improve the Service's ability to perform all of its traditional and homeland security missions.

The Coast Guard's traditional missions include search and rescue, drug and migrant interdiction, marine environmental protection, ice operations and aids to navigation.

It is imperative that we maintain the Coast Guard's ability to perform these important traditional missions in addition to the Service's homeland security mission.

Just this year, we have seen the importance of the Coast Guard's oil spill response and prevention program.

I am extremely concerned that the transfer of research and development funds to the Department will forever change the Coast Guard's abilities to balance its resources and personnel to carry out its many and varied missions.

We must protect the multi-mission nature of the Coast Guard.

We should provide funding for Coast Guard research, development, test and evaluation directly to the Service in the same manner that we provide all other Coast Guard funds.

This is what the law demands and this is the right thing to do.

I urge my fellow members to support the Simmons-LoBiondo amendment.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut.

As my colleague explained, this amendment will restore the Coast Guard's research and development funding to the Service's budget. The removal of this funding from the Coast Guard's direct control will constrict the Service's ability to direct funding to research programs to support both the Coast Guard's traditional and homeland security missions.

Mr. Chairman, this is the second year that the Administration has proposed to transfer this funding to the Department of Homeland Security's Science and Technology Directorate. The Administration has reasoned that the consolidation of research programs within the Department will reduce redundancies and maximize resources available for the entire Department. However, this reasoning does not take into account the strong focus of the Coast Guard's research program to improve the Service's capabilities to carry out its traditional missions of search and rescue, providing aids to navigation, oil spill response and prevention, and illegal drug and migrant interdiction.

Last year, the Coast Guard identified several key areas of concentration for its research and development programs that focused on enhancement to the Coast Guard's maritime safety, maritime mobility, marine environmental protection, and maritime domain awareness programs. I cannot help but be very skeptical that the Coast Guard's research and development program will continue to support such a broad scope of investigations under a DHS program that is wholly devoted to improving homeland security.

The Coast Guard has always been and has continued to be a unique, multi-mission Service within the Federal government. As such, Congress required the Coast Guard to remain an independent entity within the Department of Homeland Security with complete control over all of the Service's functions, authorities, and assets. Any changes to the Coast Guard's research and development program will restrict the Service's ability to improve methods to protect the safety and security of lives and vessels in U.S. waters and on the high seas.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and to maintain the integrity of the Coast Guard by restoring funding for the Service's research and development program. I thank the gentleman from Connecticut again for bringing forth this amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I applaud the great work the chairman and the ranking member are doing on this bill, but also wish to express my deep concerns and ask for a colloquy with the chairman.

We are not paying enough attention to the northern border of the United States. Unless they represent the border States like Minnesota, some Members may not realize that the U.S.-Canada border is over 4,000 miles long and consists of over 430 official and unofficial ports of entry. However, even with recent staffing moves, moves that I

commend, the Customs and Border Patrol has only 1,000 agents along the northern border. That compares to over 10,000 agents on the border which is half the length of the U.S.-Canada border.

This staffing shortage along the northern border poses a real security threat. In fact, due to the shortage, the Department of Homeland Security has looked for new ways to monitor the Canadian border, such as a new proposed requirement for passports to get back and forth across the border. Unfortunately, anyone who has spent time up north knows this will not accomplish much to deter or prevent illegal activities or to secure the border.

Simply put, the Canadian border is just too vast for such an approach to work with many unmanned check points in remote areas. I know from personal stories that at some of these unmanned crossings, people have to wait an hour or more before a border patrol agent can come to lift up the gate so they can cross.

Mr. Chairman, we do not expect al Qaeda and narcotics traffickers to wait an hour for the border patrol to show up at the check point. We have already recognized in numerous laws that high-tech border surveillance must be integrated into the manpower and resources we have up there to get real control over our borders.

In the prior year's Defense Authorization Act, in the prior year's Homeland Security Appropriations Act, and in this year's Intelligence Reform Act, Congress recognized the need to develop high-tech border surveillance. However, what little progress the Department of Homeland Security has made on this front has been entirely confined to the southern border even with the \$10 million appropriated in this bill last year. Mr. Chairman, this is unacceptable. We simply are not paying enough attention to the northern border.

Some think the southern border is more dangerous, but I remind my colleagues that terrorists will attack us through the path of least resistance. I believe it is critical that the funds allocated to the Customs and Border Patrol accounts used to pay much-needed research and survey technology, including unmanned aerial vehicles, be not solely devoted to the southern border but also to the northern border to stretch the resources our Custom and Border Patrol manpower has.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman from Kentucky work with me to ensure that there is sufficient resources in the bill and in the conference report to address these issues and that it be applied not just to the southern border but to the northern border as well.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for bring-

ing up this important subject. The gentleman makes an extremely important point, and that is we have two borders, the southwest and the Canadian border.

Over the years, I have to agree, we have neglected the northern border. So I join the gentleman in his sentiments that we find the monies, or be sure that the monies we have appropriated are spent on both borders. I thank the gentleman for bringing up that very important point.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that commitment and look forward to working with him on this through the conference report.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Chairman, in the supplemental bill that we just passed, there was \$36 million that had been appropriated for the northern border which the Department was not spending, and with the cooperation of the chairman, we inserted specific language telling the Department to spend the \$36 million on the northern border.

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for his commitment on this issue and look forward to working on this supplemental and other issues to ensure that the northern border remains secure.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KING of Iowa) assumed the Chair.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

#### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, as authorized by section 103 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 113), \$18,505,000.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Chief Information Officer, as authorized by section 103 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 113), and Department-wide technology investments, \$303,700,000; of which \$75,756,000 shall be available for salaries and expenses; and of which \$227,944,000 shall be available for development and acquisition of information technology equipment, software, services, and related activities for the Department of Homeland Security, and for the costs of conversion to narrowband communications, including the cost for operation of the land mobile radio legacy systems, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated shall be used to support or supplement the appropriations provided for the