

Hyde	Miller (FL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Inglis (SC)	Miller (MI)	Saxton
Issa	Miller (NC)	Schwarz (MI)
Istook	Miller, Gary	Scott (VA)
Jefferson	Moore (KS)	Sensenbrenner
Jindal	Moran (VA)	Sessions
Johnson (CT)	Murphy	Shadegg
Johnson (IL)	Murtha	Shaw
Johnson, Sam	Musgrave	Shimkus
Keller	Myrick	Shuster
Kelly	Neugebauer	Simpson
Kennedy (MN)	Ney	Smith (TX)
King (IA)	Norwood	Snyder
King (NY)	Nunes	Sodrel
Kirk	Nussle	Souder
Kline	Osborne	Spratt
Knollenberg	Otter	Stearns
Kolbe	Oxley	Sullivan
Kuhl (NY)	Pearce	Sweeney
LaHood	Pence	Tancredo
Latham	Petri	Tanner
LaTourette	Pickering	Taylor (NC)
Leach	Pitts	Terry
Lewis (CA)	Poe	Thomas
Lewis (KY)	Pombo	Thompson (CA)
Linder	Pomeroy	Thornberry
LoBiondo	Porter	Tiaht
Lofgren, Zoe	Price (GA)	Tiberi
Lucas	Price (NC)	Turner
Lungren, Daniel	Pryce (OH)	Walden (OR)
E.	Putnam	Walsh
Mack	Radanovich	Waters
Manzullo	Ramstad	Watt
Marchant	Regula	Weldon (FL)
Matheson	Rehberg	Weldon (PA)
McCauley (TX)	Reichert	Weller
McCotter	Renzi	Whitfield
McCrery	Reynolds	Wicker
McHenry	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (NM)
McHugh	Rogers (MI)	Wilson (SC)
McKeon	Ros-Lehtinen	Wolf
McMorris	Royce	Young (AK)
Melancon	Ryan (WI)	Young (FL)
Mica	Ryun (KS)	

NOT VOTING—12

Bachus	Gillmor	Ross
Cooper	Kingston	Schiff
Cramer	Peterson (PA)	Scott (GA)
Everett	Rogers (AL)	Westmoreland

□ 1448

Mr. JEFFERSON changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI) assumed the chair.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker pro tempore, Mr. PETRI, announced the signature of the Speaker to enrolled bills of the following titles:

H.R. 289. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8200 South Vermont Avenue in Los Angeles, California, as the "Sergeant First Class John Marshall Post Office Building".

H.R. 504. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4960 West Washington Boulevard in Los Angeles, California, as the "Ray Charles Post Office Building".

H.R. 627. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 40 Putnam Avenue in Hamden, Connecticut, as the "Linda White-Epps Post Office".

H.R. 1072. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 151 West End Street in Goliad, Texas, as the "Judge Emilio Vargas Post Office Building".

H.R. 1082. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 East Illinois Avenue in Vinita, Oklahoma, as the "Francis C. Goodpaster Post Office Building".

H.R. 1236. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 750 4th Street in Sparks, Nevada, as the "Mayor Tony Armstrong Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 1460. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 6200 Rolling Road in Springfield, Virginia, as the "Captain Mark Stubenhofer Post Office Building".

H.R. 1524. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 12433 Antioch Road in Overland Park, Kansas, as the "Ed Eilert Post Office Building".

H.R. 1542. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 695 Pleasant Street in New Bedford, Massachusetts, as the "Honorable Judge George N. Leighton Post Office Building".

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

TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY,
HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT,
THE JUDICIARY, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY

Mr. HEFLEY. 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. HEFLEY:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of \$669,350,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 29, 2005, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I have learned to do these pretty fast, and I do not think there is anyone here in doubt as to what it is.

I rise today to cut the level of funding in this appropriation bill by approximately 1 percent. This equals approximately \$670 million. The bill is 6 percent over last year.

It seems to me that when we do not have the money, we do not spend over last year, or should not. I will emphasize again this is not an across-the-board cut; this is an off-the-bottom-line. They can make a choice of where it comes from.

This is the seventh time that I have offered an amendment of this type this year; and had those amendments been adopted, we would have saved \$3.3 billion out of our spending for this year. Now, \$3.3 billion sounds like a lot of money to most of us, but it is not in comparison with the overall budget we have for the United States Government; but, still, it is a tremendous step in the right way.

It is important to remember that we do not have this money. This money is debt we are burdening our children and grandchildren with to pay back someday.

I would like to congratulate the chairman and the ranking member and the committee on addressing an issue I followed in the spending bill for years. While I would have preferred not to spend a dime on Amtrak, the committee has dramatically reduced the spending in the bill, and that would go a long way towards forcing Amtrak to change its ways. Now, I know there was a vote to reverse that last night, but I trust that this battle is not over, and I hope it is not over.

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my good friend, the gentleman from Colorado, has offered this any number of times; and I am not counting, but I know he has done this before. He is getting very good at it.

With all due respect to the gentleman from Colorado, I believe this to be an unnecessary amendment. The Congress cannot and should not abdicate its responsibility to review individual programs and make individual recommendations based on that review. The desire to hold spending in check should be based on congressional oversight of specific programs. We should not take a meat-ax approach, and we should not yield our power to the executive.

I ask, therefore, that this amendment be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I would just say to the gentleman, who is a dear friend and for whom I have the highest respect, we should not, he is absolutely right, we should not abdicate our responsibility to the executive branch; but sometimes around here what should be done and what is reality are two different things. I know what it is to get bills out of committee. The gentleman and I worked on the subcommittee on military construction for years together, the gentleman on appropriations and me on the authorizing, and we know what it takes to get bills out of committee sometimes. Sometimes this may be the only way to do it to get a hold on spending.

But anyway, Mr. Chairman, I encourage an "aye" vote.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY).

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

Mr. HEFLEY. 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 Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. KILPATRICK OF MICHIGAN

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan:

Page 224, insert the following after line 8: SEC. 948. None of the funds made available in this Act to the Department of the Treasury may be used to recommend approval of the sale of Unocal Corporation to CNOOC Ltd. of China.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 29, 2005, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to prohibit the sale of an American oil company to the Chinese National Offshore Oil Corporation, recommending in this bill that Treasury not be allowed to make a favorable recommendation that our ninth largest oil company should be sold to the Chinese.

Some people say, why is the gentlewoman from Michigan interested in this amendment? We are interested because we believe that Americans ought to be able to have and hold and own American companies. Did my colleagues know that 53 percent of the privately held debt of this country is held by private investors, private countries? Japan being first, China being second. This is not the time to now sell our ninth largest oil refinery to a Chinese company.

Our trade deficit with China is \$160 billion. We buy \$160 billion more from China than they buy from the United States. This is not the time, if there ever is. Our national security, which is what the CFIUS committee will look at, that is the Committee on Federal Investments in the United States chaired by Secretary of the Treasury Snow, also on that panel is the Defense Secretary as well as the Secretary of State; we believe that this is not right for our country, it is not right for our economic security.

We must also look at, and CFIUS right now only looks at national security, and probably that ought to be amended. CFIUS was established in 1988, a 12-member committee. They should probably also look at economic security, and we are looking at offering an amendment to amend that legislation as well.

China is an economic and military power. They are one of our largest competitors. In my own district, Gen-

eral Motors put \$2 billion into China last year and just 2 months ago said that they closed 30 plants, they closed 30 General Motors plants in America and laid off thousands of workers.

Should we work with China? Yes, we should. Should we turn over our government business to China? No, we should not. This amendment that I am offering would not allow the Treasury Department to issue a favorable recommendation to the President of a China company, Chinese National Offshore Oil, to sell our own, very own Unocal company.

So I am hoping that as we go through this debate and as we come to talk about this issue, we take care of Americans first.

I was just in a meeting this morning where we talked about the loss of our American jobs. We hope, Mr. Chairman, that as we have this debate, we will continue and make sure that we maintain American ownership of American corporations. Fifty-three percent of the privately held debt in America today, the bulk of it is held by Japan first, as I mentioned, and also then China. Intellectual property rights, the Chinese have no respect for our intellectual property rights. In the auto industry right now, China also abuses our parts and uses our technology.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am asking that this amendment be accepted by our entire body, that we make sure that American companies stay in America, and that we continue to employ, that we continue to train and educate our children so that your grandchildren and mine will have an America that is strong.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to first yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

We have done this to ourselves. We are \$9 trillion in debt. We cannot purchase all this debt. We rely upon other countries throughout the world, whoever is willing to, to purchase our debt. The highest proportionate increase is attributable to China. China is buying up our debt faster than anyone else.

Now, what do we think they are going to do with it? If they choose to dump it on the world financial markets, we go into a depression, I say to my colleagues. It is a financial guillotine they are holding over our neck. Far better that they use these financial assets to purchase American corporate assets in the same way that Japan did several years ago. If you do not want China purchasing our assets, then do not put us into the kind of deficit situation that we have created.

It is far better that China diversify their holdings. If they do not buy American oil companies or Western oil companies, since they desperately are

in need of energy to sustain their economy, where are they going to go? They are going to go to Iran, they are going to go to other countries that are not in our interests, and we are going to start contributing to a bipolar world again. We just got through a Cold War with the Soviet Union. If we act in this way, and I know the domestic politics of it, but if we start doing things like this, we are going to contribute to another bipolarity, another Cold War here, which is not in our interest. We have American oil companies who own drilling rights and oil resources off China's shore.

□ 1500

It is in our interest to start balancing the budget and issue less debt. But it is not in our interest to forbid China from purchasing assets, even within the United States with that cash and U.S. debt securities that they own. They need to do that. We need to be serious about this and levelheaded. And so I would oppose the amendment.

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her leadership on this important subject. As a distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee, she has been a voice for strong national security in our country, including this initiative today.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the comments of the previous speaker speak eloquently to the need for us to get our fiscal House in order because we are seeing the consequences of going so deeply in debt to other countries where we are really held hostage in terms of our own decision making because they own our debt.

Mr. Chairman, the Chinese National Overseas Oil Company's bid to acquire UNOCAL Corporation is a graphic example of America's energy vulnerability. President Bush should refuse to prove the acquisition and Congress should indicate its disapproval as well.

I urge my colleagues to support the gentlewoman from Michigan's amendment. And again I thank her for her leadership on this issue.

The Chinese bid for UNOCAL is compelling evidence of America's strategic energy vulnerability. China has clearly decided to meet its growing demand by obtaining control of energy assets around the world.

I would say to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), it is true, China will turn to Iran and Sudan and other countries. In fact, they already have. Arrangements have been made in Iran, Sudan, Venezuela and other places that illustrate their strategy. With the UNOCAL bill the Chinese plan reaches our doorstep. The Chinese government's control of CNOOC made the bid possible, not the free market.

My Republican colleagues and Democratic colleagues who are all dedicated

to the free market system should understand that this is not a free market transaction. Government-provided low interest loans allow the company to bid at rates not otherwise available. And if acquisition of UNOCAL is critical to the Chinese, they would probably allow the bid to be increased to any level needed to seal the deal.

Control of energy assets by China means China controls where those assets go and when. That raises serious national security concerns for the United States. Among those other serious national security concerns are the transfer of technology associated with the UNOCAL acquisition. It is reported that China could assume ownership of the cavitation technology with applications. Cavitation is a process which UNOCAL uses to go into deep water drilling for oil. That same technology can be used by the Chinese to do nuclear tests underground and to mask them so we would not ever be able to detect them. It would also have applications again for locating matter in deep water.

Given China's commitment to improving its military capabilities, why would the United States permit the sale of this kind of technology? Left on its own, we probably would not. But as part of the UNOCAL deal, it is being pulled through with this Trojan horse.

The reason the Chinese believed a bid for UNOCAL could succeed, as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) mentioned in his support, no, his opposition to our position, the reason the Chinese believe a bid for UNOCAL could succeed lies in our dependence on them to finance a significant portion of our massive budget deficit. Our reliance on the Chinese to finance our debt gives them far too much leverage over our decision making process.

I go back, you know, 15 years now, our arguments that expanded trade with China would result in increased freedom for the Chinese people. We were proved wrong long ago. At that time just before Tiananmen Square, our trade deficit with China was \$3.5 billion a year. And we thought, with that huge trade deficit that it would give us leverage for improving China's human rights record, for improving their behavior in terms of fair trade and for stopping China's proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. We failed in persuading Congress to do that, and today the trade deficit with China, not \$3.5 billion a year, has grown to \$3.5 billion a week. \$3.5 billion a week. With all that capital China is able to purchase our debt, have leverage over us so that now we have to, hopefully not, but some believe, agree to their buying a strategic asset which UNOCAL represents. Our reliance on China to finance our debt weakens our ability to influence China on human rights, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, North Korea, you name it.

This is the price we pay for failing to live within our means, and it is long past time we recognize that danger and

addressed it. On that, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) and I agree. Let us heed the wake up call provided by the Chinese bid for UNOCAL. Let us get serious on both issues, reducing risk in energy by adopting an innovative energy policy for the 21st century and getting our fiscal House in order.

And again, I caution our colleagues that a serious transfer of technology that would be contained in this purchase of UNOCAL and urge our colleagues to support the Kilpatrick amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK).

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. 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 Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of that portion of OMB Circular No. A-11, section 22.2, entitled "Congressional testimony and communications" that states that in testimony before Congressional committees and communication with Members of Congress, witnesses will give frank and complete answers to all questions.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous content that the Clerk read the amendment in its entirety.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 29, 2005, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and a Member opposed each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

The OMB circular which was just read reads, or which was just referred to in the amendment reads as follows: "When testifying before any congressional committee or communicating with Members of Congress, witnesses will give frank and complete answers to all questions." The purpose of this amendment is simply to make certain that none of the funds in this bill may be used to, in any way, assist in any communication from the Executive Branch of government, which is not frank and complete and truthful.

Now, that may seem like an odd thing to ask, but let me point out re-

cent years are replete with examples of how the executive branch, including this administration, have grossly misled Congress on matters of national importance. Example, the Department of Veterans Affairs deliberately withheld information related to the cost of veterans medical care that was needed during consideration of the fiscal year 2005 supplemental, which they now admit has resulted in a \$1 billion shortfall in veterans health care. In fact, they have stonewalled us over the past 3 years in terms of being frank about the needs of veterans health care.

This administration has consistently and repeatedly declined to provide a full accounting of anticipated cost for the Iraq war. Previous OMB Director Mitch Daniels once said that because of oil revenues, the war would be "affordable," and probably would only cost the U.S. 50 to \$60 billion.

Instead, the President continues to request funding for the war, and yet when you ask everyone from the Secretary of Defense on down, they are steadily refusing to give us real figures about the anticipated cost of that war.

We will all recall that just a year ago a Federal Medicare actuary was threatened with dismissal by a high administration official for disclosing the exact cost of the Medicare prescription drug benefit before Congress voted on the measure. And we will all remember, no doubt, former economic advisor Larry Lindsey, who was criticized by his colleagues and eventually fired for correctly predicting an Iraq war that would cost the U.S. at least \$200 billion. At the time his prediction was termed outlandish by higher officials in the government.

The former Chief of Police at the National Park Service was fired for publicly discussing budget shortfalls that she argued threatened the safety of her police force and hindered their ability to protect national park lands.

And former Member of Congress, Mike Parker, who once served in this very institution was fired for speaking candidly about the budget request of the Army Corps of Engineers.

And I must say that I had the unpleasant experience in the 10 years that I chaired the Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee of having well-known administration witnesses purposely mislead our subcommittee about the Iran-Contra issue. And several of those officials who were much less than candid at the time are now serving in this administration. So unfortunately, I think there is a long track record, not just with this administration, but with many, of misleading the Congress, of telling us half truths, of telling us no truths at all. And I do not know how you can change human nature to insist that the persons testifying before our committees be more forthcoming. But at least you can have the Congress spell out, through a vote, the fact that each and every Member of this Congress expects the administration to allow its witnesses to tell the truth.

We should not have to, as Senator SPECTER was forced to do last year, we should not have to change the law to require that officials from the National Institute of Health or anyone else can answer Members' questions without referring to higher-ups in the administration to get a politically correct answer.

So that is the purpose of this amendment. And I would hope it would be adopted by this House.

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to accept this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend. Does the gentleman move to strike the last word?

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 20 minutes and reserves the balance of his time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me this time, and I acknowledge the great leadership of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) as the chair of the Appropriations Subcommittee.

I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), every chance I get I want to salute his leadership, his championing the rights of America's families and now today something that should be very clear and obvious, but having to make the point that we should have truth and honesty in our dealings with the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Obey amendment.

□ 1515

It is ridiculous that we are debating on the floor of the people's House the need for truth. The need for truths is self-evident.

The truth and trust are fundamental to a democracy. We owe every American the truth in our dealings here. All Americans, as I say, deserve the truth. But our veterans deserve it even more. They are willing to make the supreme sacrifice for us. They are courageous, they are patriotic. They have given us the opportunity to have peace on Earth, good will to men over generations, and now they are not being dealt with honestly.

The need for truth is made painfully clear in the current crisis we are facing on veterans health care funding shortfalls. On April 5, Department of Veterans Affairs Secretary Jim Nicholson said, "I can assure you the VA does not need emergency supplemental funds in FY 2005 to continue to provide timely quality service."

Last week, less than 3 months later, Secretary Nicholson and the Bush administration finally acknowledged their failed budgetary policies and mis-

placed priorities and owned up to the shortfall in veterans funding. In the meantime, the supplemental bill passed the Congress, went to the President's desk without covering that shortfall because of the misrepresentations that were made by the Secretary to the Congress.

This should come as no surprise to anyone. Over the past 2 years, Democrats have stood shoulder to shoulder with veteran service organizations calling for adequate funding for the VA. Time after time, Democrats have put forward proposals to increase funding for our veterans, and time after time Republicans have voted them down. We have had straight party line votes. There have been some moments of clarity and truth from Republicans in this fight.

In February 2004, Veterans Affairs Secretary Anthony Principi acknowledged the inadequacy of President Bush's FY 2005 budget for the VA. He said, "I asked OMB for \$1.2 billion more than I received." It was his professional judgment that that \$1.2 billion was needed a year and a half ago for fiscal year 2005 and here we are today still without it. Secretary Principi knew then that the Bush budget was inadequate.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), knew that the Bush budget was inadequate. That is why he joined the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), a champion for veterans, in calling for additional funds for the VA.

The result? Not increasing funding for veterans but ousting the chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), for daring to stand up to the Republican leadership and a new VA Secretary who hides the truth so that he can be in lockstep with the failed budgetary policies and misplaced priorities of this administration.

How can we even face our veterans when we as a Congress say to them, and as a country, including the President, it is more important to us, we place a higher value in giving the people who make over a million dollars a year, \$140,000 in tax cuts, but we are not giving you the health benefits that you earned, that you deserve, and that you were promised.

Democrats are united on this issue. Every single Democrat joined me yesterday in writing to President Bush calling for an emergency supplemental to fund veterans health care. This should not be partisan and I hope that later today we will right this wrong. But even if we pass a bill on the floor today, we will go into the Fourth of July weekend without correcting the situation, because it would have to come back after the recess, go into conference, et cetera, pass the Senate with which there is no guarantee.

Our veterans deserve nothing less than our honoring our commitment to them.

Mr. Chairman, in time of war, the military says we will leave no soldier behind on the battlefield. When they come home we must leave no veteran behind when it comes to delivering our promises to them.

Our Founding Fathers, over 200 years ago, declared independence with their wisdom, their enlightenment, their courage, and their willingness to sacrifice, they launched what would become the United States of America, a free and independent country. Our veterans have kept us that way. We honor our Founding Fathers' vision and we honor the sacrifice of our veterans, our men and women in uniform, when we keep our promises to them. We owe them nothing less. I support the Obey amendment.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman for yielding me time.

I rise in opposition to this amendment. But first on the merits of this discussion about the veterans budget, we held a subcommittee hearing, an oversight hearing on Tuesday with the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs. The gentleman from Indiana (Chairman BUYER) held a hearing this morning with the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs to try to sort this shortfall out and that is exactly what it is. It is a shortfall.

I do not believe that there is any intent to mislead or deceive the Congress. And if this amendment is an attempt to belie the confidence of the American public in the process that we have, I think it is a mistake.

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs and his administration made a mistake. They made an estimate as to what the costs would be for 2005. Now we have 3 months left in 2005. They have completed their mid-year review and they have found that there was an error in their assumptions. Now, this is a 30-plus billion dollar budget. So a 3 percent mistake, which is what this was, they were off by 3 percent, that is a billion dollars.

Now, I cannot speak for any other Member of Congress, but I suspect there have been times when my office budget has been either overestimated or underestimated by 3 percent. It is a small percentage, but when you are talking huge amounts of money like we are talking about here, it comes out to be a very large number, a billion dollars. But I believe that they made an error. They made a mistake. I do not think they tried to deceive us or mislead us.

Let us be honest. The appropriations process moved very quickly this year. Their mid-year review came after we completed most of the deliberations in our hearings on this bill. So we are going to fix that. I mean, if the idea here is to get at the problem we have, we found the problem. By the way, it was oversight by the Committee on

Veterans' Affairs that discovered this in consultation with the Veterans Affairs Administration. So we are sorting it out. And I think we have done the responsible thing.

We have identified what that shortfall is. Somewhere in the neighborhood, plus or minus \$5 million, of about \$975 million. It is a lot of money, but we fortunately will be able to remedy that today. The last bill, I believe, that we work on tonight will be a supplemental bill to provide those funds to make sure that we keep the Veterans Health Administration whole.

They planned to work around the solution. They were going to use capital funds. They were going to take from their own hide, basically the capital account of \$600 million and they had a reserve plan for \$375 million. We want them to have that reserve. We want them to have those capital expenditures. We do not want them to defer maintenance and repair and purchases of computers and MRIs and other medical equipment. We want no diminution, no reduction in the quality of service our veterans have, especially in this time of war.

So we are moving. We are moving at a pace, and we will have this resolved at least on the House side this evening.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 10 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Does the gentleman have any other speakers besides himself?

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I do.

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I do not find myself always happy with what witnesses before our committees have to say. Just because I disagree with them does not mean they are not being as complete as they would choose to be.

I do not always have witnesses provide me with the answers that are my answers. But I do remember early on in my career here, it was my second term, I was a new member of the Committee on Appropriations. In those days the issues swirled around what was going on in Central America. There was a divide in the House it seemed. Most of the people on that side were very much concerned about changes in Central America. I remember the debates about the Sandinistas and there was discussion that maybe the witnesses were not being totally open and fair and straightforward.

It is convenient to point a finger and suggest one administration's witnesses is not being straight, another one is

answering questions fully. The fact is that it is pretty obvious we expect people to be straightforward with us.

I would suggest if the gentleman really has a problem in some of his committees, he might want to urge that people take the oath everywhere. I do not tend to follow that pattern in my own committees. But indeed it is important to recognize that people in public service, whether they are working for the administration, maybe working for the State Department or otherwise, do come to us generally and try to do as full a service as they possibly can.

I must say that I sense a pattern here where issues are being raised in this fashion because perhaps some people have ambitions to do something else with their life besides just sitting in a committee. But indeed, it is important that we not distort our process to the point where public affairs becomes a political battle, a partisan confrontation at every turn.

If there have been partisan votes on the floor, let me submit the vast percentage of those have come that way because there was a direction from the Democratic side that we are going to be together and be opposed to whatever those Republicans are doing.

That is not a healthy way to carry forward public affairs. I am very concerned about the pattern. I do not believe I will carry my discussion about this much further than I am today but I may because it is very disturbing to this Member of Congress.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if I understood the chronology correctly, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) was pointing out that there were Reagan administration witnesses, of which people had similar complaints. And I would stipulate to that. But this is not a question of just one administration or another. It is a disturbing failure of this House to carry out its constitutional responsibilities for independence.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I appreciate the gentleman yielding because, indeed, that was the Reagan administration. And during that time the Democrats were supporting the Sandinistas and we were fighting for freedom.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Reclaiming my time, first of all, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) got here and I do not think most people understood that he was talking about the Reagan administration. He talked somewhat vaguely about a previous administration, as if we were somehow being partisan, and he cited the Reagan administration did the same thing.

Then he follows that up with this outrageous comment that we were sup-

porting the Sandinistas and they were supporting freedom. If that is the gentleman's example of how not to be partisan, than I do not think the gentleman is going to be finding many people follow his example.

The problem we have here is a failure of this House to fulfill its constitutional responsibilities.

□ 1530

You say, oh, nobody was trying to be dishonest. Have people forgotten so soon the prescription drug issue? When the Department of Health and Human Services responsible officials refused to let one of their officials tell the truth, threatened their officials with retaliation, that was not an honest error. That was a deliberate pattern of suppression.

I mean, what we have here is a degree of submissiveness on the part of the Republican majority and the executive branch that I believe is unprecedented in American history.

You want an example of it? I believe the Republican membership has over the years become more afraid of its own leadership than of anything else, including terrorism. And you want the proof?

We had a very prolonged rollcall yesterday which had to be interrupted because we had a potential terrorist problem. The rollcall that was extended, because we had to evacuate and deal with the terrorist threat, took a lot less time than the rollcall that you used to pass the prescription drug bill. You were more afraid on your side of retribution from your leadership if you did not get that bill passed than you were of a terrorist threat.

I remember when the Clinton administration was new and the Democrats were in power. I served on the Committee on the Judiciary that had a very tough oversight hearing on Waco, called Janet Reno up and was very tough on her. I served on the Committee on Banking that had hearings on Whitewater.

Oversight has disappeared; and when we do have conscious and deliberate lies and we know the Health and Human Services misrepresented the cost of the prescription drug bill, they knew one thing and they threatened with retribution somebody who might have told the truth, and there was not any complaint from the Republican side.

As to the veterans budget, I do not think it is accidental that the underestimate came. It was not an overestimate, and it was not just an arithmetic error. There were people saying you do not have enough, you do not have enough. We remember. The gentleman from Wisconsin reminded me when the veterans affairs people sent out a notice telling their own people not to try to do outreach, do not bring us more people, and the gentleman from New York said it is going to be fixed. Well, at the cause of some disruption. Having the heads of the Department have to

stop and say, well, we will take some capital funds, that is not a useful way to run things.

So there has been a deliberate pattern here of a failure to oversee, and that is what the gentleman from Wisconsin's amendment seeks to remedy.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), chairman of the defense authorizing committee.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I think most of my colleagues know that we had a hearing 2 days ago on something that is not an easy subject, that is, Guantanamo, the treatment of the detainees, many of whom were picked up on terrorist battlefields around the world, including the 20th hijacker, the bodyguard for Osama bin Laden and an institution which is at the focal point of a great deal of public discussion.

We had Brigadier General Hood, the commander of Guantanamo; Sergeant Major Menendez; and Lieutenant Commander Ostergaard, who runs the medical facilities. They gave us straight ahead, candid, absolutely truthful answers, and every member of the committee, Democrat and Republican, had a chance to ask them questions, cross-examine them. I would just ask my colleagues to look at the statements that came from Democrats and Republicans regarding the quality of the testimony.

Now, each year, we put together a \$400 billion-plus defense budget. That requires candid, up-front testimony from the people that wear the uniform of the United States and the civilian officials that oversee the Pentagon.

In addition to that budget, we bolt on and bolted on this year a \$50 billion bridge appropriations; and to do that, we had to ask of the services and of our military leadership, and we drilled down right to the platoon level; we had to ask them for unfunded requirements, that is, we said what did you need that was not in the budget but in your estimation, in your candid opinion, General, Captain, Lieutenant, Sergeant, what do you think we need for the Armed Forces of the United States.

They answered us candidly; and because of that, we were able to put together a complete and robust statement of the requirements that we had, and we were able to meet those with the \$50 billion bridge fund that we then bolted on to the defense authorization bill.

Our process has been one that has been marked by candor, by truthful testimony, and I think by respect from Republicans and Democrats for the process.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have remaining on both sides?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve my time.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER).

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Chairman, in 13 years I have seen a lot of amendments in subcommittee and in full committee and on the House floor. This one is a bit peculiar. I do not even, frankly, know what the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is trying to say. I think it is perhaps being used just so he can come to the floor and speak, I suppose.

No moneys can be used in contravention of the OMB circular that states that in testimony before congressional committee and committee before Members of Congress the witnesses give frank and complete answers to all questions. Man, blow me away today.

I want to share with my colleagues with regard to the Veterans Administration. Let me give a record as I understand it from testimony and actions that have occurred with reference to the 2005 budget.

On April 5 of 2005, a letter to Senator HUTCHISON, the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, stating that the VA, as part of good management, prudently uses reserve funding whenever trends indicate the need to refocus priorities, and the Secretary before the full committee on the House Veterans Affairs testified about that today.

On April 7 of 2005, Dr. Perlin testified to the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee at his confirmation hearing that reserve funds were being used to meet operational needs in 2005.

On April 12 of 2005, Dr. Perlin sent a letter to the Senate VA Committee stating that projected carryover of fiscal year 2006 might be diminished to address current operational demands, including care in OIF and OEF returning combat veterans noting that "we do feel confident that VHA has sufficient resources for the remainder of 2005."

On April 19 of 2005, VA staff met with both majority and minority Members of the House appropriations subcommittee. During the meeting, management decisions to reallocate capital funds for direct patient care in 2005 was discussed.

On June 3 of 2005, a meeting with the House and Senate majority staff at the request of the staff detailing the modeling differences between the independent budget and the VA's annual budget process.

On June 9, a meeting with Secretary Nicholson and the general counsel regarding the budget shortfall and the extent to which reprogramming had already taken place.

On June 21, a meeting with Secretary Nicholson regarding the upcoming hearing on budget modeling.

On June 22, a meeting with Dr. Perlin, Under Secretary for Health, regarding the mid-year review and the

reprogramming of capital assets and rollover accounts into medical services.

I am going down this entire list. I should have opened with a March 24 letter that Secretary Nicholson had sent to the appropriators, in particular to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, along with the very same letter that I have here in hand that was sent to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS), the ranking member of that subcommittee, regarding the reprogramming and redirection of funds.

I do not want to have to repeat that, but I just want to let my colleagues know that notice was given with regard to this reprogramming. So with regard to this question about hide the ball, there was no hiding the ball.

On June 22, 2005, there is a meeting with Dr. Perlin, the Under Secretary for Health, regarding the mid-year review and reprogramming of capital asset and rollover accounts into medical services.

On June 23, there is a hearing before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs investigating the budget modeling process at the VA and the independent budget and the private sector, and at this hearing is where Dr. Perlin testified with regard to his shortfall of \$975 million. That is when the public became fully aware.

On June 28, Secretary Nicholson testified before the House Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Military Quality of Life and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, regarding the newly identified budget shortfalls for 2005 and 2006.

June 28, 2005, Secretary Nicholson then testified before the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee regarding newly identified budget shortfalls for 2005 and 2006.

June 29, Senator Nicholson joined the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs at a press conference to alert everyone that he was going to come up with an exact number yesterday and then give testimony before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs regarding that number.

Today, he came before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. He testified with regard to an actual shortfall, made an oral request for a supplemental appropriation in the amount of \$975 million to cover the shortfall.

I would say everybody's been pretty up front. I am pretty impressed on how things have moved in a bipartisan fashion. I want to compliment the veterans service organizations. I want to compliment the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS). I want to compliment the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), because what we have here is we want to move in regular order.

What happened over in the Senate is that they make it as an amendment on a 2005 supplemental on an 2006 Interior

bill. What I am really pleased about is the leadership of the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and the gentleman from New York (Chairman Walsh) that they are going to take appropriate action; they are going to act on the Secretary's request for the shortfall.

Why? Because all of us believe and understand in the fabric of the common bond of why we call ourselves American is to care for the men and women who wear the uniform; and when they take off the uniform, we care for them when they are veterans. If they fall in the service of their country, we pick them up and attempt to make them whole. If they fall and die, then we make sure that we give them an honorable burial, and we take care of their widows and their orphans.

That is what this is going to do. We are going to take this measure up tonight. I applaud the chairman for his immediate action. I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for his cooperation in making sure this happened tonight; and I know the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has been equally impatient, but we are going to make this happen, and we are going to come together to make this happen, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the ranking member ought to win the support of every single Member of this House.

Truth should be our expectation. In fact, that proposition is a legally binding directive of the Office of Management and Budget.

I tell my friend from Indiana, the amendment that he seems to feel is peculiar simply says to the administration, tell the truth. Is that peculiar?

Yet on one of the most important pieces of legislation that this Congress has considered in recent memory, the Medicare prescription drug bill, officials in the current administration purposely, deliberately, and cynically suppressed the real costs of that bill because it did not further their political agenda.

When that legislation was under consideration in November of 2003, the Congress was told that it would cost \$395 billion between fiscal year 2004 and 2013. Yet just 3 months later, in February 2004, it was disclosed that the office of the Medicare actuary actually estimated that bill would cost \$534 billion. In other words, it was not a 1 or 2 percent misrepresentation; it was a 95 percent misrepresentation. Then we now hear it may cost up to \$1.2 trillion.

So on the prescription drug bill, I tell my friend from New York in particular, it was not a 1 or 2 percent mistake. It was a 300 percent mistake that was made on the prescription drug bill. That is a misrepresentation.

The truth is, Mr. Chairman, the Members of this Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike, purposely had the cost hidden because the Republican leadership, in my opinion, knew that the bill would not pass if the truth were told.

□ 1545

That is what this amendment says: tell the truth.

The chief Medicare actuary, in fact, Richard Foster, told Congress in March 2004, that he had consistently estimated that the legislation would cost more than \$400 billion, and he had prepared dozens of analyses that said it would be over \$500 billion. But Mr. Foster told Congress that he had been ordered by Tom Scully, the head of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services in this administration, to withhold his cost estimates from Congress.

The failure to tell the truth is a lie. In fact, the Government Accountability Office has found that Mr. Scully violated Federal law when he threatened Mr. Foster's job. Now, luckily for him, he was not working for the Federal Government then so no sanctions can be taken.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) simply says, tell the truth, administration, when you talk to Congress. Mr. Chairman, this sorry episode ought to trouble, indeed infuriate, every Member of this House and, indeed, every American.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for truthfulness. That is all this amendment says. Do not be so defensive on your mistake on the veterans' funding. The Democratic budget told you the truth on the funding necessary and you simply ignored it. Vote for the truth.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) said he found this amendment "peculiar." I do not know what is peculiar about simply saying that any witness who appears before Congress ought to tell the truth. I find it peculiar that someone thinks that that is peculiar.

Let me also make the point that he is chairman of that committee today, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, because the previous committee chairman, Republican chairman, was removed by his party's leadership because the previous committee chairman agreed with Democrats that the veterans' budget was inadequate. He told the truth and he paid a high price for it.

There is no question that this administration has hidden the cost of the Iraqi war. They have revealed the cost on the installment plan, a little bit at a time. There is no question that the administration threatened the firing of the man who was charged with telling Congress what the cost of the new Medicare prescription drug program would be. And there is no question that

they did fire the National Park Service Chief of Police for telling the truth about the safety of her forces. And there is no question they did fire former Congressman Mike Parker for telling the truth with respect to the Corps of Engineers.

With respect to the ridiculous contention on the part of the gentleman from California that during the Nicaraguan war, Democrats were "for the Sandinistas," I would remind the gentleman that we signed a letter to the Sandinistas demanding that they listen to the Reagan administration's demands for free elections in Nicaragua. I would also remind the gentleman that what we were opposed to was the illegal arms-for-hostages trade with the Iranians. And I would remind him that we were against an illegal, and I emphasize "illegal," war in Nicaragua. So so much for the gentleman's ridiculous contention.

I have a simple suggestion, Mr. Chairman. If the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle think that witnesses should not tell the truth when they are before the Congress, then, by all means, vote against this amendment.

I remember Lyndon Johnson lied to this country about the war in Vietnam, and we paid a high price for it for years. And when he did that, I vowed, every day I served in this Congress, that I would see to it that whoever testified before us, and whoever talked to us, whether it was President or the most lowly administration official, would be held to a high standard of truth. Because when they are not, people die.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority leader.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, frankly, I support the words in this amendment, but I reject the politics that brings it here. I think this House has sunk to a very new low, using veterans and trying to scare veterans for political gain.

It is absolutely amazing to me that because you disagree with policies of the administration, you try to lead the Nation to think that people are lying. There is no lying here. Questioning the motives of military heroes that come to testify before this House and before the Senate is a new low. Questioning people's honest, forthright presentation of the facts as they know them at the time that they testify as lies is a new low. And that is what we have come to. It has come to politicizing everything. It does not matter what it is.

And not only politicizing it, but trying to scare people into supporting your position. I remember very distinctly when this issue came to us, because the Veterans Administration had done a mid-year review and found the problem with the shortfall in veterans health. They properly informed the people that should be informed, both Democrat as well as Republican. Instead of doing what the responsible

thing is, which is what our chairmen of the relevant committees did, that is, start looking at the problem, making sure we understand the problem, and then finding a solution for the problem, what did the other side of the aisle do; they immediately ran down here and tried to pass an amendment to a bill and throw over \$1 billion at a problem they did not even understand.

Why? Why would you do that? Why would you do such an irresponsible thing? The only reason you would do it is for politics. They had no idea what was required. As mentioned earlier, the Veterans Administration had suggested that they just move money around to get us through this fiscal year so that we could appropriate the next year. That was not a good solution. And the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) understood that and worked with the administration, and we are going to pass the solution tonight, understanding that we need not only to replace this money that is in the shortfall, but to make sure that there is enough money forward.

I mean, in the bill that most of this House voted for that funds Veterans' Affairs, this House and our committees knew that there was a shortfall in what was presented by the administration, in our opinion. Not because we were lied to, but in our opinion. And we put \$1.64 billion more than what was requested by the President, thinking that would take care of the problem. And it still may take care of the problem next year. And that is what these bills are all about, funding next year. We will take care of the problem now.

And I say to the veterans in this country, you will not miss one day of health care that is coming to you. Do not listen to the politics and be afraid that you may lose your health care. That is not going to happen. We will take care of it, just as we have always taken care of it.

Since the Republicans became the majority in 1995 funding for veterans has increased 77 percent. When the Democrats controlled this House from 1984 to 1994, spending per veteran rose from \$923 to \$1,300. Yet in the next 10 years, in the years that we have had the majority, it rose to \$2,773. From \$1,300 to \$2,700. Funding for the Montgomery GI bill rose 35 percent when they were in charge. But since we have been in charge the last 10 years, the GI bill funding rose 147 percent. And yet we are constantly trying to play politics and cover up the facts.

The bill that we passed for next year will take care of this. From 2001 to 2005, the percentage increase in the VA health care funding, 40 percent, was larger than the Defense Department's increase; 33 percent. And this is a time of war. We are providing for the needs of our veterans. We are taking care of our veterans.

Do not let the political rhetoric and the political posturing and the demagoguery say otherwise. Because the

facts, if you really want the truth, the facts say that we are not only taking care of our veterans, not only do we understand our responsibilities to our veterans, not only do we understand what veterans have contributed to this Nation and our welfare and our freedom, we are doing more than talking about it. We are taking the responsible way of taking care of our veterans and not playing irresponsible politics.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to vote "no" against this cynical, political amendment.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit the following article in regard to the Obey amendment alleging that the Bush Administration and Congress are deliberately misled on a variety of issues.

[From the Weekly Standard, Jun. 30, 2005]

A CNN ANCHOR GETS IRAQ AND AL QAEDA WRONG. BUT WILL THE NETWORK ISSUE A CORRECTION?

(By Stephen F. Hayes)

"There is no evidence that Saddam Hussein was connected in any way to al Qaeda."

So declared CNN Anchor Carol Costello in an interview yesterday with Representative Robin Hayes (no relation) from North Carolina.

Hayes politely challenged her claim. "Ma'am, I'm sorry, but you're mistaken. There's evidence everywhere. We get access to it. Unfortunately, others don't."

CNN played the exchange throughout the day. At one point, anchor Daryn Kagan even seemed to correct Rep. Hayes after replaying the clip. "And according to the record, the 9/11 Commission in its final report found no connection between al Qaeda and Saddam Hussein."

The CNN claims are wrong. Not a matter of nuance. Not a matter of interpretation. Just plain incorrect. They are so mistaken, in fact, that viewers should demand an on-air correction.

But such claims are, sadly, representative of the broad media misunderstanding of the relationship between Iraq and al Qaeda. Richard Cohen, columnist for the Washington Post, regularly chides the Bush administration for presenting what he calls fabricated or "fictive" links between Iraq and al Qaeda. The editor of the Los Angeles Times scolded the Bush administration for perpetuating the "myth" of such links. "Sixty Minutes" anchor Lesley Stahl put it bluntly: "There was no connection."

Conveniently, such analyses ignore statements like this one from Thomas Kean, chairman of the 9/11 Commission. "There was no question in our minds that there was a relationship between Iraq and al Qaeda." Hard to believe reporters just missed it—he made the comments at the press conference held to release the commission's final report. And that report detailed several "friendly contacts" between Iraq and al Qaeda, and concluded only that there was no proof of Iraqi involvement in al Qaeda terrorist attacks against American interests. Details, details.

There have been several recent developments. One month ago, Jordan's King Abdullah explained to the Arabic-language newspaper al Hayat that his government had tried before the Iraq war to extradite Abu Musab al Zarqawi from Iraq. "We had information that he entered Iraq from a neighboring country, where he lived and what he was doing. We informed the Iraqi authorities about all this detailed information we had, but they didn't respond." He added:

"Since Zarqawi entered Iraq before the fall of the former regime we have been trying to

have him deported back to Jordan for trial, but our efforts were in vain."

One week later, former Iraqi Prime Minister Iyad Allawi told the same newspaper that the new Iraqi government is in possession of documents showing that Ayman al Zawahiri, bin Laden's top deputy, and Zarqawi both entered Iraq in September 1999. (If the documents are authentic, they suggest that Zarqawi may have plotted the Jordanian Millennium attacks from Iraq.)

Beyond what people are saying about the Iraq-al Qaeda connection, there is the evidence. In 1992 the Iraqi Intelligence services compiled a list of its assets. On page 14 of the document, marked "Top Secret" and dated March 28, 1992, is the name of Osama bin Laden, who is reported to have a "good relationship" with the Iraqi intelligence section in Syria. The Defense Intelligence Agency has possession of the document and has assessed that it is accurate. In 1993, Saddam Hussein and bin Laden reached an "understanding" that Islamic radicals would refrain from attacking the Iraqi regime in exchange for unspecified assistance, including weapons development. This understanding, which was included in the Clinton administration's indictment of bin Laden in the spring of 1998, has been corroborated by numerous Iraqis and al Qaeda terrorists now in U.S. custody. In 1994, Faruq Hijazi, then deputy director of Iraqi Intelligence, met face-to-face with bin Laden. Bin Laden requested anti-ship limpet mines and training camps in Iraq. Hijazi has detailed the meeting in a custodial interview with U.S. interrogators. In 1995, according to internal Iraqi intelligence documents first reported by the New York Times on June 25, 2004, a "former director of operations for Iraqi Intelligence Directorate 4 met with Mr. bin Laden on Feb. 19." When bin Laden left Sudan in 1996, the document states, Iraqi intelligence sought "other channels through which to handle the relationship, in light of his current location." That same year, Hussein agreed to a request from bin Laden to broadcast anti-Saudi propaganda on Iraqi state television. In 1997, al Qaeda sent an emissary with the nom de guerre Abdullah al Iraqi to Iraq for training on weapons of mass destruction. Colin Powell cited this evidence in his presentation at the UN on February 5, 2003. The Senate Intelligence Committee has concluded that Powell's presentation on Iraq and terrorism was "reasonable."

In 1998, according to documents unearthed in Iraq's Intelligence headquarters in April 2003, al Qaeda sent a "trusted confidante" of bin Laden to Baghdad for 16 days of meetings beginning March 5. Iraqi intelligence paid for his stay in Room 414 of the Mansur al Melia hotel and expressed hope that the envoy would serve as the liaison between Iraqi intelligence and bin Laden. The DIA has assessed those documents as authentic. In 1999, a CIA Counterterrorism Center analysis reported on April 13 that four intelligence reports indicate Saddam Hussein has given bin Laden a standing offer of safe haven in Iraq. The CTC report is included in the Senate Intelligence Committee's review on prewar intelligence.

In 2000, Saudi Arabia went on kingdom-wide alert after learning that Iraq had agreed to help al Qaeda attack U.S. and British interests on the peninsula. In 2001, satellite images show large numbers of al Qaeda terrorists displaced after the war in Afghanistan relocating to camps in northern Iraq financed, in part, by the Hussein regime. In 2002, a report from the National Security Agency in October reveals that Iraq agreed to provide safe haven, financing and weapons to al Qaeda members relocating in northern Iraq. In 2003, on February 14, the Philippine

government ousted Hisham Hussein, the second secretary of the Iraqi embassy in Manila, for his involvement in al Qaeda-related terrorist activities. Andrea Domingo, head of Immigration for the Philippine government, told reporters that “studying the movements and activities” of Iraqi intelligence assets in the country, including radical Islamists, revealed an “established network” of terrorists headed by Hussein.

Can CNN stand by its claim that “there is no evidence that Saddam Hussein was connected in any way to al Qaeda?”

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

Mr. OBEY. 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 Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TIAHRT

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TIAHRT:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to promulgate regulations without consideration of the effect of such regulations on the competitiveness of American businesses.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 29, 2005, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved against the amendment.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) for this opportunity to talk about some issues that I think are very important to America and to our current economic and future economic environment.

My amendment is very simple. It says “none of the funds made available in this Act may be used to promulgate regulations without consideration of the effect such regulations have on the competitiveness of American business.”

Recently, just about an hour ago, we had an amendment on the floor here from the gentlewoman from Michigan expressing her concern about the sale of Unocal, an American company, to a Chinese company. Now, I too am concerned. But perhaps we should ask the question: How did this company get in the situation where they are so susceptible to a hostile takeover by a Chinese company?

Perhaps we can learn a lesson from this situation, with this threat of a hostile takeover. The problem that has occurred with many businesses, including Unocal, is that they have to face barriers and overcome barriers that have been created by Congress over the last generation. The barriers have made American companies less competitive and more vulnerable.

The less competitive American companies always will have to struggle against having some outside business, especially if it is subsidized by a foreign government, taking them over. The barriers that have been created by Congress include unbridled rising health care costs. The costs have been driven up by Medicaid and Medicare and the government bureaucracies that control them.

It is also litigation abuse that has driven up the cost of insurance. In the average settlement, Mr. Chairman, 60 percent of the cost now goes to lawyers instead of those who have been taken advantage of.

Also, we have the regulation costs to comply with, which drive up costs for companies complying with confusing red tape.

We have a tax policy that punishes success. We have an energy policy that we have passed five times in the House of Representatives, and yet we have not been able to get it into law. And we could be creating 700,000 jobs and bringing down the cost of energy for our companies.

□ 1600

We have a trade policy that fails to open up new markets like Central America and the Dominican Republic. We have research and development that we need to focus on the future economy, and we have lifelong learning issues and barriers created by Congress that have failed to address the needs of a future economy and provide the engineers and scientists and those in math and other areas of technology that will be needed in the future economy.

These policies are preventing the creation of jobs, and the result has been the loss of high-quality, high-paying jobs here in America.

The amendment I have focuses on regulations because regulatory costs are killing jobs. Less government regulations will mean granting the freedom to allow Americans to pursue their dreams, and it also means providing the space for business to thrive and create opportunities.

Instead, our Federal Government has become a creeping ivy of regulations that strangle enterprise. Unrealistic, impractical, unnecessary environmental prohibitions, OSHA mandates and the like are literally driving our industries and small businesses and our health care system to a grinding halt.

How can we expect our economy to develop and grow when bureaucracy prevents business from starting and expanding jobs; when doctors cannot even keep up with the ever-changing regula-

tions and codes; when teachers are forced to spend more time filling out paperwork than they do in the classroom. It is estimated that the total regulatory burden as of the year 2000 was \$843 billion. That is \$8,000 per manufacturing worker. The regulatory compliance burden on U.S. manufacturers is equivalent to a 12 percent excise tax. It is no wonder we are having trouble competing worldwide. It is no wonder our companies are more vulnerable to hostile takeovers by foreign companies.

As we approve spending allocations by the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, HUD, and related agencies, including the OMB, we need to remind them of the importance of their actions with that funding.

Each and every Federal agency should take into consideration the effectiveness of U.S. businesses, and they should be held accountable for those effects.

We should be concerned when a U.S. company is threatened by a hostile takeover by a foreign company. We need to change the economic environment today so we can look forward and create jobs.

I intend to withdraw this amendment, but I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) for looking out for American jobs. I am confident we can work together to make this possible to bring jobs back into America and to keep and create more jobs by changing the economic environment.

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF OHIO

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Ohio: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

Sec. ____ . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Council of Economic Advisers to produce an Economic Report of the President regarding the average cost of developing and introducing a new prescription drug to the market at \$800 million or more.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 29, 2005, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FERGUSON) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is co-authored with the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

The Economic Report of the President is supposed to be an educational

tool, not a drug industry PR piece. On page 167, it asserts: "On average, a new drug takes 12 years to develop and costs \$800 million to introduce to the market."

That cost estimate, by drug industry-backed researcher Dr. Joseph DiMasi, is used widely by drug companies to justify the high and rapidly rising prices they charge American consumers. But the DiMasi estimate is based on a widely disputed methodology that dramatically inflates actual R&D costs. The most blatant shortcoming is that the DiMasi estimate generalizes from the cost of developing a breakthrough product to the cost of developing any new drug. Most new drugs on the market are me-too drugs, or second generation products. They are by their very nature far less expensive to develop than the original.

Even more troubling is the accounting gimmick unearthed by Professor Donald Light and Associate Professor Joel Lexchin. They write, "About half of the \$800 million figure consists of 'opportunity costs,' the money that would have been made if R&D funds had been invested in equities."

Treating opportunity costs as actual costs is a good way to inflate the R&D estimate, but a bad way to give the public honest data on actual R&D spending.

By such an accounting, the cost of producing a stick of bubble gum could include the box office revenue foregone by the manufacturer's decision to make gum instead of motion pictures.

As Light and Lexchin write: "Minus the built-in profits, R&D costs would average about \$108 million 93 percent of the time, and \$400 million 7 percent of the time."

By that reckoning, the industry estimate overstates the cost of developing a new drug by 740 percent. But in his economic report, President Bush uses the drug industry's estimate without question, without qualification, without even attribution.

Put simply the Brown-Gutknecht amendment would fix that. It prevents the Council of Economic Advisers, which works with the President to produce his economic report, from using that bogus estimate next year.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I do not understand the purpose of this amendment. It is designed to restrict information used by the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

Just because a Member does not like the findings of an independent study does not mean we should be trying to prevent the White House from using that information. What kind of precedent would this set? Where can Congress stop in restricting the President's Council of Economic Advisers and the executive branch from discussing the findings of independent studies? What other type of economic data will Members try to restrict then?

The \$800 million figure that the gentleman from Ohio cites is from a 2003

Tufts University study. Is Tufts University no longer able to provide information to this government with studies? Which university will be next? Harvard University? Are they good enough? Princeton? It seems to me Tufts University is a good source of independent information.

This information was put together independently. It was not created out of thin air. It was not created by the White House. The fact is this amount of money that pharmaceutical companies spend on R&D is considerable. They spend enormous resources on research and development. In 2003, pharmaceutical companies spent an estimated \$33.2 billion on research and development. In the same year, the budget for the entire NIH, the entire budget for the National Institutes of Health, their operating budget was \$27 billion, less than what the industry had spent on R&D alone.

Over the past 10 years, pharmaceutical research companies, scientists and researchers have earned an average of 32 new drug approvals a year. In 2003, a total of 35 new drugs, including 21 new molecular entities and 14 new biologics, were approved by the Food and Drug Administration.

These were important products. These are products used to prevent or treat conditions like Alzheimer's, cancer, HIV infection, asthma, pneumonia, psoriasis, and other infectious diseases. The President's advisers should not be censored while talking about this world-leading American industry and the amount of money that they spend on research and development.

I urge opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT), the co-sponsor of the amendment.

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I do not think anyone should be censored, but I think having no information can sometimes be better than having bad information. And what the Council of Economic Advisers did was they took lock, stock, and barrel failed research. Then it gets repeated and repeated and repeated, this \$800 million figure.

According to the pharmaceutical company themselves, that \$800 million figure includes \$400 million of opportunity costs. That means they could have taken that money and bought Microsoft shares and made more money. That is ridiculous.

Mr. Chairman, just read this report that I will include for the RECORD by Dr. Donald Light. He is from New Jersey. He teaches at a little school called Princeton. He also teaches at the Princeton medical school. He is the one who went through this. More importantly, in this 2-page report there are almost a page of footnotes. They document what they do.

The problem with the Council of Economic Advisers is they just took this number and they repeated it. They do not document it. They do not ask questions, and so now everyone is running around saying it cost \$800 million to develop a new drug. That is not true, and it is worse than having no information at all.

This is one way to send a message to the Council of Economic Advisers, that if they are going to put out information so policymakers at the White House or here on Capitol Hill make decisions based on that information, you better make sure you check the numbers and document them first because bad information is worse than no information at all.

[From the American Journal of Bioethics, Jan. 2004]

WILL LOWER DRUG PRICES JEOPARDIZE DRUG RESEARCH? A POLICY FACT SHEET

(By Donald Light and Joel Lexchin)

This documented fact sheet provides evidence that all drug research by large firms, net of taxpayers' subsidies, is paid for out of domestic sales in each country, with profits to spare. Prices can be lower without jeopardizing basic research for new drugs. More exposure to global price competition would encourage more innovative research and less of the derivative me-too research that now dominates.

In the U.S., the FDA Commissioner, Mark McClellan, and the drug industry are responding to pressures for lower costs by mounting a large campaign to pressure all other affluent countries to raise their prices to U.S. levels. They claim that lower prices do not pay for drug research costs, but we provide evidence that this is untrue. Ultimately, however, such nationalistic arguments are based on regarding basic research and new discoveries, which can happen anywhere, and the cost of trials, which are carried out in the countries deemed most commercially advantageous, as part of national companies and national accounts, when in fact they are part of a global economy for pharmaceutical products.

FDA MYTHS

1. FDA Commissioner, Mark McClellan, holds that other affluent countries like Canada and the UK set their prices for patented drugs so low that they do not pay for research and development (R&D) (McClellan 2003). We can find no evidence to support that claim.

On the contrary, audited financial reports of major drug firms in the UK, show that all research costs are paid, with substantial profits left over, based solely on domestic sales at British prices (Pharmaceutical Price Regulation Scheme 2002). Likewise, 79 research drug companies in Canada submitted reports showing their R&D expenditures have risen more than 50% since 1995, all paid for by domestic sales at Canadian prices (Patented Medicine Prices Review Board 2002). Sales to the U.S. and elsewhere are in addition to the positive, domestic balance sheets.

2. FDA Commissioner McClellan says that European or Canadian prices are "slowing the process of drug development worldwide" (McClellan 2003). There is no known verifiable evidence to support this claim. In fact, drug research has been increasing steadily in Europe as well as in the U.S., with some countries having a more rapid increase than the U.S. (Patented Medicine Prices Review Board 2002).

3. FDA Commissioner McClellan says that "price controls discourage the R&D needed

to develop new products" (McClellan 2003). But there is no known verifiable evidence to support this claim.

R&D expenditures have been growing rapidly, though it is becoming more and more difficult to discover breakthrough drugs on targets not already hit (Harris 2003). The truth kept from Americans is that first-line treatment for 96% of all medical problems requires only 320 drugs (Laing et al. 2003). In wealthy countries, more drugs might be appropriate to treat people who do not respond to first-line agents.

4. FDA Commissioner McClellan charges that efforts to negotiate lower prices for patented drugs by other countries (and by major employers, unions and governors in the U.S.) are "no different than violating the patent directly" to make cheap copies (McClellan 2003). This charge echoes the drug industry and implies that large buyers seeking better value should be considered a criminal act.

5. FDA Commissioner McClellan paints a picture of other wealthy countries driving down their prices to marginal costs, but the widening gap between prices for patented drugs in the U.S. and other countries is due to drug companies raising U.S. prices, not other countries lowering theirs (Sager and Socolar 2003; Families USA 2003).

6. The "free-rider" problem that McClellan emphasizes can be solved by U.S. prices coming down to European levels, where they will cover all R&D costs, plus profits that are higher than those in most industries.

7. Drug company profits, after all R&D costs, have long been more than double the profits of Fortune 500 corporations. In recent years they have jumped to triple and even quadruple the profits of other major companies (National Institute for Health Care Management 2000). The global firms spend two and a half to three times more for marketing and administration than for research (Families USA 2001).

8. Americans pay for more R&D than any other country because the United States accounts for more sales than any other country. But while the U.S. accounts for 51% of world sales, it took 58% of global R&D expenditures invested in the US to discover only 43% of the more important new drugs (NCEs) (European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industries and Associations 2003). This means that other countries are helping to pay for the large, inefficient U.S. R&D enterprise, the opposite of what the editors of Business Week claimed (Business Week editors 2003). William Safire's claim of a "foreign rip-off" as Americans pay for the world's R&D is contradicted by the facts above (Safire 2003).

RESEARCH IS MISDIRECTED BY THE INDUSTRY, AGAINST PATIENTS' INTERESTS

9. Most drug innovation provides little or no therapeutic advantage over existing * * *

Independent review panels plus a major industry review conclude that only 10-15% of "new" drugs provide a significant therapeutic breakthrough over existing drugs and involve a new chemical or molecule (Barral 1996; Prescrire International 2003; National Institute for Health Care Management Research and Education Foundation 2002). Other industry-sponsored figures are much higher but not reliable.

10. The FDA approves drugs that are better than nothing (placebo) but does not test them against the best existing drugs for the same problem. Most research is for "new" drugs to treat problems already treated by other drugs.

11. About 18% of the drug industry's research budget goes to basic research for breakthrough drugs. About 82% goes to derivative innovations on existing drugs and to testing.

The long-standing survey of basic research by the National Science Foundation estimates that basic research has increased to 18% of the total research and development (R&D) budget for the pharmaceutical industry. It used to be less (National Science Foundation 2003). Industry-sponsored figures based on secret unverifiable data are much higher but not reliable (DiMasi, Hansen, and Grabowski 2003). The 85-90% of "new" drugs that have little therapeutic gain reflects equal protection from competition for much less investment and risk.

12. Congress has repeatedly extended patent protection for drugs beyond what other industries enjoy, despite much higher profits year in and year out. Government protection from normal competition is now more than 50% greater for the drug industry than a decade ago (National Institute for Health Care Management 2000). These incentives reward research into derivative large markets, rather than to finding effective treatments for diseases that have none.

13. These facts constitute the Blockbuster Syndrome: the lure of monopoly pricing and windfall profits for years spurs the relentless pursuit for drugs that might sell more than \$1 billion a year, regardless of therapeutic need or benefit. Research projects for the disorders of affluent nations proliferate, as do clinical trials. Doctors are paid like bounty hunters to recruit patients for thousands of dollars each. Most patients get the misimpression that the experimental drug will be better than existing ones (Wolpe 2003). The corruption of professional judgment, ethics and even medical science follow (Williams 2003; Wazana 2000; Barnett 2003; Lexchin, Bero, Djulbegovic et al. 2003; Bekelman, Mphil, and Gross 2003; Villanueva, Peiro, Librero et al. 2003; Fletcher 2003).

DRUG RESEARCH COSTS MUCH LESS THAN CLAIMED

14. Drug companies claim to spend 17% of domestic sales on R&D, but more objective data reports they spend only 10% (National Science Foundation 2003). Thus, only 1.8% of sales goes to research for breakthrough new drugs (18% x 10%) (Love 2003).

15. Taxpayers pay for most research costs, and many clinical trials as well.

In 2000, for example, industry spent 18% of its \$13 billion for R&D on basic research, or \$2.3 billion in gross costs (National Science Foundation 2003). All of that money was subsidized by taxpayers through deductions and tax credits. Taxpayers also paid for all \$18 billion in NIH funds, as well as for R&D funds in the Department of Defense and other public budgets. Most of that money went for basic research to discover breakthrough drugs, and public money also supports more than 5000 clinical trials (Bassand, Martin, Ryden et al. 2002). Taxpayer contributions are similar in more recent years, only larger.

16. The average amount of research funds the drug industry needs to recover appears to be much less than the industry's figure of \$800 million per new drug approved (NDA).

The \$800 million figure is based on the small unrepresentative subsample of all new drugs. It excludes the majority of "new" drugs that are extensions or new administrations of existing drugs, as well as all drugs developed by NIH, universities, foundations, foreign teams, or others that have been licensed in or bought. Variations on existing drugs probably cost much less because so much of the work has already been done and trials are simpler.

About half of the \$800 million figure consists of "opportunity costs", the money that would have been made if the R&D funds had been invested in equities, in effect a presumed profit built in and compounded every

year and then called a "cost." Drug companies then expect to make a profit on this compounded profit, as well as on their actual costs. Minus the built-in profits, R&D costs would average about \$108 million 93% of the time and \$400 million 7% of the time.

The \$800 million estimate also does not include taxpayers' subsidies via deductions and credits and untaxed profits (DiMasi, Hansen, and Grabowski 2003; DiMasi, Hansen, Grabowski et al. 1991). Net R&D costs are then still lower.

Contrary to some press reports from the industry, screening for new compounds is becoming faster and more efficient and the time from initial testing to approval has shortened substantially (Kaitin and Healy 2000). The large size of trials seems more due to signing up specialists to lock in substantial market share. Advertising firms are now running clinical trials (Bassand, Martin, Ryden et al. 2002; Peterson 2002; Moyers 2002).

17. Because clinical trials have become a high-profit sub-industry, trial "costs" appear to be much more than is necessary.

An international team of experts estimates that clinical trials could be done for about \$500 per patient rather than \$10,000 per patient, a 95% reduction (Bassand, Martin, Ryden et al. 2002). The most detailed empirical study of trial costs also concludes that costs can be much less than reported (The Global Alliance for TB Drug Development 2001).

U.S. DRUG PRICES VERY HIGH

18. Americans seem unaware how much more they are paying for drugs than other countries, in the name of the "free market" where prices are controlled by corporations. So-called "price controls" abroad are negotiated wholesale prices. Corporate price controls in the U.S. are un-negotiated monopoly prices, which then large buyers negotiate down.

According to a detailed analysis, American employers and health plans pay at wholesale 2.5-3.5 times the prices in Australia and other countries with comparable prices for patented drugs (Productivity Commission of Australia 2001). There is no evidence that these prices do not cover research costs. U.S. generic prices shadow patent drug prices and are also 2.5-3.5 times more.

19. High American prices are essentially monopoly rents charged to employers in every other industry. They shift profits from other industries to the drug industry.

20. If American prices were cut in half, research budgets would not have to suffer unless executives decided to cut them in favor of marketing, luxurious managerial allowances or high profits. They probably would not, because R&D gets such favorable tax treatment compared to other expenses. Lower prices would save other Fortune 500 companies billions in drug benefit costs, and drug company profits could come into line with the profits of the companies who pay for their drugs.

REALIGN INCENTIVES TO REWARD TRUE INNOVATION

21. Current incentives strongly reward derivative innovation. We get what we reward.

22. Because the U.S. is by far the biggest spender, it has by far the most R&D and new drugs. Four other industrialized countries, however, devote more of their GDP to R&D for new drugs than the U.S. (Patented Medicine Prices Review Board 2002).

23. Officials of drug companies commonly claim that nearly all new drugs are discovered in the U.S. However, the industry's own studies (and others) show that over the past quarter century, the U.S. has accounted for less than or about the same as its proportionate share of international new drugs, not more and certainly not nearly all (Barral

1996; European Federation of Pharmaceutical Industries and Associations 2000). Until 2002, even the U.S. pharmaceutical industry was investing an increasing percent of its R&D budget in highly productive research teams abroad (Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America 2002).

24. Americans are getting less innovation and paying a lot more. Competing countries profit from these American self-delusions by covering their R&D and keeping their own drug prices reasonable, while leaving drug companies to make bonanza profits from the monopoly American market.

25. Price competition has been the greatest spur to innovation for over 200 years. Price protections reward derivative and me-too innovation as well as excessive costs and a focus on blockbuster marketing. If we want lower prices and more breakthrough innovations, we need to change the incentives to reward those goals (Baker and Chatani 2002).

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN).

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment. The Brown amendment seeks to prevent the President's Council of Economic Advisers, a highly reputable group, from referencing an independent study that concluded the average new drug or medicine takes \$800 million to develop in its future economic reports.

This \$800 million figure comes from a 2003 Tufts University study, not from the PhRMA, pharmaceutical industry, and not from the administration. There is nothing partisan or slanted about its findings. To try to block information just because you disagree with it is not the way to serve the American people who deserve and expect debate on the real costs of researching and developing pharmaceuticals. This amendment amounts, basically, to censorship and deserves to be defeated.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Cleveland, Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, is the administration manipulating information to benefit the pharmaceutical industry? Is the economic report of the President? And in that economic report, the administration parrots Big Pharmaceuticals' claims that drug prices need to be so high because of the costs of continuing to develop innovative life-saving drugs.

But this assumption is directly at odds with the assumption the administration made in its cost estimate of the new Medicare drug benefit. CMS assumed that escalating drug costs would slow because drug companies will be churning out fewer innovative drugs. Which is it?

If the drug industry is spending big on the next generation of innovative drugs, then projected costs of the Medicare drug benefit will be higher than the administration estimates. Then again, if the drug industry is not, in fact, spending big on innovative research, then the high prices charged by Big PhRMA amount to price gouging, plain and simple. I urge support for the Brown amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG).

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I will take just a few moments to rise in opposition to this amendment which attempts to use the appropriations process to control the content of information about our economy, which I think is a wrong thing to do. I believe the committee is about learning facts, not ignoring them or being denied them.

Moreover, the proposed amendment does not change the 2005 economic report of the President which discusses the average cost of developing and introducing a new prescription drug, as has been mentioned, a new drug to the market at \$800 million or more. I have been informed that the administration strongly objects to the proposed Brown amendment. Preventing any discussion on the factors that contribute to pharmaceutical pricing or in fact any other topic that might be controversial would compromise the credibility of the future economic reports of the President.

So I join my colleagues in opposing the Brown amendment and urge that it be defeated.

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

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I hear my friend from New Jersey, well, all of my friends from New Jersey. They are arguing on behalf of the drug industry. Here is what this is all about, as the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) said.

The drug industry funds a study. They do it through Tufts University. They find a professor at Tufts. This Dr. DiMasi has been doing these studies for the drug industry for several years. This is, I believe, his third study. After the study is done saying it costs \$800 million, numbers just pulled from all over the place as the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) proved in his comments, they get that study in a government report, and then that number gets all over the place to try to justify continued high drug prices, the kind of prices that the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) and others on this floor have tried to do something about for several years.

So when the industry does a study, then you put it in a government report, it simply does not make sense to do that for the public interest.

□ 1615

There is a lot at stake here. The industry uses that fabricated cost estimate to justify charging our constituents the highest prices in the world. Two, three, four times Americans pay what Canadians or French or Germans

or Israelis or Japanese pay; prices that force way too many American seniors to choose between their medicine and food; prices that drive up employer-sponsored health care costs, making American companies less competitive. Look at the problems at GM that my State faces. Prices that drive up tax bills by exploding the cost of Medicaid and Medicare and other public health programs.

With that much at stake, the very least we should do is make sure we get the numbers right. This will be the first step in debunking this \$800 million myth. This will be the first step in getting the numbers right so that we can get on in dealing with real prescription drug legislation in the future.

I ask support for the Brown-Gutknecht amendment.

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

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Chairman, I just want to come back to one point because I think a lot of people may not have been paying attention. This study that we are talking about where we got the \$800 million figure originally started with a study that was funded by pharmaceutical companies. That number then gets repeated by the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and we all believe that it is true. We have an independent research that was not financed by PhRMA. That was done by a professor who was at Princeton from New Jersey. More importantly, he was an adviser to this President on health policy. Let me add one other thing: He is a Republican.

Now, this is, I think, far more credible than that number that keeps getting bantered around and bantered around. Bad numbers are worse than no numbers at all. This is the one way to say to the Council of Economic Advisers to the President of the United States they ought to be ashamed.

Whether or not this amendment passes, the point, I think, is made: that if they are going to put information out to the President, out to the public, out to policymakers about important issues like this, they had better make sure that the facts are correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, it seems that the sponsors of this amendment are intent on impugning the integrity of Tufts University, and that is unfortunate. And they are also intent on censoring the White House and the Council of Economic Advisers of what they can say. Does the gentleman believe that we should apply this message to a President from his party as well? Should the President be unable to reference independent studies on global warming or international labor issues or the minimum wage, or is this really just partisan censorship?

The gentleman uses rhetoric and figures that I may not agree with, but I certainly do not disagree with his right to say it.

This is a bad amendment. I urge its defeat.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. 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 Ohio (Mr. BROWN) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KNOLLENBERG

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KNOLLENBERG:

Sec. _____. The amount otherwise provided under the heading "Management and Administration—Working Capital Fund", in title III is hereby increased by \$22,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 29, 2005, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG).

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

This is a very simple amendment. It would simply partially restore funds to HUD's Working Capital Fund that were cut by an amendment adopted yesterday. This amendment has been cleared with the minority, and I urge its adoption.

If I were to just briefly talk about it, this is not just a random pot of money. The Working Capital Fund pays the cost of all computers and phones at HUD, which is a huge expenditure. So, briefly, that is the essence of it.

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to this amendment.

I just want to point out that we had quite a number of different places from which money was taken as a result of the amendments. During the course of the debate yesterday, very sizable money was taken from the GSA accounts, the building account, that is to say, the building fund in the GSA; and also from the Secretary of Transportation's budget; as well from, as the amendment here suggests, the Working Capital Fund within HUD. There is also money taken from the Air Transportation Stabilization Fund.

And if I could remember off the top of my head, I would probably be able to come up with about six other places where money was taken from from last year's. But I think what the chairman has proposed is to put this back in the

Management and Administration Working Capital Fund of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and this one is as difficult a spot. So I have no objection to having that done in that place.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Briefly, we have had, what is it, over the last 15 hours, some interesting conversations about money, and we have drawn money from a number of sources and, frankly, not too many sources, and some of that does create pain. In the case of this particular situation, these moneys are needed now. So I very much appreciate the gentleman's agreeing with me that this money should go to that particular source.

So I am content to accept his approval and move forward.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, as we are coming now close to the very end of this bill and as it would appear there are about three or four other people from, in fact, both sides of the aisle who have indicated that they wish to propose amendments, I want to take a couple of minutes to allow for the possibility that they may, in fact, come in defense of their positions and the amendments that they had, and to again commend the staff for the great work that they have done on this committee.

The people on both the minority and majority side, the majority clerk, Dena Baron, and the other members of her staff; and on the minority side, Mike Malone and Michelle Burkett, who are seated next to me and have done a yeoman's service in providing assistance to the minority and the minority members, the minority members of the subcommittee and the general minority members in the preparation of this legislation.

The gentleman from Michigan (Chairman KNOLLENBERG) has been an entirely fair chairman for this subcommittee. It is the first time that he is dealing with this newly expanded subcommittee. It is actually, of course, the first time that I have served as ranking member of the expanded Transportation, Treasury, HUD, The Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee, now covering a good many more agencies than it did before. And I found that it is very easy to work with the chairman. I appreciate very much the kind of relationship that we have been able to have. He has been very accessible and very kind in his consideration of all of the amendments and positions that I have brought forward to end on my own part and on the part of members of the subcommittee and, at the

same time, for members of the minority that are not on the subcommittee that may be on the full committee or not on the Committee on Appropriations at all.

And I know that he has listened very carefully to the concerns of people from all of those categories within the House of Representatives, those that I have mentioned.

In particular, I want to thank him at this time for having listened, at a late stage in the preparation of the legislation, to the concerns that I had about the funding for the accounts for tax law compliance in the IRS, for the development and the funding for YouthBuild, which we actually chose a very creative way to allow for the funding of YouthBuild by giving some additional money which was needed back to the account for the Community Development Block Grant and then speaking here on the floor about the use of that money for the continuation of YouthBuild.

I would hope that, in fact, by the time we get to a conference committee, we may have well have had a reauthorization of YouthBuild in a different place. And if that is the case, then that money will be available for Community Development Block Grant purposes without the consideration of use for YouthBuild, but it then serves as a possibility of dealing in either place of working in either location, and I am very grateful for him to do that.

Earlier in the process, the chairman was very responsive to the request to provide funds for the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund in the Department of the Treasury and funded that well for the coming year, the 2006 fiscal year.

So there were those and a whole number of other occasions when we were able to work together well.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CLAY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLAY:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 948. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide mortgage insurance under the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) for any mortgage or loan made by a lender that has been determined, by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, under the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 (12 U.S.C. 2801 et seq.) to have engaged in lending practices that are not prudent.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 29, 2005, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY).

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

The amendment seeks to prohibit funds available in this Act for the provision of mortgage insurance under the National Housing Act to lenders who engage in lending practices that are not prudent as referenced in the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act and the FDIC Improvement Act.

□ 1630

Given the chairman's willingness and commitment to collaborate with the ranking member from Massachusetts, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and I seek to engage the conferees to include language that speaks to the issue referenced in this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise as a cosponsor of this amendment.

Specifically, the amendment seeks to prohibit funds in this act for the provision of mortgage insurance under the National Housing Act to lenders who engage in lending practices that are not prudent, as referenced in the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act and FDIC Improvement Act.

The gist of this amendment is to stop predatory lending. I want to pay tribute to the National Community Reinvestment Coalition and the hearing that was just held with the members of the Committee on Financial Services, including the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT), and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY), that presented this report from the National Community Reinvestment Coalition that indicated minorities, women, and low- and moderate-income borrowers across the United States of America receive a disproportionate amount of high-cost loans.

It also says that the Community Reinvestment Act has been unsuccessful, for example, in examining subprime lenders. So they have not been able to weed out those who might raise the interest rates so high that minorities and women and others are impacted negatively.

In order to improve the housing market and to give access to better interest loans, we believe that there should be greater oversight. So this amendment was constructed to provide greater oversight.

I am delighted to be able to join the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) on this amendment, but I hope that we will have the opportunity to work with our colleagues and really be able to provide an answer to this report, the "2004 Fair Lending Disparities: Stubborn and Persistent."

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlewoman for her willingness to cosponsor the amendment. I also thank the chairman for his willingness to talk to us about this amendment, and I appreciate this opportunity.

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

Mr. CLAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate and share the concern that my colleagues have about abusive lending practices and the need to eliminate predatory lending by financial institutions. I also recognize that HUD has been working on a regulation for more than 3 years to address the problem, the very problem my colleague mentioned.

I commit to my colleagues that, as this bill moves forward, I will work with my colleagues to include report language which helps to evaluate and accelerate a solution to what is a national problem.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman. I also wanted to make him aware that there is legislation being crafted by our colleagues, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KANJORSKI), as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT), to address this issue and it is winding its way through the Committee on Financial Services.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLAY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure that we acknowledge and yield to the ranking member and thank him for his interest in this area and, of course, to be able to work with him during conference on this very important issue of trying to stop predatory lending.

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

Mr. CLAY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleagues for bringing this matter before the House, as I agree that predatory lending is a well-recognized problem in many jurisdictions around the Nation. I will be happy to work with the chairman, as he has already indicated, to work with our colleagues as we go on through this process to conference in bringing this legislation to fruition, which will be some months from now.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Missouri will continue to yield, I want to thank the chairman very much. I did not hear the conclusion; I do not know if the gentleman from Michigan concludes after we conclude, with respect to report language, but I assume that is what we might be able to work with the chairman on.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the cooperation of all sides on this issue. The chairman has given a commitment to work with us, and at this point I thank also the gentlewoman for her willingness to cosponsor the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the General Services Administration to carry out the eTravel Service program.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 29, 2005, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

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

Mr. Chairman, small businesses still struggle to participate in the Federal marketplace. For the past 4 years, the Federal Government has not met its small business contracting goal, costing entrepreneurs billions of dollars in lost opportunities.

By failing to take advantage of their exceptional quality and reasonable prices, the Federal Government is losing out on the best value for taxpayers' dollars.

One of the primary reasons the Federal Government has failed is because of contract bundling. These megacontracts have been responsible for a 56 percent drop in available contracts to small businesses in 9 years. After all this time, we have yet to see one dime in savings of taxpayers' dollars.

The latest chapter in small business lost opportunity comes from the General Services Administration. GSA is moving forward with an ill-conceived megacontract called e-travel. With this contract, GSA is poised to eliminate a whole sector of the small business community, travel agents, from working with the government. This is an industry small businesses dominate, as 99 percent of its firms have 30 employees or less.

This move is despite the President's small business agenda and his repeated statements that contracts should be broken into smaller pieces. Completely ignoring this, GSA is cutting small businesses out, all in the name of streamlining, which they cannot even prove.

It is not a new issue. In fact, recognizing the potential harmful impact that this contract will have for small businesses and local economies, the conference report for the fiscal year 2004 omnibus appropriation took the

extraordinary step of telling GSA it needs to preserve these contracts for small businesses.

Despite this mandate, GSA did just the opposite, and made the e-travel project mandatory barely 1 month after the conference report. This means that no local or Federal office can use their neighborhood travel agency, even if they already have for years.

The results of GSA's actions are massive losses which industry estimates project costing small travel agencies at least \$100 million in contracting opportunities, and possibly more. With only 78,000 jobs being created last month, can we afford to lose out on more opportunity in areas of the country that so desperately need jobs?

GSA is ignoring the President's small business agenda designed to increase contracting opportunities. They are ignoring the will of Congress. They care nothing about saving taxpayers' dollars. The amendment I am offering today will make sure they listen and stop pushing small businesses out of the Federal marketplace.

Let us not forget the important role small travel agencies have played. On September 11, when thousands of people were stranded in airports, they took as long as was necessary to figure out ways to get people home. When people stopped traveling out of fear, they got them going again. The thanks they got from the airline industry was a loss of booking fees and direct competition. The airline industry decided it could do their job.

Now the Federal Government is telling them that their services are no longer needed. This is not only shortsighted, but it fails to recognize the value that these companies add.

My amendment will balance contracting opportunities in the travel industry, much like the previous system. It would allow large providers to perform on the national contracts, but it would not prevent a Federal agency from using a local travel agent if that is what they prefer to do.

Let me make one thing clear. If this amendment is not adopted, not one single small business travel agent will be able to do business with Federal agencies, and this is outrageous. These megacontracts have clearly gone too far; and it is time that we say enough is enough.

This amendment has received the support of the Society of Government Travel Professionals, as well as the U.S. Women's Chamber of Commerce. I am urging my colleagues today to protect small business contracting by supporting this amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) has expired.

Does any Member seek to claim time in opposition?

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I seek the time in opposition, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I oppose this amendment because it will shut down the GSA e-travel program.

In 1996, GAO recommended that travel management should be consolidated government-wide; and in 2001, they found that decentralized travel operations at the agency level resulted in the following: inconsistent and/or duplicative travel processes and procedures. It is costly to maintain these multiple, redundant systems on a stand-alone basis and with an inability to effectively monitor and manage the travel function at the agency level.

Further, many agencies were developing expensive in-house custom systems. These "boutique" systems, if you will, were not connected, causing a heavy burden on the traveler. OMB recommended that a common government-wide travel management service would significantly improve the traveler's experience and save the government money. Government-wide e-travel is projected to save approximately \$450 million over the 10-year cycle. It is expected to achieve a 15 percent savings in transactional costs over status quo in the base period of the contract, and 20 percent in outlying years.

So I do not believe that this is the answer that the gentlewoman is seeking, which brings forward the shutdown, entire shutdown of the e-travel program. So I would suggest that we all unite and vote against this amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the amendment that has been offered by the ranking member of the Committee on Small Business; and for the reason, I will just cover it simply, for the reason that in the conference report for the fiscal year 2004 omnibus appropriation covering GSA, concern was expressed about the mandatory nature of the e-travel service.

In fact, the report states, and I am quoting from the report: "The conferees agree that GSA has been responsive to the House's concerns that e-travel initiatives should not involve mandatory participation by Federal agencies. Furthermore, the conferees agree that in its management of e-travel prime contractors, GSA should seek to preserve that portion of the Federal travel agent business that is currently served by small businesses and local entrepreneurs."

Now, not to demand that there be a particular portion or whatever that goes to those Federal travel agent businesses that are currently served by small businesses and local entrepreneurs but, rather, to point out that the vast majority, probably over 90 percent of travel agencies have fewer than 30 employees, and are, therefore, categorized as small businesses.

While I recognize what the chairman has said, that sometimes by a very large economy-of-scale kind of con-

tract you give everything to one, you can then wipe out the small businesses from being able to compete in that process, I think that, as I have quoted from the conference report for the 2004 appropriations act concerning GSA, there was the sense of the Congress that we did not want that to happen, that we wanted some of this business to remain with the local and small business entrepreneurs.

So I support the amendment.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I just would like to respond for the record to a statement made by the chairman that the e-travel will save taxpayers' money. Let me just say that an industry review of the booking fees listed on the Federal Supply Schedule, it appears that GSA's figures on travel booking fees may have been estimated too high by as much as \$20 per transaction, and these are the big industries, the big travel agencies, not the small businesses.

□ 1645

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Let me say this about the amendment. What the amendment would do, it would shut down E-travel, just shut it down. The E-travel system saves money, saves taxpayers money and is easier to navigate for travel. The answer to the question that she has does not involve shutting down E-travel.

I would simply urge a no vote on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WYNN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WYNN:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 948. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay a Federal contractor with respect to a contract if the contractor—

(1) fails to enter into a subcontract with a small business in accordance with the contractor's subcontracting plan (under section 8(d) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)) for the contract, unless the contractor provides written justification; or

(2) was not in compliance under a previous Federal contract with the contract clause required by section 8(d)(2) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C 637(d)(2)) with respect to timely payment, as found by the awarding agency, and is the subject of litigation or an administrative claim relating to a late payment to a subcontractor by the contractor.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of June 29, 2005, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) and a member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN).

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

In this House, we frequently proclaim the importance of helping small businesses. Consider, in fact, that the Small Business Act states, in part, it is the policy of the United States that small business concerns shall have the maximum practical opportunity to participate in the performance of contracts let by any Federal agency, including subcontractors.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment addresses two issues that are, in fact, already part of the Small Business Act but continue to be problems for the small business community. First, under current law, proclaimed by the Small Business Act, it is required that the successful bidder shall have a subcontracting plan included in the contract, and that prior compliance of the bidder with other subcontracting plans shall be considered by the Federal agency to determine if the bidder is responsible in the award of the contract.

However, the fact is that, in far too many cases, the subcontractors that are listed on the subcontracting plan of the bidder that wins the contract are never used to perform the contract work. As a result, small businesses, women-owned businesses, African American businesses, other ethnic minority businesses who, we are told, are being included in Federal contracting are, in fact, often excluded. They are not allowed to perform the work. This practice constitutes fraud and undermines small businesses, and we need to put a stop to it.

My amendment penalizes Federal contractors that fail to subcontract with small businesses as submitted in their subcontracting plan. Should the contractor not use the subcontractor laid out in their plan, the amendment requires that the contractor provide written justification or lose the award. Small business contractors deserve adequate protection from dishonest contractors.

The second issue raised in this amendment is a problem that, in many cases, after a subcontractor successfully performs the work they are not being paid in a timely manner to allow them to meet their obligations. Again, the Small Business Act currently ad-

resses this issue. It says that the policy of the United States is that prime contractors establish procedures to ensure the timely payment of amounts due pursuant to the terms of their contracts with small businesses.

Unfortunately, all too often this does not happen. It is hard enough to survive in business without the added burden of late payments affecting cash flow and growth potential. Small businesses cannot afford to wait long periods of time to be paid after completing a job, especially a small business contracting on a government contract.

A growing number of small businesses have complained to me about the threat to their survival as a result of having late payments or having to pursue claims through litigation or administrative procedures in order to get paid. This problem has caused me to introduce prompt payment legislation in the last few Congresses. This amendment addresses the problem by providing that when a prime contractor has been found to be out of compliance with prompt payment provisions, or are the subject of administrative claims or litigation, they should be denied the ability to be awarded Federal contracts.

My amendment addresses the problem of subcontractors not receiving payment for services to a prime contract in a timely manner. We need to stop paying lip service to the small business community and roll up our sleeves and address the specific problems they confront. They confront the problem of being listed in Federal contracts but never used, and they confront the problem of not being paid on time and having to pursue litigation remedies. This amendment will address both of these issues. I believe it is, in fact, germane to the bill that no money shall be used to pay contractors who violate these two provisions, accurate subcontracting and prompt payment.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI. That rule states in pertinent part, an amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law. This amendment requires a new determination, and I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I would just add that this bill does not change existing law. If you will note, I actually read into the RECORD the status of existing law regarding the requirement to list your subcontractors and the requirement for prompt payment. This bill merely adds the provision to enforce existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. Do any other Members wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland would require a new determination by the relevant executive branch official. Specifically, the amendment would require a determination of whether a contractor has a history of late payments or is the subject of litigation. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained and the amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. VAN HOLLEN

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement the revision to Office of Management and Budget Circular A-76 made on May 29, 2003.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 29, 2005, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment deals with the process that we now have in place in the Federal Government for contracting out work that is performed by Federal employees around the country, in other words, what process is in place for privatizing certain Federal Government jobs. That process, which is known by the Office of Management and Budget, A-76 process, is a broken process. In fact, both Federal Government employees and private contractors have serious legitimate concerns and complaints about the existing competitive sourcing process. This amendment would, in fact, encourage OMB to go back to the drawing board and develop a competitive sourcing process that addresses everybody's concerns. And it is an amendment that is identical, word for word, to an amendment that has passed the House on this appropriations bill in the last 2 years.

And we have passed this bill for the past 2 years for a very simple reason. We recognize that the existing contracting out process is unfair and that it needs to be fixed. And that has not changed from last year to this year. In fact, already this year the Appropriations Committee and this House have recognized the fact that the existing contracting out process is broken because we have passed a number of bills to change that on an ad hoc basis. For example, the Defense appropriations bill, which has already passed this House, changed the A-76 contracting

out rules for Department of Defense Federal employees in a number of ways. It insured, first of all, that Federal employees of the Department of Defense would always have the opportunity to compete to keep their jobs through forming what is known as the most efficient organization. The Defense appropriations bill also required that when a private contractor is trying to take over work it demonstrates that it can provide some minimal level of savings to the taxpayer. After all, that is what competition should be about.

That is something the GAO has recommended, and it is something the Appropriations Committee put in the Defense appropriations bill but it is not part of the normal contracting out process. The Defense appropriation bill also prevents private contractors from gaining an advantage by providing less health benefits to their employees. We as a Federal Government should be setting an example to the public, not trying to encourage people to dump health coverage for their employees. And so the appropriations for defense did that.

There are also things we did with respect to the authorization bill for the Defense Department that changed the contracting out rules. For example, we made sure that during the appeals process, that the appeals rights of Federal employees would be the same as appeal rights for private contractors. That seems to make sense. That is only fair.

In fact, if you look at different appropriations bills that have come out, the Homeland Security appropriations bill, the Interior appropriations bill, the Agriculture appropriations bill, all of those bills had changes to this contracting out process.

So the question arises if the Appropriations Committee itself has changed the contracting out rules in all these other bills, does it not make sense to ask the Office of Management and Budget to go back and get it right, come up with a uniform policy that applies governmentwide, rather than have five different tests in different appropriations bills.

That is what this amendment is all about. It does not get rid of the competitive sourcing rules. It would say to OMB, go back to the rules that were in place before May 2003 until you fashion a new set of rules that make sense for everybody.

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

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

The Van Hollen amendment harms taxpayers, in my judgment, by preventing agencies from conducting public private competitions under OMB's revised circular A-76. By forcing agencies to return to the rules of the old circular world, the old circular world would disadvantage, Number 1, Federal employees by allowing much of their work to be directly converted to pri-

vate sector performance without even considering in-house capabilities or the cost implications of outsourcing. It will also harm taxpayers by making them bear the cost of processes that are outdated, inefficient and not results oriented. The advantages of the revised circular are that they were developed with broad input, broad input from the public to ensure competition is used in a fair manner that accommodates the diverse needs of our citizens. And it focuses on achieving the best results for the taxpayer by requiring agencies to evaluate cost and permitting agencies to also consider the quality of the service provided such as technology support and security.

I would just stop there, but suggest to the gentleman from Virginia that this is not a friendly amendment in regard to the taxpayer. It truly is not. The committee opposes it and certainly I oppose it, and I would ask or urge for a no vote.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I would just pose the question to the subcommittee chairman, I thank him for those remarks, but if the current A-76 contracting out process works so well, if that is the ideal that we want to have, why has the Appropriations Committee, on five different bills that it has reported out, changed those rules with respect to several agencies?

With the Interior appropriations bill there was a rider that came out that passed the House that limited the amount of money that may be used for privatization review by the Department of the Interior and for the Forest Service specifically.

On the Homeland Security appropriations bill, you prevented the Department of the Interior from reviewing for privatization work performed by three different categories of employees who serve on the front lines of the war against terrorism.

On the Agriculture appropriations bill, the Appropriations Committee in this House included provisions that prevented the Department of Agriculture from reviewing for privatization any employees involved in rural development or farm loan programs.

□ 1700

So I would just say to my colleagues, if the existing system works so well, why has the Committee on Appropriations in this House this year already voted to change it in so many ways? Let us have a uniform policy that applies equally across Federal agencies.

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

Mr. Chairman, let me respond to the gentleman's comments. Those appropriations bills, I believe there were five, it was different in each one of them because it was applied specifically, tailored to that particular bill and the operation of that bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me time. I appreciate the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) coming forth and asking questions which are very important, and I believe the chairman talked about that, and that is that where we believe appropriate that the government be involved in inherently government operations, the government should be. However, we know that this government is huge and has many areas in which they are not only behind in their ability to be prepared technologically-wise but also to meet the demands and needs of taxpayers and people out in this country who need to make sure that this government works and works properly.

I would like to remind the gentleman that this is part of the President's management agenda, part of the management agenda where he has talked very clearly to the American public and to Congress about things where we need to change, to change and incorporate changes so that taxpayers and people in need are able to get better benefits and better services.

What the gentleman is doing today says, we are going to wipe out the President's management agenda. We are not going to allow competitive outsourcing and then come to the floor and say, look, you have done it five times. Is that not an indication that this is a broken system?

It is not. It is a system that will continue to be reformed. What the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) has done is to say very clearly where reform is necessary, we will do it; but the taxpayers and people who need the things which government or government money does to implement change within our system is very important.

Mr. Chairman, I will tell you, I oppose the Van Hollen amendment and the taxpayers would too. I hope that our colleagues all hear this debate because it is important not only for taxpayers but for government efficiency.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, this is not about getting rid of the competitive sourcing program. There always has been competitive sourcing in the government, and there will continue to be. The issue is what rules apply. I would suggest to my colleagues that the defense appropriations bill rider that was attached said when you have these competitions, you should at least demonstrate that the taxpayers would be saved some money. A minimum of at least 10 percent of the funds was a good idea. That was required by this House. That is not required by the current A-76 process. We should make that. That should not just apply to the Defense Department that we get a good deal for the taxpayer. That should apply.

The provision of health benefits, let us do what the House has already done

two times, which is adopt this exact language. We did it last year on this bill. We did it the year before. I urge my colleagues to do it again this year.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of taking 5 minutes. I just want to point out since my friend, the chairman, has the chance to close, I just want to point out that this amendment has been passed each of the last 2 years in the House by fairly strong bipartisan votes. And it has then gone to conference committee and never reappeared from the conference committee in either of those years.

It suggests that there is no intention on the part of the majority of adhering to the will of the House which ought to carry at least as much weight as the President's management agenda, so-called, and so I am going to just urge that we again pass this and give the conference one more chance to reject the will of the House, which seems to be its full intent year after year to do and thereby show its total contempt for the will of the House of Representatives.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing very quickly, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) referenced the fact that his idea actually was passed last year, included in the bill and there was a threat of a veto then, and so it was removed from the bill. And this administration is prepared to do the very same thing this year. So I would suggest to him that it is enough of a problem or an annoyance to them that it will be something that will be subject to a veto threat and perhaps go through the same process again.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Van Hollen amendment to H.R. 3058, the Transportation, Treasury and HUD Appropriations bill for FY 2006.

Representative VAN HOLLEN's amendment would prevent the Administration from using federal funds to conduct public-private competitions under the new A-76 process announced in May of 2003. The amendment stops the Administration from playing politics with the civil service system and it deserves your strong support.

The independent think tank, the Brookings Institution, and others explain that the true size of the federal government includes the "shadow workforce" of private contractors. Brookings has found that the private contractor workforce of the federal government is now 16.7 million. That is almost 10 times the size of the federal civil service.

The rush to privatize the civil service system is dangerous, because when the government turns to poorly supervised private contractors, the potential for waste, fraud, and abuse soars.

This is not my assessment. GAO has issued countless reports on contractor abuses and inadequate contract management by federal agencies. The problem is so bad that contract management at DOD, the Energy Department, and NASA—the three agencies that most heavily rely on contractors—has been on

GAO's list of "high risk" federal programs for years. And to make matters worse, agencies, particularly DOD, have cut the number of acquisition personnel in a misguided attempt to save money. That means that there are not enough people to conduct adequate contract oversight.

The Van Hollen amendment prohibits public-private competitions from being conducted under revised rules that give an unfair advantage to private contractors. It's passage would provide Congress and the Administration the opportunity to address several critical matters, including: creating a reliable way to keep track of the costs of service contractors, guaranteeing federal employees the right to compete fairly for their jobs before they are privatized, and ensuring a level playing field by giving federal employees the same legal rights as contractors enjoy.

The Washington Monthly has written that, "even the federal payroll can become a source of patronage. . . . And while doing so may or may not save taxpayers much money, it will divert taxpayer money out of the public sector and into private sector firms, where the GOP has a chance to steer contracts towards politically connected firms."

We must stop the destructive and misguided effort to send federal jobs to private contractors at any cost. Vote "yes" on the Van Hollen amendment and stop this Administration's war on federal employees.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. TERRY). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

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

The Acting Chairman. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 948. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement section 12(c) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437j(c)).

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 29, 2005, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I discuss this amendment to help educate my colleagues and to remind them that this amendment was passed in previous Congresses and the work of many of my colleagues, including the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), has been ongoing to try to bring fairness to this process.

I would first like to say that none of us disagree with the idea of volunteer service. But my amendment simply says that it prohibits the use of funds in this act to implement the community service requirement for public housing tenants.

This proposal has a long history, and of course the reason is because this is a difficult provision to enforce. Part of the enforcement in this time of decreasing public housing is to evict individuals from public housing, the individuals who are most vulnerable, the individuals who are most needy, and the individuals who may be least able because of their physical condition to perform community service.

I have a letter here from the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials which indicates: "Dear Representative Jackson-Lee: I write on behalf of the National Association of Housing Redevelopment Officials to support your amendment to halt the implementation of the public housing community service requirement. This organization is the Nation's oldest and largest association of housing community development professionals and the leading advocate for adequate and affordable housing and strong, viable communities for all Americans, particularly those with low and moderate incomes. Our 21,000 agency and individual members help millions of families nationwide find safe and affordable housing.

"This organization has been opposed to the community service requirement since its enactment in 1998. Although a limited percentage of families nationwide meet the criteria for being subject to the community service requirement, all families must be screened and tracked for compliance. This requirement is an unfunded mandate that public housing can ill afford. In time of scarce resources, we believe that Federal funds could be better focused on maintaining safe, decent housing for 12 million low-income families."

In essence, they are committed to providing this service themselves.

In fact, they say, "many agencies partner with local service organizations to assist in case management and provide services. Other communities find it is necessary to augment local resources with programs and services that are easily accessible by public housing communities. The community is in the best position to make this decision."

This amendment is a clean-up amendment. It allows the local authorities to provide the opportunities for community service, but it does not burden those public housing entities by

using Federal funds to require the oversight and then to evict those most needy for public housing.

I would ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOUSING
AND REDEVELOPMENT OFFICIALS,
Washington, DC, June 29, 2005.

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON-LEE: I write on behalf of the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials (NAHRO) to support your amendment to halt the implementation of the public housing community service requirement under Section 12(c) of the US Housing Act of 1937. NAHRO is the nation's oldest and largest association of housing and community development professionals and the leading advocate for adequate and affordable housing and strong, viable communities for all Americans—particularly those with low- and moderate-incomes. Our 21,000 agency and individual members help millions of families nationwide find safe, affordable housing and economic opportunities through a variety of local, state, and federal programs, such as Public Housing, Section 8 Housing Vouchers, Community Development Block Grants, HOME and the Low Income Housing Tax Credit.

NAHRO has been opposed to the community service requirement since its enactment in 1998. Although a limited percentage of families nationwide meet the criteria for being subject to the community service requirement, all families must be screened and tracked for compliance. This requirement is an unfunded mandate that public housing can ill afford. In a time of scarce resources, we believe that federal funds could be better focused on maintaining safe, decent housing for 1.2 million low-income families, 47 percent of which are headed by the elderly or persons with disabilities, and supporting self-sufficiency programs that get real results.

Total funding for public housing has declined steadily in recent years. The President's FY 2006 budget requested 20 percent less funding for public housing than Congress provided in 2001. A Harvard Operating Cost study found that public housing has traditionally been underfunded compared with all other assisted housing. At the same time, basic housing operating costs have increased exponentially due to factors beyond local agencies' control, including employee health care costs, energy and utility costs, and public facilities insurance increases following 9/11. The cumulative effect of several years of this funding crunch has been to undermine local agencies' ability to provide basic services and maintain our country's \$90 billion investment in affordable public housing.

We are pleased that Subcommittee Chairman Knollenberg and Ranking Member Olver have been able to improve upon the President's requested funding levels for Public Housing Capital and Operating Funds in HR 3058. Despite their efforts in this area, however, public housing is far from fully funded. With so many stresses on our public housing, the unfunded mandate of the community service requirement is simply a drain on local agencies' ability to meet the core mission of providing housing and meaningful support for families seeking a better life.

Thank you for your efforts to remove this unfunded mandate and pennit local housing agencies to focus on our core mission of assisting families and preserving the country's investment in affordable housing.

Sincerely,

SAUL N. RAMIREZ, JR.,
Executive Director.

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in 1998 the last time the Congress authorized the public housing and section 8 programs, they established this policy that tenants of public housing should undertake two responsibilities: number one, they should do some community service. The act requires that individuals in public housing do 8 hours of public service each month. There are numerous exemptions from their requirements for those that cannot do even the most minimal amount of service. The act also requires tenants to be part of the self-sufficiency program, a program designed to help tenants get jobs, keep jobs, and move off and out of public housing so other people may benefit.

My own view is that this was a sound policy then, and it is a sound policy now. Neither appears to be a huge burden and the Department of Housing and Urban Development has not indicated any large-scale problems with the provision that would need this type of action.

This is clearly an amendment that should be taken to the authorizers, and they are, by the way, right now reviewing all public housing assistance programs. So until Congress changes the policy, I believe that the policy should remain in force.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, many of these residents are not able-bodied; and as indicated by the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, it is best utilized at the local levels. They have been partnering with local organizations to try to work through service. We all believe in service.

This is an unfunded mandate. It is a burden on those who are most vulnerable in housing that cannot, either because of their physical or mental condition, perform this service and they are vulnerable to conviction.

I would suggest to my colleagues it is worthy of eliminating.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, let me indicate that I believe it is an unfunded mandate; but

more particularly I hope that we will get to a point, if this amendment is not accepted by my colleagues, that we can come together and work for what is best for those most vulnerable. That is what public housing is for.

When it was passed in 1998, there were many good intentions. It was in the climate of welfare reform. But it is an unfunded mandate. It is burdensome. And it is disrespectful to suggest that those who are poor are not desirous of public service. It is discriminatory and it is unfair, patently so.

I hope that my colleagues will work together with many of us who believe that we can ensure good citizenship by those in public housing; at the same time we can be fair by making sure that they do not get the ultimate penalty which is eviction and force unfunded mandates and public housing authorities who can least afford this in this time of declining funds.

This is a burden. And I would ask that they go in any neighborhood of homeowners and ask the homeowners association whether or not to stay in your house, other than keeping your own house in a good condition, whether you are demanded to perform public service. Public service should be voluntary, and it should be out of your heart. I can assure you that poor people believe in public service. This is high-handed, up-handed, if you will, and elitist; and we know that it is a problem. And I would hope that my colleagues would vote for my amendment.

In the option they do not, we will keep working because we believe in fairness to all who are deserving of public housing and who need public housing and are the most vulnerable.

I ask my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I just reiterate what I said. I am in opposition to the amendment, and I urge everyone to oppose this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The amendment was rejected.

□ 1715

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PICKERING

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. TERRY). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PICKERING:
Page 224, insert after line 8 the following:

TITLE X—LIMITATION

SEC. 1001. None of the funds contained in this Act may be used to enforce the Individuals With Disabilities Parking Reform Amendment Act of 2000 (D.C. Law 13—279).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 29, 2005,

the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PICKERING).

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

I rise today with an amendment at the desk. I want to thank the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations subcommittee for his work on this. I want to thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for her attention and help. I also want to thank the responsiveness of the Mayor's office and the city council.

I will submit into the RECORD at this point letters from the Mayor's office and from Carol Schwartz, council member on the District of Columbia council.

Quickly, let me tell my colleagues the issue that was brought to my attention by one of my constituents in the last week, and as we come to the 4th of July, when millions will come to the District, when thousands of veterans, many of whom are disabled, will be visiting our Nation's capital and going to our monuments, what was brought to my attention by Viola Cupit from Bogue Chitto, Mississippi, who called my office last week.

She had come to our Nation's capital. She happens to be disabled. She has a disabled license plate from the State of Mississippi. She parked on Constitution Avenue. The parking sign says disabled, 4 hours free parking. She thought that she was correctly parked and would not face any fine or ticket.

She returned to discover that it is free for D.C. residents, but not free for those who travel to our Nation from other States. If you are from Mississippi or from Tennessee or from California, if you were to come to the District, you are disabled and you were to park, you would either have to pay or go to the DMV, which can be a long, difficult and frustrating process in the District of Columbia to get a District disabled placard card.

Now, we know in our Nation's capital that we want equal treatment. We do not want discriminatory treatment, especially for our disabled citizens and veterans. We do not want to see them differently. I do not think it was the intent of the District of Columbia and their regulations to have this unequal, discriminatory treatment; but it nonetheless is.

I think the intent of the letters of the Mayor and the city council member indicate that they want to correct this inequity.

I also want to submit for the RECORD a letter from the Paralyzed Veterans of America who have also asked that this discriminatory practice cease, and they stand willing and ready to work with the District of Columbia to have a fair policy.

I will insert the letters that I have referred to into the RECORD at this point.

PARALYZED VETERANS OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, June 29, 2005.
Hon. CHARLES W. PICKERING, JR.,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PICKERING: Paralyzed Veterans of America (PVA) is pleased to support your efforts to correct a policy of the District of Columbia to charge people with out of state placards for accessible parking. PVA expressed our concerns to the D.C. government before this policy went into effect. We oppose paying for accessible parking when in fact the parking is provided on a discriminatory basis. While we understand the need to curb abuse, we do not believe that the city made sufficient parking truly accessible or gives adequate notice to those who need it.

The current policy is confusing and discriminatory. Disabled drivers with D.C. placards or plates are allowed four hours of free parking. Drivers with a valid placard from any other jurisdiction must pay, but the only notice of the requirement to pay is on the sidewalk side of each meter. Simply finding that notice may require the person to get out of the car, wheel through traffic to a curb cut (assuming there is one), then wheel back on the sidewalk to the meter. At that point, the visitor can only hope that the meter itself is accessible.

PVA believes the District's policy violates the "reciprocal agreements" under Public Law 100-641 (23 CFR 1235). The law established guidelines for states and jurisdictions to follow in designing accessible parking spaces, placards and license plates and urged reciprocity in enforcement and parking privileges granted by other jurisdictions.

Again, thank you for your leadership on this issue. PVA is ready to work with you to ensure accessible parking privileges in the District of Columbia are equally available to all disabled drivers, regardless of jurisdiction.

Sincerely,

LEE PAGE,
Associate Advocacy Director.

COUNCIL OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, DC, June 30, 2005.

Hon. CHIP PICKERING,
Congressman, Third District, Mississippi,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PICKERING: I appreciated the opportunity to speak with you at length this morning about the District's enforcement of the "Individuals with Disabilities Parking Reform Amendment Act of 2000." I am committed to revisiting the law to ensure that all disabled persons, regardless of where they live, are treated equally. This was always our intent, but I also recognize that there may have been some unintended consequences.

As I said in our conversation, I will work with the Mayor to develop satisfactory solutions to the problems we discussed, and I appreciate the opportunity to address your concerns.

I am available at your convenience to discuss the matter further if necessary, and may be reached in my office at (202) 724-8105.

Sincerely,

CAROL SCHWARTZ,
Councilmember, At
Large, Chair, Committee on Public
Works and the Environment.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF
COLUMBIA, EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF
THE MAYOR,

June 30, 2005.

Hon. CHARLES PICKERING,
Congressman, Third Districts, Mississippi, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PICKERING: On behalf of the Mayor, who is traveling out of town, I want to give you our administration's assurance and commitment to review the Individuals With Disabilities Parking Reform Amendment Act of 2000 to assure that it meets our intention that disabled visitors to our city enjoy equal treatment. We were seeking to curb abuses, not to create difficulties for disabled visitors to our city. We are especially proud to be an important tourist destination receiving 20 million visitors annually. We also take pride in our policies regarding equal treatment for disabled people. I would very much appreciate your courtesy in giving me the opportunity to work with Public Works and the Environment Committee Chair Carol Schwartz and our City Council to correct the flaws you have found in this statute. I appreciate your bringing this matter to our attention. I would be pleased to discuss this matter with you, or have the appropriate staff answer any questions you or your staff may have.

Thank you again for your attention to this important issue and for respecting our right to self-government by calling the matter to our attention.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT BOBB,
City Administrator.

What I would like to do at this point is enter into a colloquy with the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) as to the steps that we hope will be taken to rectify this.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PICKERING. I yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for doing so.

I rise to claim my time in opposition, but I do not intend to oppose because I believe when we are finished with this colloquy that the amendment will be withdrawn because of assurances from me and from the responsible officials in the District of Columbia.

If I may, I want to thank the gentleman for the way in which he handled this matter. First, I want everyone to know that the gentleman did not come to the floor first. The gentleman called the District of Columbia, and I want to apologize to the gentleman that the staff who handled this did not tell me that a Member of Congress had done them the courtesy of calling about a matter so that I might have become a part of this beforehand because the gentleman did exactly the right thing.

The gentleman from Mississippi went to the source of the problem to see if he was really reading correctly that disabled people who came here, for example in a wheelchair, might have to go to the DMV in order to take advantage of the same free parking that someone in a wheelchair here would have.

The staff involved simply told him the reason for the policy. The reason

for the policy is sometimes rather flagrant abuses by residents and non-residents. Usually, the nonresidents live a whole lot closer to us, I say to the gentleman, than his own constituent from Mississippi, and as a result, this matter was not resolved, and the Member did what one might expect. This was the chance then that he had to do it. It came to my attention only last night.

At that point, I thought I ought to go upstairs and talk to not the staff who apparently had been involved but to the Mayor, the chair of the City Council and the chair of the committee that has jurisdiction.

The Mayor was getting on a plane. I did not have time to talk to him in depth, but he said something to the effect, you know, Eleanor, this is the mecca of equal opportunity; I cannot imagine how we can have unequal treatment of that kind. I told him about the DMV, and he is famous for jokes about the DMV.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi's time has expired.

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Chairman, if I could strike the last word.

Ms. NORTON. I have time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not permitted under the unanimous consent agreement to strike the last word.

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

I will in a moment yield to the gentleman from Mississippi for him to respond. I just wanted to explain myself because frankly I am embarrassed by the fact that the gentleman had to call our officials.

Needless to say, everyone has gone out of their way to assure the gentleman from Mississippi and to thank him frankly for bringing the matter to our attention. I just want to read one part of the letter on behalf of the Mayor from the city administrator, the top person under the Mayor.

"We were seeking to curb abuses, not create difficulties for disabled visitors to our city. We are especially proud to be an important tourist destination receiving 20 million visitors annually. We also take pride in our policies regarding equal treatment for disabled people. I would very much appreciate your courtesy in giving me the opportunity to work with Public Works and the Environment Committee Chair Carol Schwartz and our City Council to correct the flaws you have found in this statute."

Ms. Schwartz, who is the committee chair, by the way the only Republican on the City Council, wrote, and she said that, "this was always our intent, but I also recognize that there may have been some unintended consequences." She has spoken directly to the gentleman from Mississippi, and I am grateful that she herself spoke with him.

Again, could I invite all Members, when you see something like this,

maybe we can get it done, maybe we cannot, but if you would follow the example of the gentleman from Mississippi and go directly to the source, but by the way, always tell me so I can hammer them, too; then we will try to correct such matters, to keep them from taking up the time of the House.

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding, based on our conversations, that the gentlewoman would encourage the city to do something similar to what they did when the World War II memorial was opened, and that is, to grant an emergency status to make sure that the disabled had free parking in the district. Is it the gentlewoman's intention to do so, and during the interim, until they are able to clarify the regulations, that no one would be ticketed that is disabled from out of the District who would come to visit our Nation's capital?

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the gentleman that they have represented to me, and I believe that they are sincere, that they meant no discrimination between the disabled out of state and the disabled here. Therefore, citing the precedent the gentleman himself has indicated, I will represent to him that there will be no disabled out-of-state tickets given during the time that this matter is being straightened out.

Let me also represent to the gentleman, because Members are accustomed to coming to me about tickets that should not have been issued, Members under certain circumstances may not get tickets in the District of Columbia. They sure know how to find me. I want my colleagues to know if they have any constituent who is ticketed during this interim period, they should find the Congresswoman from the District of Columbia so she can see that those tickets are not outstanding, and I represent that to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman would further yield, I want to thank the gentlewoman from the District for her very effective representation, her advocacy for her constituents. All politics is local. Nothing is more local than parking tickets; and as we go into the 4th of July, I thank the gentlewoman for her help for those who are disabled, especially our disabled veterans, to make sure that they do not face unequal or discriminatory treatment as they find their place to park on Constitution Avenue or by our monuments or wherever it may be.

Again, I thank the gentlewoman for the spirit in which we have worked together and look forward to other opportunities in the future.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, again, for the way in which he has handled this matter, and may I say as well that I thank him for bringing it to our attention. This is a

tourist destination and is frankly embarrassing that this matter was not taken care of beforehand.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I hope for the last time I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding to me.

I want to thank the ranking member for doing that, and I rise to speak about the issue of the FAA and school soundproofing funding.

I recently heard from a school in my district, the Lexington School in Queens, that was awarded Federal funding for soundproofing from the FAA, and I thank the gentleman for the time for a colloquy between himself and the ranking member and the chairman.

They have completed all of the initial investigations and are finalizing the specs as mandated by the FAA, and they anticipate obtaining bids by the end of this year. The school is now awaiting their promised soundproofing funds, which are now mysteriously being held up by the FAA because the school does not have bids in this fiscal year.

This certainly appears to be contradictory to the intent of Vision 100 legislation and FAA's own guidance on priorities for issuing discretionary funds which recognizes that a project is considered started if bids are received in the fiscal year or within 6 months from the end of the fiscal year.

I am concerned that other schools may also be waiting for delayed funding.

These soundproofing funds are vital for schools, and this money must be forthcoming.

I ask the chairman and ranking member if they will work with me to look into this concern with respect to the FAA funding for soundproofing.

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

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for raising his concerns on this matter. If there has been a slow-down in the release of Federal soundproofing dollars from the FAA, we do need to know. We appreciate the gentleman bringing this to the floor. I thank the gentleman for his comments and pledge to work with him on this issue.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York for raising the issue. I, too, am concerned about the reported slow-down in this release of funds for an obviously good cause, the release of soundproofing funds to eligible recipients, in this particular case, the Lexington School in Queens.

Though I do not know whether it is very close to La Guardia Airport or to Kennedy Airport, I, too, pledge to work with the gentleman from New York on this issue to ensure the early release of these funds.

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

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friends, the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman KNOLLENBERG) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Ranking Member OLVER), for their commitment to helping me find a solution to this FAA funding as it pertains to soundproofing.

For the record, the Lexington School is about anywhere between a quarter mile or half a mile as the crow flies from La Guardia Airport, so it is very proximate, very close; and on behalf of my constituents, I thank both gentlemen for their assistance in this.

Mr. OLVER. I did not want to put it in the flight path of La Guardia Airport, so I brought in Kennedy Airport as well.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair reminds those that cell phone use on the floor is prohibited.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by reducing the amount made available for "Department of Transportation-Surface Transportation Board-Salaries and Expenses", and increasing the amount made available for "Federal Aviation-Operations" derived from the General Fund, by \$5,000,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 29, 2005, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan reserves a point of order.

The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 1730

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to take this opportunity to discuss what I think is a very important issue.

While recognizing that this committee, the chairman and the ranking member, funded the air traffic controllers at the rate that the President asked for, at 595; and recognizing as

well that there had been additional dollars placed in FAA for additional services which might be used for air traffic controllers, and I hope that will be the case, as recently acquiring Houston Intercontinental Airport in my Congressional district, and let me also say that I support the previous colloquy of the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) on the dollars for soundproofing because all who live in the area are well aware of that need, but I wanted to quote for my colleagues the news report of the incident of yesterday: Stray Plane Sets Off Evacuation At Capitol. The last paragraph in the article in The Washington Post says "A Federal official said radio communications between the pilot and the authorities indicated the pilot ended up in a restricted area while trying to avoid bad weather."

I can only say, since it does not designate who the authorities were, that we know air traffic controllers are enormously busy. We are looking at increasingly congested skies and we are looking at overburdened and overworked air traffic controllers. In fact, in one airport in Texas, it was found that at this particular airport air traffic controllers and managers routinely covered up serious operational errors and deviations, including aircraft, for the last 7 years. The U.S. Office of Special Counsel said the controllers had allowed airplanes to fly too close to each other near the airport, and that supervisors either failed to investigate or did not report the incidents to the FAA headquarters as required. The independent Federal agency said the cover-up of controller mistakes have been jeopardizing air traffic safety.

We need more air traffic controllers, because 595, in my view, is certainly not enough. So my amendment was to offer \$5 million that was offset by the Department of Transportation's Surface Transportation Board salaries and expenses.

This amendment is about establishing priorities. And even though the amount of monies is capped off and no more monies can be allowed in that particular account, I think that is an important issue. And I hope my colleagues, as they move into the next year and the next session in this appropriations process, they will recognize that our skies are getting busier and busier, our air traffic controllers are getting tired and tired, and they need increased training and they need relief.

I want to applaud our air traffic controllers. This is a very, very, very serious business. It requires great attention to detail. It requires nerves of steel, and we understand that. But the key is that there is a great need for more than 595.

Mr. Chairman, I will submit for the RECORD, at the appropriate time, this letter that I will read: "I write this letter to support your amendment to H.R. 3058, to increase the amount made available for the Department of Trans-

portation with respect to air traffic controllers. In these times of shortages of personnel and training, this amendment would provide much-needed relief to continued budgetary shortfalls. Please accept our a gratitude for your efforts." This is the National Association of Air Traffic Specialists.

So I am hoping we will have an opportunity to work on this. The point of order, of course, refers to the capping of this particular account, and I recognize the hard work of this committee, but I think in all seriousness, besides the danger that was proposed yesterday, we do know our skies are busy with small and large planes.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment seeks to increase the "Federal Aviation Administration Operations" account on page 6 by \$5 million and would offset this amount from the "Department of Transportation-Surface Transportation Board-Salaries and Expenses" account in Title I.

This amendment is about establishing priorities. While the salaries of the staff within the Department of Transportation is of enormous concern, I would think that my colleagues would agree with me that providing funds to help navigate the ever-increasing air traffic is of a higher priority, especially given our new utilization of equipment such as we find at the Boston Terminal Radar Approach Control (TRACON)—which is America's newest FAA consolidated facility.

New technology requires adequate staffing. Therefore, my amendment would provide the necessary funds to make new employee recruitment and training possible. Problems exist within our Federal Aviation Administration, Mr. Chairman. I cite the June 24, 2005 article in the Dallas Morning News (page 1A) entitled "Agency: Air traffic errors covered up Controller at D/FW spurs inquiry into unreported close calls":

The U.S. Office of Special Counsel said the controllers had allowed airplanes to fly too close to each other near Dallas/Fort Worth International Airport and that supervisors either failed to investigate or didn't report the incidents to Federal Aviation Administration headquarters as required.

The independent federal agency said the cover-up of controller mistakes had been "jeopardizing air traffic safety."

"This was a substantial and specific danger to public safety," it said.

[Furthermore,] a number of corrective actions were taken after a March report from the Department of Transportation's Office of Inspector General substantiated . . . allegations.

Specifically, the D/FW Terminal Radar Approach Control, or TRACON, was placed on probation for two years, the center's quality assurance manager was reassigned, and one air traffic controller was decertified.

In addition, the FAA placed the facility manager, operations managers, supervisors and other controllers on probation.

This citation alone underscores major problems in the system. In addition, it highlights the fact that the jobs should not be outsourced, an issue that my colleague Mr. SANDERS has championed.

The key national security function of Air Traffic Control Specialists was evident during and immediately after the horrific 9/11 attacks. During this national tragedy, Air Traffic Control Specialists communicated crucial instructions

to planes in the air and on the ground, and were responsible for re-starting air traffic in the days afterward. Air Traffic Control Specialists also play a vital role in keeping commercial and general aviation airplanes out of restricted airspace, including the restricted airspace around the White House. And, Air Traffic Control Specialists are critical during a natural disaster. For example, when hurricanes hit the Southeast last year, the FAA closed air traffic facilities in the region, but kept Flight Service Stations open and Air Traffic Control Specialists working to ensure the safety of airline passengers.

We should be strengthening, not weakening air traffic safety. In the 1980s we had 315 Flight Service Stations across the country. Today, we only have 61, and if the FAA gets its way there will only be 23 Flight Service Stations left in this country responsible for protecting over 600,000 general aviation pilots, as well as military and commercial pilots. This could only make our Nation's airspace less secure.

Mr. Chairman, we must support our Air Traffic Controllers by providing them with the support they need. I ask that my colleagues support this amendment.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
AIR TRAFFIC SPECIALISTS,

Wheaton, Maryland, June 30, 2005.

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JACKSON LEE: I write this letter to support your amendment to H.R. 3058 to increase the amount made available for "Department of Transportation—Surface Transportation Board Salaries and Expense Federal Aviation Operations Derived from the General Fund by \$5,000,000. In these times of shortages of personnel and training this amendment would provide much needed relief to continuing budgetary shortfalls.

Please accept our gratitude for your efforts in this regard and let me know if I can be of any help in securing this amendment.

Sincerely,

KATE BREEN,
President.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I insist on my point of order, and I would like to respond in this fashion.

I raise a point of order against the amendment. The amendment proposes to increase an appropriation not authorized by law and, therefore, is in violation of clause 2(a) of rule XXI.

Although the original account funding for FAA operations is unauthorized, it was permitted to remain in the bill pursuant to the provisions of the rule that provided for the consideration of this bill. When an authorized appropriation is permitted to remain in a general appropriations bill, an amendment merely changing that amount is in order; but the rules of the House apply a "merely perfecting standard" to the items permitted to remain and do not allow the insertion of a new paragraph, not part of the original text permitted to remain, to increase a figure permitted to remain.

The amendment cannot be construed as merely perfecting and, therefore,

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Chair rule the amendment out of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does anyone wish to speak on the point of order?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I do, Mr. Chairman. Let me say that I have acknowledged the point of order by the fact that the account itself is capped and, as was indicated, the issue regarding the authorization. But I raised this amendment, and I intend to withdraw this amendment, but I raised it because the discussion and the dollars are clearly needed.

I am hoping my colleagues will see that 595 air traffic controllers are not enough for the increasingly busy skies over the United States of America. I have cited in one airport the incident of air traffic controllers being cited for routinely covering up serious operational errors and deviations involving aircraft; I have cited, of course, the support by the National Association of Air Traffic Specialists.

I think that the difficulty is that we have a cap. We have \$25 million for 595. I think we could use 1,000. Because of the budget shortfall, and because we do not have the money, we are faced with this dilemma. I happen to think the safety and security of Americans warrants increased dollars and an increased number of air traffic controllers.

I know that the busy airport I represent, Houston Intercontinental Airport, could stand additional well-trained air traffic controllers, the opportunity to give relief to air traffic controllers who, in fact, are working very hard. I am hoping, Mr. Chairman, that we will have an opportunity to work on this issue and recognize the dire needs and the crisis that we face if we do not continue to grow air traffic controllers, to train them and provide them the kind of support services necessary to protect the Nation's skies.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, did the gentleman not already do that before?

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, yes, I have done this before. In fact, I was going to apologize to the staff and the chairman of the subcommittee for destroying the good working relationship that we have had over time, and that I complimented them so broadly about earlier, by actually offering this motion to strike the last word at a point when I really was not expecting to do so.

I do know that this may have lasting implications, given the work that has

been done by Dena Baron, Cheryle Tucker, Dave Gibbons, Steve Crane, Tammy, Hughes, Kristen Jones, and David Napoliello, all of whom would dearly love to get off this floor and on to the votes that we have coming before us.

This bill has been a long slog year, and I have heard some people on the other side have had low-level headaches. There have been times here, as the afternoon has worn on, that I have nearly sunk under the table when amendments came, as long as the amendments we have had here today and yesterday, and with the votes on the rule on the day before, I think, though I may have lost a day in this process, so that there comes a point where I would be surprised if the chairman or I actually were able to remember our names. And it has been just suggested that I could also thank David Pomerantz of our staff, which is probably the only person I have not previously thanked.

And with that, Mr. Chairman, I do, in fact, apologize to the chairman and all of the staff, not only the majority staff but the minority staff as well, because the ranking member has concluded that he does not wish to speak.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE
OF THE WHOLE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order: Amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 88, noes 338, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 352]

AYES—88

Akin	Franks (AZ)	Miller (FL)
Andrews	Garrett (NJ)	Musgrave
Bachus	Gibbons	Myrick
Barrett (SC)	Gohmert	Neugebauer
Bartlett (MD)	Graves	Norwood
Barton (TX)	Gutknecht	Otter
Bass	Harris	Paul
Bean	Hart	Pence
Beauprez	Hayworth	Petri
Blackburn	Hefley	Pitts
Brady (TX)	Hensarling	Poe
Brown-Waite,	Herger	Price (GA)
Ginny	Hoekstra	Radanovich
Burton (IN)	Hostettler	Rogers (MI)
Buyer	Inglis (SC)	Rohrabacher
Cannon	Jenkins	Royce
Chabot	Jindal	Ryan (WI)
Chocola	Johnson, Sam	Ryun (KS)
Coble	Jones (NC)	Sensenbrenner
Cox	Keller	Sessions
Cubin	King (IA)	Shadegg
Davis (TN)	Lewis (KY)	Shimkus
Davis, Jo Ann	Linder	Stearns
Deal (GA)	Lungren, Daniel	Tancred
Diaz-Balart, M.	E.	Tanner
Duncan	Mack	Taylor (MS)
Feeney	Manzullo	Terry
Flake	McHenry	Thornberry
Fossella	McMorris	Westmoreland
Foxx	Mica	Wilson (SC)

NOES—338

Abercrombie	Crowley	Herseth
Ackerman	Cuellar	Higgins
Aderholt	Culberson	Hinche
Alexander	Cummings	Hinojosa
Allen	Cunningham	Hobson
Baca	Davis (AL)	Holden
Baird	Davis (CA)	Holt
Baker	Davis (FL)	Honda
Baldwin	Davis (IL)	Hooley
Barrow	Davis (KY)	Hoyer
Becerra	Davis, Tom	Hulshof
Berkley	DeFazio	Hunter
Berman	DeGette	Hyde
Berry	Delahunt	Inslee
Biggert	DeLauro	Israel
Bilirakis	DeLay	Issa
Bishop (GA)	Dent	Istook
Bishop (NY)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Jackson (IL)
Bishop (UT)	Dicks	Jackson-Lee
Blumenauer	Dingell	(TX)
Blunt	Doggett	Jefferson
Boehlert	Doolittle	Johnson (CT)
Boehner	Doyle	Johnson (IL)
Bonilla	Drake	Johnson, E. B.
Bonner	Dreier	Jones (OH)
Bono	Edwards	Kanjorski
Boozman	Ehlers	Kaptur
Boren	Emanuel	Kelly
Boswell	Emerson	Kennedy (MN)
Boucher	Engel	Kennedy (RI)
Boustany	English (PA)	Kildee
Boyd	Eshoo	Kilpatrick (MI)
Bradley (NH)	Etheridge	Kind
Brady (PA)	Evans	King (NY)
Brown (OH)	Farr	Kirk
Brown (SC)	Fattah	Kline
Brown, Corrine	Ferguson	Knollenberg
Burgess	Filner	Kolbe
Butterfield	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Kucinich
Calvert	Foley	Kuhl (NY)
Camp	Forbes	LaHood
Cantor	Ford	Langevin
Capito	Fortenberry	Lantos
Capps	Frank (MA)	Larsen (WA)
Capuano	Frelinghuysen	Larsen (CT)
Cardin	Gallely	Latham
Cardoza	Gerlach	LaTourrette
Carnahan	Gilchrist	Leach
Carson	Gillmor	Lee
Carter	Gingrey	Levin
Case	Gonzalez	Lewis (CA)
Castle	Goode	Lewis (GA)
Chandler	Goodlatte	Lipinski
Clay	Gordon	LoBiondo
Cleaver	Granger	Loftgren, Zoe
Clyburn	Green (WI)	Lowe
Cole (OK)	Green, Al	Lucas
Conaway	Green, Gene	Lynch
Conyers	Grijalva	Maloney
Cooper	Gutierrez	Marchant
Costa	Hall	Markey
Costello	Hastings (FL)	Marshall
Cramer	Hastings (WA)	Matheson
Crenshaw	Hayes	Matsui

McCarthy	Pelosi	Smith (TX)
McCaul (TX)	Peterson (MN)	Smith (WA)
McCollum (MN)	Pickering	Snyder
McCotter	Platts	Sodrel
McCrery	Pombo	Solis
McDermott	Pomeroy	Souder
McGovern	Porter	Spratt
McHugh	Price (NC)	Stark
McIntyre	Pryce (OH)	Strickland
McKeon	Putnam	Stupak
McKinney	Rahall	Sullivan
McNulty	Ramstad	Sweeney
Meehan	Rangel	Tauscher
Meek (FL)	Regula	Taylor (NC)
Meeks (NY)	Rehberg	Thomas
Melancon	Reichert	Thompson (CA)
Menendez	Renzi	Thompson (MS)
Michaud	Reyes	Tiahrt
Millender-	Reynolds	Tiberi
McDonald	Rogers (AL)	Tierney
Miller (MI)	Rogers (KY)	Towns
Miller (NC)	Ros-Lehtinen	Turner
Miller, Gary	Rothman	Udall (CO)
Miller, George	Roybal-Allard	Udall (NM)
Mollohan	Ruppersberger	Upton
Moore (KS)	Rush	Van Hollen
Moore (WI)	Ryan (OH)	Velazquez
Moran (KS)	Sabo	Viscosky
Moran (VA)	Salazar	Walden (OR)
Murphy	Sánchez, Linda	Walsh
Murtha	T.	Wamp
Nadler	Sanchez, Loretta	Wasserman
Napolitano	Sanders	Schultz
Neal (MA)	Saxton	Watson
Ney	Schakowsky	Watt
Northup	Schwartz (PA)	Waxman
Nunes	Schwarz (MI)	Weiner
Nussle	Scott (GA)	Weldon (FL)
Oberstar	Scott (VA)	Weldon (PA)
Obey	Serrano	Weller
Oliver	Shaw	Wexler
Ortiz	Shays	Whitfield
Osborne	Sherman	Wicker
Owens	Sherwood	Wilson (NM)
Oxley	Shuster	Wolf
Pallone	Simmons	Woolsey
Pascrell	Simpson	Wu
Pastor	Skelton	Wynn
Payne	Slaughter	Young (AK)
Pearce	Smith (NJ)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Everett	Peterson (PA)	Waters
Harman	Ross	
Kingston	Schiff	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN
The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. TERRY)
(during the vote). Members are advised
there are 2 minutes remaining in this
vote.

□ 1805

Messrs. BECERRA, SPRATT,
ISRAEL, BERMAN, and ABER-
CROMBIE changed their vote from
“aye” to “no.”

Mrs. MYRICK and Messrs. COBLE,
POE, and SESSIONS changed their
vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. KILPATRICK OF
MICHIGAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KIL-
PATRICK) on which further proceedings
were postponed and on which the ayes
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded
vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be
a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 333, noes 92,
not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 353]

AYES—333

Abercrombie	Feeney	Matsui
Ackerman	Ferguson	McCarthy
Aderholt	Filner	McCaul (TX)
Akin	Fitzpatrick (PA)	McCollum (MN)
Allen	Foley	McCotter
Andrews	Forbes	McGovern
Baca	Ford	McHenry
Baldwin	Fortenberry	McHugh
Barrett (SC)	Fossella	McIntyre
Barrow	Fox	McKeon
Bass	Frank (MA)	McKinney
Bean	Franks (AZ)	McNulty
Becerra	Gallely	Meehan
Berkley	Gerlach	Meek (FL)
Berry	Gibbons	Meeks (NY)
Bilirakis	Gillmor	Melancon
Bishop (GA)	Gingrey	Menendez
Bishop (NY)	Gohmert	Mica
Bishop (UT)	Gonzalez	Michaud
Blackburn	Goode	Millender-
Bonner	Goodlatte	McDonald
Boozman	Gordon	Miller (FL)
Boren	Green (WI)	Miller (MI)
Boswell	Green, Al	Miller (NC)
Boucher	Green, Gene	Miller, Gary
Boyd	Grijalva	Miller, George
Bradley (NH)	Gutierrez	Mollohan
Brady (PA)	Gutknecht	Moore (KS)
Brown (OH)	Harris	Moore (WI)
Brown (SC)	Hart	Moran (KS)
Brown, Corrine	Hastings (FL)	Murphy
Brown-Waite,	Hayworth	Musgrave
Ginny	Hefley	Myrick
Burton (IN)	Herger	Nadler
Butterfield	Herseth	Napolitano
Buyer	Higgins	Neal (MA)
Calvert	Hinche	Ney
Camp	Hinojosa	Northup
Capito	Hobson	Norwood
Capps	Holden	Nunes
Capuano	Holt	Nussle
Cardin	Hooley	Oberstar
Cardoza	Hostettler	Obey
Carnahan	Hoyer	Oliver
Carson	Hunter	Ortiz
Case	Hyde	Osborne
Castle	Inglis (SC)	Otter
Chabot	Israel	Owens
Chandler	Issa	Pallone
Clay	Jackson (IL)	Pascrell
Cleaver	Jackson-Lee	Pastor
Clyburn	(TX)	Payne
Coble	Jefferson	Pearce
Conyers	Jenkins	Pelosi
Costa	Johnson, E. B.	Pence
Costello	Johnson, Sam	Peterson (MN)
Cramer	Jones (NC)	Pickering
Crenshaw	Jones (OH)	Pitts
Crowley	Kanjorski	Platts
Cubin	Kaptur	Poe
Cuellar	Keller	Pombo
Culberson	Kelly	Pomeroy
Cummings	Kennedy (MN)	Porter
Cunningham	Kennedy (RI)	Putnam
Davis (AL)	Kildee	Radanovich
Davis (CA)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Rahall
Davis (FL)	Kind	Ramstad
Davis (IL)	King (IA)	Rangel
Davis (TN)	Klaine	Regula
Davis, Jo Ann	Kucinich	Rehberg
Deal (GA)	Kuhl (NY)	Reichert
DeFazio	LaHood	Renzi
DeGette	Langevin	Reyes
DeLauro	Lantos	Reynolds
Dent	Larsen (CT)	Rogers (AL)
Diaz-Balart, L.	LaTourrette	Rogers (KY)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Lee	Rogers (MI)
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Rohrabacher
Doolittle	Lewis (KY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Doyle	Linder	Rothman
Drake	Lipinski	Roybal-Allard
Duncan	LoBiondo	Royce
Edwards	Lowe	Ruppersberger
Emanuel	Lucas	Rush
Emerson	Lynch	Ryan (OH)
Engel	Maloney	Ryun (KS)
English (PA)	Manzullo	Sabo
Eshoo	Marchant	Salazar
Etheridge	Markey	Sánchez, Linda
Evans	Marshall	T.
Fattah	Matheson	Sanchez, Loretta
		Sanders

Saxton
Schakowsky
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns

Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez

Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson
Watt
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Andrews
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

A recorded vote was ordered.
The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 208, noes 215, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 354]

AYES—208

Alexander
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Berman
Biggert
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Burgess
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chocola
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Davis (KY)
Davis, Tom
Delahunt
Dicks
Doggett
Dreier
Ehlers

NOES—92

Farr
Flake
Frelinghuysen
Garrett (NJ)
Gilchrest
Granger
Graves
Hall
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hensarling
Hoekstra
Honda
Hulshof
Inlee
Istook
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
King (NY)
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lungren, Daniel
E.
McCrery

McDermott
McMorris
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Neugebauer
Oxley
Paul
Petri
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Stark
Thomas
Thornberry
Upton
Walsh
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—8

Cox
Everett
Harman

Kingston
Schiff
Waters
Ross

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1814

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut and Miss MCMORRIS changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina and Mr. WELLER changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Caroza
Carmahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene

NOES—215

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt

Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inlee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NY)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar

Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Guterman
Hastings
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Reyes
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—10

Everett
Harman
Kingston
Peterson (PA)

Ross
Schiff
Sherwood
Shuster

□ 1822

Mr. WAXMAN changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF OHIO

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 141, noes 284, not voting 8, as follows:

Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering

Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryan (KS)
Saxton
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Stearns
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiberi
Turner
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

[Roll No. 355]

AYES—141

Ackerman	Hefley	Oberstar
Allen	Herseeth	Olver
Baldwin	Higgins	Ortiz
Barrow	Hinchee	Ortiz
Bartlett (MD)	Hinojosa	Ottner
Becerra	Hoekstra	Owens
Berkley	Hoyer	Pallone
Berman	Israel	Pastor
Berry	Jackson (IL)	Paul
Bishop (NY)	Jackson-Lee	Payne
Blumenauer	(TX)	Pelosi
Boswell	Johnson, E. B.	Pomeroy
Brady (PA)	Jones (NC)	Rangel
Brown (OH)	Jones (OH)	Reichert
Brown, Corrine	Kennedy (RI)	Royal-Allard
Burton (IN)	Kildee	Ruppersberger
Butterfield	Kilpatrick (MI)	Rush
Capps	King (IA)	Ryan (OH)
Cardin	Kucinich	Sabo
Cardoza	Langevin	Salazar
Carnahan	Lantos	Sanchez, Linda
Carson	Larsen (WA)	T.
Case	Larson (CT)	Sanchez, Loretta
Chandler	Lee	Sanders
Conyers	Levin	Schakowsky
Costello	Lewis (GA)	Scott (GA)
Crowley	Lipinski	Serrano
Cummings	Lowey	Slaughter
Davis (FL)	Lynch	Solis
Davis (IL)	Maloney	Stark
DeFazio	Manzullo	Strickland
Delahunt	Matsui	Stupak
DeLauro	McCarthy	Tancredo
Doggett	McCollum (MN)	Tauscher
Edwards	McDermott	Taylor (MS)
Emanuel	McKinney	Tierney
Emerson	McNulty	Udall (NM)
Evans	Meehan	Van Hollen
Farr	Michaud	Velázquez
Fattah	Millender-	Visclosky
Filner	McDonald	Wasserman
Ford	Miller (NC)	Schultz
Gibbons	Miller, George	Watson
Green, Al	Mollohan	Watt
Green, Gene	Moran (VA)	Weiner
Grijalva	Nadler	Wexler
Gutierrez	Napolitano	Woolsey
Gutknecht	Neal (MA)	Wynn
Hastings (FL)	Northup	

NOES—284

Abercrombie	Chabot	Foley
Aderholt	Chocola	Forbes
Akin	Clay	Fortenberry
Alexander	Cleaver	Fossella
Andrews	Clyburn	Fox
Baca	Coble	Frank (MA)
Bachus	Cole (OK)	Franks (AZ)
Baird	Conaway	Frelinghuysen
Baker	Cooper	Gallely
Barrett (SC)	Costa	Garrett (NJ)
Barton (TX)	Cox	Gerlach
Bass	Cramer	Gilchrest
Bean	Crenshaw	Gillmor
Beauprez	Cubin	Gingrey
Biggert	Cuellar	Gohmert
Bilirakis	Culberson	Gonzalez
Bishop (GA)	Cunningham	Goode
Bishop (UT)	Davis (AL)	Goodlatte
Blackburn	Davis (CA)	Gordon
Blunt	Davis (KY)	Granger
Boehlert	Davis (TN)	Graves
Boehner	Davis, Jo Ann	Green (WI)
Bonilla	Davis, Tom	Hall
Bonner	Deal (GA)	Harris
Bono	DeGette	Hart
Boozman	DeLay	Hastings (WA)
Boren	Dent	Hayes
Boucher	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hayworth
Boustany	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hensarling
Boyd	Dicks	Heger
Bradley (NH)	Dingell	Hobson
Brady (TX)	Doolittle	Holden
Brown (SC)	Doyle	Holt
Brown-Waite,	Drake	Honda
Ginny	Dreier	Hooley
Burgess	Duncan	Hostettler
Buyer	Ehlers	Hulshof
Calvert	Engel	Hunter
Camp	English (PA)	Hyde
Cannon	Eshoo	Inglis (SC)
Cantor	Etheridge	Inslee
Caputo	Feeney	Issa
Capuano	Ferguson	Istook
Carter	Fitzpatrick (PA)	Jefferson
Castle	Flake	Jenkins

Jindal	Moore (WI)	Shadegg
Johnson (CT)	Moran (KS)	Shaw
Johnson (IL)	Murphy	Shays
Johnson, Sam	Murtha	Sherman
Kind	Musgrave	Sherwood
Kaptur	Myrick	Shimkus
Keller	Neugebauer	Shuster
Kelly	Ney	Simmons
Kennedy (MN)	Norwood	Simpson
Kind	Nunes	Skelton
King (NY)	Nussle	Smith (NJ)
Kirk	Osborne	Smith (TX)
Kline	Oxley	Smith (WA)
Knollenberg	Pascrell	Snyder
Kolbe	Pearce	Sodrel
Kuhl (NY)	Pence	Souder
LaHood	Peterson (MN)	Spratt
Latham	Petri	Stearns
LaTourette	Pickering	Sullivan
Leach	Pitts	Sweeney
Lewis (CA)	Platts	Tanner
Lewis (KY)	Poe	Taylor (NC)
Linder	Pombo	Terry
LoBiondo	Porter	Thomas
Lofgren, Zoe	Price (GA)	Thompson (CA)
Lucas	Price (NC)	Thompson (MS)
Lungren, Daniel	Pryce (OH)	Thornberry
E.	Putnam	Tiahrt
Mack	Radanovich	Tjiberi
Marchant	Rahall	Towns
Markey	Ramstad	Turner
Marshall	Regula	Udall (CO)
Matheson	Rehberg	Upton
McCaul (TX)	Renzi	Walden (OR)
McCotter	Reyes	Walsh
McCrary	Reynolds	Wamp
McGovern	Rogers (AL)	Waxman
McHenry	Rogers (KY)	Weldon (FL)
McHugh	Rogers (MI)	Weldon (PA)
McIntyre	Rohrabacher	Weller
McKeon	Ros-Lehtinen	Westmoreland
McMorris	Rothman	Whitfield
Meek (FL)	Royce	Wicker
Meeks (NY)	Ryan (WI)	Wilson (NM)
Melancon	Ryun (KS)	Wilson (SC)
Menendez	Saxton	Wolf
Mica	Schwartz (PA)	Wu
Miller (FL)	Schwarz (MI)	Young (AK)
Miller (MI)	Scott (VA)	Young (FL)
Miller, Gary	Sensenbrenner	
Moore (KS)	Sessions	

NOT VOTING—8

Everett	Obey	Schiff
Harman	Peterson (PA)	Waters
Kingston	Ross	

□ 1829

Messrs. WAXMAN, SMITH of Washington, MARKEY and MCGOVERN changed their vote from “aye” to “no.” So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 192, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 356]

AYES—233

Abercrombie	Allen	Baca
Ackerman	Andrews	Baird

Baldwin	Gutierrez	Obey
Barrow	Hall	Olver
Bean	Hastings (FL)	Ortiz
Becerra	Hayworth	Osborne
Berkley	Herseth	Owens
Berman	Higgins	Pallone
Berry	Hinchee	Pascrell
Bilirakis	Hinojosa	Pastor
Bishop (GA)	Holden	Payne
Bishop (NY)	Holt	Pearce
Blumenauer	Honda	Pelosi
Boren	Hooley	Pickering
Boswell	Hoyer	Platts
Boucher	Hulshof	Poe
Boyd	Inslee	Pomeroy
Brady (PA)	Israel	Porter
Brown (OH)	Jackson (IL)	Price (NC)
Brown, Corrine	Jackson-Lee	Rahall
Butterfield	(TX)	Ramstad
Capps	Jefferson	Rangel
Cardin	Johnson (IL)	Reichert
Cardoza	Johnson, E. B.	Renzi
Carnahan	Jones (OH)	Reyes
Carson	Kanjorski	Ros-Lehtinen
Case	Kaptur	Rothman
Chandler	Kelly	Royal-Allard
Clay	Kennedy (RI)	Ruppersberger
Cleaver	Kildee	Rush
Clyburn	Kilpatrick (MI)	Ryan (OH)
Coble	Kind	Salazar
Conyers	King (IA)	Sanchez, Linda
Cooper	King (NY)	T.
Costa	Kucinich	Sanchez, Loretta
Costello	Langevin	Sanders
Cramer	Lantos	Schakowsky
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Schwartz (PA)
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Scott (GA)
Cummings	Lee	Scott (VA)
Davis (AL)	Levin	Serrano
Davis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Shays
Davis (FL)	Lipinski	Sherman
Davis (IL)	Lofgren, Zoe	Shuster
Davis (TN)	Lowey	Simmons
Davis, Jo Ann	Lynch	Skelton
DeFazio	Maloney	Slaughter
DeGette	Manzullo	Smith (NJ)
Delahunt	Markey	Snyder
DeLauro	Marshall	Solis
Dent	Matheson	Spratt
Diaz-Balart, L.	Matsui	Stark
Dicks	McCarthy	Strickland
Dingell	McCollum (MN)	Stupak
Doggett	McCotter	Tanner
Doyle	McDermott	Tauscher
Edwards	McGovern	Taylor (MS)
Emanuel	McIntyre	Taylor (NC)
Engel	McKinney	Terry
Eshoo	McNulty	Thompson (CA)
Etheridge	Meehan	Thompson (MS)
Evans	Meek (FL)	Tierney
Farr	Meeks (NY)	Towns
Fattah	Melancon	Udall (CO)
Filner	Menendez	Udall (NM)
Fitzpatrick (PA)	Michaud	Van Hollen
Forbes	Millender-	Velázquez
Ford	McDonald	Visclosky
Fortenberry	Miller (NC)	Wasserman
Frank (MA)	Miller, George	Schultz
Gerlach	Mollohan	Watson
Gibbons	Moore (KS)	Watt
Gonzalez	Moore (WI)	Waxman
Goode	Moran (KS)	Weiner
Gordon	Moran (VA)	Weldon (PA)
Graves	Murtha	Wexler
Green, Al	Nadler	Woolsey
Green, Gene	Napolitano	Wu
Grijalva	Neal (MA)	Wynn

NOES—192

Aderholt	Bradley (NH)	Cox
Akin	Brady (TX)	Crenshaw
Alexander	Brown (SC)	Cubin
Bachus	Brown-Waite,	Culberson
Baker	Ginny	Cunningham
Barrett (SC)	Burgess	Davis (KY)
Bartlett (MD)	Burton (IN)	Davis, Tom
Barton (TX)	Buyer	Deal (GA)
Bass	Calvert	DeLay
Beauprez	Camp	Diaz-Balart, M.
Biggert	Cannon	Doolittle
Bishop (UT)	Cantor	Drake
Blackburn	Capito	Dreier
Blunt	Capuano	Duncan
Boehlert	Carter	Ehlers
Boehner	Castle	Emerson
Bonilla	Chabot	English (PA)
Bonner	Chocola	Feeney
Bono	Cole (OK)	Ferguson
Boustany	Conaway	Flake

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 3058)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION					
Office of the Secretary					
Salaries and expenses.....	86,536	87,046	84,913	-1,623	-2,133
Immediate Office of the Secretary.....	(2,202)	---	(2,198)	(-4)	(+2,198)
Immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary.....	(699)	---	(698)	(-1)	(+698)
Immediate office of the Secretary and Deputy Office of the General Counsel.....	(15,272)	---	(15,183)	(-89)	(+15,183)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Aviation Office of the Under Secretary for Transportation Policy.....	(12,526)	---	(11,680)	(-846)	(+11,680)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs.....	(8,504)	---	(7,593)	(-911)	(+7,593)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs.....	(2,297)	---	(2,052)	(-245)	(+2,052)
Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration.....	(23,249)	---	(23,139)	(-110)	(+23,139)
Office of Public Affairs.....	(1,914)	---	(1,910)	(-4)	(+1,910)
Executive Secretariat.....	(1,444)	---	(1,442)	(-2)	(+1,442)
Board of Contract Appeals.....	(698)	---	(697)	(-1)	(+697)
Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization.....	(1,268)	---	(1,265)	(-3)	(+1,265)
Office of Intelligence and Security.....	(2,037)	---	(2,033)	(-4)	(+2,033)
Office of the Chief Information Officer.....	(11,301)	---	(11,895)	(+594)	(+11,895)
Office of emergency transportation.....	(3,125)	---	(3,128)	(+3)	(+3,128)
User fees.....	(-2,500)	(-2,500)	(-2,500)	---	---
Spending of user fees.....	(2,500)	(2,500)	(2,500)	---	---
Subtotal.....	(86,536)	(87,046)	(84,913)	(-1,623)	(-2,133)
Office of Civil Rights.....	8,630	8,550	8,550	-80	---
Rescission of excess compensation for air carriers.....	-235,000	---	---	+235,000	---
Transportation planning, research, and development....	19,840	9,030	40,613	+20,773	+31,583
Working capital fund.....	(149,846)	---	(120,014)	(-29,832)	(+120,014)
Minority business resource center program.....	893	900	900	+7	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(18,367)	(18,367)	(18,367)	---	---
Minority business outreach.....	2,976	3,000	3,000	+24	---
New headquarters building.....	67,456	100,000	100,000	+32,544	---
Payments to air carriers (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)	51,584	---	54,000	+2,416	+54,000
Total, Office of the Secretary.....	237,915	208,526	291,976	+54,061	+83,450
Federal Aviation Administration					
Operations.....	7,712,800	8,051,000	8,042,920	+330,120	-8,080
Flight Service Stations A-76 transition.....	---	150,000	150,000	+150,000	---
Subtotal.....	7,712,800	8,201,000	8,192,920	+480,120	-8,080
Facilities & equipment (Airport & Airway Trust Fund)..	2,519,680	2,448,000	3,053,000	+533,320	+605,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324).....	5,100	---	---	-5,100	---
Research, engineering, and development (Airport and Airway Trust Fund).....	129,880	130,000	130,000	+120	---
Grants-in-aid for airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund)(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(2,800,000)	(3,300,000)	(3,600,000)	(+800,000)	(+300,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(3,472,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,600,000)	(+128,000)	(+600,000)
Small community air service pilot program.....	(19,840)	---	(20,000)	(+160)	(+20,000)
2006 F&E Pop-up contract authority.....	---	605,000	---	---	-605,000
Rescission of contract authority (2006 F&E Pop-up)	---	-605,000	---	---	+605,000
Rescission of contract authority (2006 AIP).....	---	-600,000	---	---	+600,000
Rescission of contract authority (prior yr Pop-up)	-265,000	-469,000	-469,000	-204,000	---
Emergency assistance to airports (Airport and Airway Trust Fund) (P.L. 108-324).....	25,000	---	---	-25,000	---
Subtotal.....	(3,232,000)	(1,931,000)	(3,131,000)	(-101,000)	(+1,200,000)

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 3058)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
War risk insurance (extension).....	-50,000	---	-80,000	-30,000	-80,000
Total, Federal Aviation Administration.....	10,342,460	11,384,000	11,295,920	+953,460	-88,080
(Limitations on obligations).....	(3,422,000)	(3,000,000)	(3,600,000)	(+128,000)	(+600,000)
Rescissions of contract authority.....	-265,000	-1,674,000	-469,000	-204,000	+1,205,000
Total budgetary resources.....	(13,549,460)	(12,710,000)	(14,426,920)	(+877,460)	(+1,716,920)
Federal Highway Administration					
Limitation on administrative expenses.....	(343,728)	(367,638)	(359,529)	(+15,801)	(-8,109)
Federal-aid highways (Highway Trust Fund):					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(36,000,000)	(+1,000,000)	(+1,000,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(34,422,400)	(34,700,000)	(36,287,100)	(+1,864,700)	(+1,587,100)
(Exempt contract authority).....	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	---	---
(Transfer to NHTSA).....	(-156,127)	---	---	(+156,127)	---
Rescission of contract authority (Highway Trust Fund).	-520,277	---	---	+520,277	---
Appalachian development highway system.....	79,360	---	---	-79,360	---
Emergency relief programs (Highway Trust Fund).....	735,072	---	---	-735,072	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324).....	1,202,000	---	---	-1,202,000	---
Rescission of contract authority (Hwy Trust Fund).....	-741,000	---	---	+741,000	---
TIFIA (rescission of contract authority).....	-100,000	---	---	+100,000	---
Belleair causeway bridge.....	33,728	---	---	-33,728	---
Unobligated balances(rescission of contract authority)	-14,408	---	---	+14,408	---
Unobligated balances (rescission).....	-2,000	---	---	+2,000	---
Total, Federal Highway Administration.....	2,050,160	---	---	-2,050,160	---
(Limitations on obligations).....	(34,422,400)	(34,700,000)	(36,287,100)	(+1,864,700)	(+1,587,100)
(Exempt contract authority).....	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	---	---
Rescissions.....	-2,000	---	---	+2,000	---
Rescissions of contract authority.....	-1,375,685	---	---	+1,375,685	---
Total budgetary resources.....	(35,833,875)	(35,439,000)	(37,026,100)	(+1,192,225)	(+1,587,100)
Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration					
Motor carrier safety (limitation on administrative					
expenses)(liquidation of contract authorization)....	(257,547)	---	---	(-257,547)	---
(Limitation on obligations).....	(255,487)	---	---	(-255,487)	---
National motor carrier safety program (Highway Trust					
Fund)(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(190,000)	---	(286,000)	(+96,000)	(+286,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(188,480)	---	(286,000)	(+97,520)	(+286,000)
Motor carrier safety grants (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	---	(232,000)	---	---	(-232,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	---	(232,000)	---	---	(-232,000)
Motor carrier safety operations and programs (Highway					
Trust Fund)(Liquidation of contract authorization)..	---	(233,000)	(215,000)	(+215,000)	(-18,000)
(Limitation on obligations).....	---	(233,000)	(215,000)	(+215,000)	(-18,000)
Total, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Admin.....	---	---	---	---	---
(Limitations on obligations).....	(446,027)	(465,000)	(501,000)	(+54,973)	(+36,000)
Total budgetary resources.....	(446,027)	(465,000)	(501,000)	(+54,973)	(+36,000)
National Highway Traffic Safety Administration					
Operations and research.....	---	---	152,367	+152,367	+152,367
Operations and research (Highway trust fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(72,000)	(227,367)	(75,000)	(+3,000)	(-152,367)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(71,424)	(227,367)	(75,000)	(+3,576)	(-152,367)
(Transfer from FHA).....	(156,127)	---	---	(-156,127)	---
National Driver Register (Highway trust fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(3,600)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(+400)	---
(Limitation on obligations).....	(3,571)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(+429)	---

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 3058)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Highway traffic safety grants (Highway Trust Fund)					
(Liquidation of contract authorization).....	(225,000)	(465,000)	(551,000)	(+326,000)	(+86,000)
(Limitation on obligations):					
Highway safety programs (Sec. 402).....	(163,680)	(172,000)	(229,000)	(+65,320)	(+57,000)
Formula grants (Sec. 402(k)).....	---	(183,000)	---	---	(-183,000)
Formula grants (Sec. 402(l)).....	---	(50,000)	---	---	(-50,000)
Occupant protection incentive grants (Sec. 405). Alcohol-impaired driving countermeasures grants (Sec. 410).....	(19,840)	---	(136,000)	(+116,160)	(+136,000)
Emergency medical services grants (Sec. 407)....	(39,680)	---	(129,000)	(+89,320)	(+129,000)
State traffic safety information system improvement grants (Sec. 412).....	---	(10,000)	---	---	(-10,000)
High visibility enforcement.....	---	(50,000)	(30,000)	(+30,000)	(-20,000)
Child safety and booster seat grants.....	---	---	(15,000)	(+15,000)	(+15,000)
Motorcyclist safety.....	---	---	(6,000)	(+6,000)	(+6,000)
Motorcyclist safety.....	---	---	(6,000)	(+6,000)	(+6,000)
Subtotal.....	(223,200)	(465,000)	(551,000)	(+327,800)	(+86,000)
Total, National Highway Traffic Safety Admin..					
(Limitations on obligations).....	---	---	152,367	+152,367	+152,367
Total budgetary resources.....	(298,195)	(696,367)	(630,000)	(+331,805)	(-66,367)
Total budgetary resources.....	(298,195)	(696,367)	(782,367)	(+484,172)	(+86,000)
Federal Railroad Administration					
Safety and operations.....	138,651	145,949	145,949	+7,298	---
Railroad research and development.....	35,737	46,325	26,325	-9,412	-20,000
Railroad rehabilitation and improvement program.....	6,000	---	---	-6,000	---
Next generation high-speed rail.....	19,493	---	10,165	-9,328	+10,165
Alaska Railroad rehabilitation.....	24,800	---	---	-24,800	---
Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.....	1,207,264	360,000	550,000	-657,264	+190,000
Total, Federal Railroad Administration.....	1,431,945	552,274	732,439	-699,506	+180,165
Federal Transit Administration					
Administrative expenses, general fund.....	---	83,500	---	---	-83,500
Administrative expenses.....	9,672	---	12,000	+2,328	+12,000
Administrative expenses (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account)(limitation on obligations).....					
Office of the Administrator.....	(67,704)	---	(68,000)	(+296)	(+68,000)
Office of Chief Counsel.....	(892)	---	(989)	(+97)	(+989)
Office of Civil Rights.....	(4,067)	---	(4,140)	(+73)	(+4,140)
Office of Communications and Congressional Affairs.....	(2,989)	---	(3,113)	(+124)	(+3,113)
Office of Budget and Policy.....	(1,233)	---	(1,276)	(+43)	(+1,276)
Office of Planning.....	(6,874)	---	(7,123)	(+249)	(+7,123)
Office of Program Management.....	(4,138)	---	(4,155)	(+17)	(+4,155)
Office of Demonstration and Innovation.....	(7,337)	---	(7,916)	(+579)	(+7,916)
Office of Administration.....	(4,608)	---	(4,712)	(+104)	(+4,712)
Central Account.....	(6,468)	---	(7,284)	(+816)	(+7,284)
Regional offices.....	(16,302)	---	(17,884)	(+1,582)	(+17,884)
National Transit database.....	(19,988)	---	(21,408)	(+1,420)	(+21,408)
National Transit database.....	(2,480)	---	---	(-2,480)	---
Subtotal.....	(77,376)	---	(80,000)	(+2,624)	(+80,000)
Formula grants.....	499,990	---	662,550	+162,560	+662,550
Formula grants (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account)(limitation on obligations).....					
Formula grants and research (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account)(limitation on obligations).....	(3,499,928)	---	(3,754,450)	(+254,522)	(+3,754,450)
Formula grants and research (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account)(limitation on obligations).....	---	(6,135,000)	---	---	(-6,135,000)
Subtotal.....	(3,999,918)	(6,135,000)	(4,417,000)	(+417,082)	(-1,718,000)
University transportation research.....	744	---	1,200	+456	+1,200
University transportation research (Highway Trust Fund Mass Transit Account)(limitation on obligations)....					
University transportation research (Highway Trust Fund Mass Transit Account)(limitation on obligations)....	(5,208)	---	(6,800)	(+1,592)	(+6,800)
Subtotal.....	(5,952)	---	(8,000)	(+2,048)	(+8,000)

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 3058)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Transit planning and research.....	15,872	---	24,049	+8,177	+24,049
Transit planning and research (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account)(limitation on obligations)....	(111,104)	---	(136,276)	(+25,172)	(+136,276)
Rural transportation assistance.....	(5,208)	---	---	(-5,208)	---
National transit institute.....	(3,968)	---	---	(-3,968)	---
Transit cooperative research.....	(8,184)	---	---	(-8,184)	---
Planning (TEA-LU).....	---	---	(103,325)	(+103,325)	(+103,325)
Research (TEA-LU).....	---	---	(57,000)	(+57,000)	(+57,000)
Metropolitan planning.....	(59,903)	---	---	(-59,903)	---
State planning.....	(12,513)	---	---	(-12,513)	---
National planning and research.....	(37,200)	---	---	(-37,200)	---
Subtotal.....	(126,976)	---	(160,325)	(+33,349)	(+160,325)
Trust fund share of expenses (Highway Trust Fund) (liquidation of contract authorization).....	(6,744,500)	(689,700)	(7,209,700)	(+465,200)	(+6,520,000)
Capital investment grants.....	414,014	---	546,251	+132,237	+546,251
Capital investment grants (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account)(limitation on obligations).....	(2,898,100)	---	(3,095,424)	(+197,324)	(+3,095,424)
Major capital investment grants.....	---	872,800	---	---	-872,800
Major capital investment grants (Highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account)(limitation on obligations)....	---	(689,700)	---	---	(-689,700)
Subtotal.....	(3,312,114)	(1,562,500)	(3,641,675)	(+329,561)	(+2,079,175)
Fixed guideway modernization.....	(1,204,684)	(1,531,250)	(1,386,670)	(+181,986)	(-144,580)
Buses and bus-related facilities.....	(669,600)	---	(693,335)	(+23,735)	(+693,335)
New starts.....	(1,437,830)	---	(1,561,670)	(+123,840)	(+1,561,670)
Metropolitan and statewide planning activities..	---	(31,250)	---	---	(-31,250)
Subtotal.....	(3,312,114)	(1,562,500)	(3,641,675)	(+329,561)	(+2,079,175)
Job access and reverse commute grants.....	15,500	---	26,250	+10,750	+26,250
Job access and reverse commute grants (Hwy Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account)(limitation on obligations)....	(108,500)	---	(148,750)	(+40,250)	(+148,750)
Subtotal.....	(124,000)	---	(175,000)	(+51,000)	(+175,000)
Total, Federal Transit Administration.....	955,792	956,300	1,272,300	+316,508	+316,000
(Limitations on obligations).....	(6,690,544)	(6,824,700)	(7,209,700)	(+519,156)	(+385,000)
Total budgetary resources.....	(7,646,336)	(7,781,000)	(8,482,000)	(+835,664)	(+701,000)
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation					
Operations and maintenance (Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund).....	15,773	8,000	16,284	+511	+8,284
Spending from proposed mandatory user fee.....	---	8,284	---	---	-8,284
Total, Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corp...	15,773	16,284	16,284	+511	---
Maritime Administration					
Maritime security program.....	97,910	156,000	156,000	+58,090	---
Operations and training.....	108,602	113,650	112,336	+3,734	-1,314
Ship disposal.....	21,443	21,000	21,000	-443	---
Maritime Guaranteed Loan (Title XI) Program Account:					
Administrative expenses.....	4,726	3,526	3,526	-1,200	---
National defense tank vessel construction program.....	74,400	---	---	-74,400	---
Rescission.....	---	-74,400	---	---	+74,400
Ship construction (rescission).....	-1,979	---	-2,071	-92	-2,071
Total, Maritime Administration.....	305,102	219,776	290,791	-14,311	+71,015
Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration					
Hazardous materials safety.....	---	26,324	26,183	+26,183	-141

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 3058)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Administrative expenses.....	---	16,382	16,382	+16,382	---
Pipeline Safety Fund.....	---	645	645	+645	---
Subtotal.....	---	17,027	17,027	+17,027	---
Pipeline safety:					
Pipeline Safety Fund.....	54,331	54,165	57,860	+3,529	+3,695
Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund.....	14,880	19,000	15,000	+120	-4,000
Subtotal.....	69,211	73,165	72,860	+3,649	-305
Emergency preparedness grants:					
Emergency preparedness fund.....	198	200	200	+2	---
Limitation on emergency preparedness fund.....	(14,300)	---	(14,300)	---	(+14,300)
Total, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration.....	69,409	116,716	116,270	+46,861	-446
=====					
Research and Innovative Technology Administration					
Research and development.....	---	6,274	4,326	+4,326	-1,948
Research and special programs.....	46,738	---	---	-46,738	---
(By transfer).....	(645)	---	---	(-645)	---
Total, Research and Innovative Technology Admin.	46,738	6,274	4,326	-42,412	-1,948
=====					
Office of Inspector General					
Salaries and expenses.....	58,528	62,499	62,499	+3,971	---
Surface Transportation Board					
Salaries and expenses.....	21,080	24,388	26,622	+5,542	+2,234
Offsetting collections.....	-1,050	-1,250	-1,250	-200	---
Total, Surface Transportation Board.....	20,030	23,138	25,372	+5,342	+2,234
=====					
Total, title I, Department of Transportation....	13,656,167	11,871,787	13,791,544	+135,377	+1,919,757
Appropriations.....	(14,303,731)	(13,620,187)	(14,262,615)	(-41,116)	(+642,428)
Rescissions.....	(-238,979)	(-74,400)	(-2,071)	(+236,908)	(+72,329)
Rescission of contract authority.....	(-1,640,685)	(-1,674,000)	(-469,000)	(+1,171,685)	(+1,205,000)
Emergency appropriations.....	(1,232,100)	---	---	(-1,232,100)	---
Offsetting collections.....	---	---	---	---	---
(Limitations on obligations).....	(45,329,166)	(45,686,067)	(48,227,800)	(+2,898,634)	(+2,541,733)
(Exempt contract authority).....	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	---	---
(By transfer).....	(156,772)	---	---	(-156,772)	---
(Transfer out).....	(-156,127)	---	---	(+156,127)	---
Net total budgetary resources.....	(59,724,333)	(58,296,854)	(62,758,344)	(+3,034,011)	(+4,461,490)
Transportation discretionary total.....	13,656,167	11,871,787	13,791,544	+135,377	+1,919,757
=====					

TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Departmental Offices

Salaries and expenses.....	156,299	195,253	187,452	+31,153	-7,801
Executive direction.....	(7,216)	(16,656)	(7,216)	---	(-9,440)
General Counsel.....	(7,142)	---	(7,521)	(+379)	(+7,521)
Economic policies and programs.....	(31,405)	(32,011)	(32,011)	(+606)	---
Financial policies and programs.....	(25,863)	(24,721)	(24,721)	(-1,142)	---
Financial crimes.....	(10,548)	(39,938)	(35,409)	(+24,861)	(-4,529)
Treasury wide management.....	(16,626)	(16,843)	(16,843)	(+217)	---
Administration.....	(57,499)	(65,084)	(63,731)	(+6,232)	(-1,353)
Subtotal.....	(156,299)	(195,253)	(187,452)	(+31,153)	(-7,801)

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 3058)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Office of Foreign Assets Control.....	22,113	---	---	-22,113	---
Department-wide systems and capital investments programs.....	32,002	24,412	21,412	-10,590	-3,000
Office of Inspector General.....	16,368	16,722	17,000	+632	+278
Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration.....	128,093	133,286	133,286	+5,193	---
Air transportation stabilization program account.....	1,984	2,942	2,500	+516	-442
Community development financial institutions fund program account.....	55,078	7,900	55,000	-78	+47,100
Treasury building and annex repair and restoration....	12,217	10,000	10,000	-2,217	---
Expanded access to financial services (rescission)....	-4,000	---	---	+4,000	---
Violent crime reduction program (rescission).....	-1,200	---	---	+1,200	---
Financial Crimes Enforcement Network.....	71,922	73,630	73,630	+1,708	---
Total, Departmental Offices.....	490,876	464,145	500,280	+9,404	+36,135
Financial Management Service.....	229,083	236,243	236,243	+7,160	---
Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau:					
Salaries and expenses.....	82,336	62,486	91,126	+8,790	+28,640
Spending from proposed mandatory user fees.....	---	28,640	---	---	-28,640
Subtotal.....	82,336	91,126	91,126	+8,790	---
Bureau of the Public Debt.....	173,765	176,923	176,923	+3,158	---
Payment of government losses in shipment.....	1,000	1,000	1,000	---	---
Total, Dept. of Treasury, non-IRS.....	977,060	969,437	1,005,572	+28,512	+36,135
Internal Revenue Service					
Tax administration and operations.....	---	10,013,555	---	---	-10,013,555
Contingent appropriation.....	---	446,496	---	---	-446,496
Processing, assistance, and management.....	4,056,857	---	4,181,520	+124,663	+4,181,520
Tax law enforcement.....	4,363,539	---	4,541,466	+177,927	+4,541,466
Information systems.....	1,577,768	---	1,606,846	+29,078	+1,606,846
Subtotal.....	9,998,164	10,460,051	10,329,832	+331,668	-130,219
Business systems modernization.....	203,360	199,000	199,000	-4,360	---
Health Insurance Tax Credit Administration.....	34,562	20,210	20,210	-14,352	---
Total, Internal Revenue Service.....	10,236,086	10,679,261	10,549,042	+312,956	-130,219
Total, title II, Department of the Treasury.....	11,213,146	11,648,698	11,554,614	+341,468	-94,084
Appropriations.....	11,218,346	11,648,698	11,554,614	+336,268	-94,084
Rescissions.....	-5,200	---	---	+5,200	---

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 3058)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE III - DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT					
Public and Indian Housing					
Tenant-based Rental Assistance:					
Direct appropriation.....	10,599,520	11,645,194	11,331,400	+731,880	-313,794
Renewals.....	(13,355,285)	(14,089,756)	(14,089,756)	(+734,471)	---
Tenant protection vouchers.....	(161,696)	(354,081)	(165,700)	(+4,004)	(-188,381)
Family self-sufficiency coordinators.....	(45,632)	(55,000)	(45,000)	(-632)	(-10,000)
Administrative fees.....	(1,200,426)	(1,295,408)	(1,225,000)	(+24,574)	(-70,408)
Working capital fund.....	(2,881)	(5,949)	(5,900)	(+3,019)	(-49)
Additional rental subsidy.....	---	(45,000)	---	---	(-45,000)
Advance appropriations provided in previous acts..	4,166,400	4,200,000	4,200,000	+33,600	---
Subtotal.....	14,765,920	15,845,194	15,531,400	+765,480	-313,794
Advance appropriations provided in current year...	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	---	---
Total, Tenant-based rental assistance.....	18,965,920	20,045,194	19,731,400	+765,480	-313,794
Project-based rental assistance:					
Renewals.....	5,298,272	5,072,100	5,088,300	-209,972	+16,200
Contract administrators.....	(5,195,203)	(4,923,100)	(4,940,100)	(-255,103)	(+17,000)
Working capital fund.....	(101,085)	(147,200)	(147,200)	(+46,115)	---
Working capital fund.....	(1,984)	(1,800)	(1,000)	(-984)	(-800)
Public housing:					
Capital fund.....	2,579,200	2,327,200	2,600,000	+20,800	+272,800
Operating fund.....	2,438,336	3,407,300	3,600,000	+1,161,664	+192,700
Revitalization of severely distressed public housing..	142,848	---	---	-142,848	---
Native American housing block grants.....	621,984	582,600	600,000	-21,984	+17,400
Indian housing loan guarantee fund program account....	4,960	2,645	2,645	-2,315	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(145,345)	(98,967)	(98,967)	(-46,378)	---
Native Hawaiian housing:					
Block grant.....	---	8,815	8,815	+8,815	---
Loan guarantee fund.....	992	882	882	-110	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(37,403)	(35,000)	(35,000)	(-2,403)	---
Total, Public and Indian Housing.....	30,052,512	31,446,736	31,632,042	+1,579,530	+185,306
Current year advance appropriations.....	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	---	---
Net Total (excluding current year advances).....	25,852,512	27,246,736	27,432,042	+1,579,530	+185,306
Community Planning and Development					
Housing opportunities for persons with AIDS.....	281,728	268,000	285,000	+3,272	+17,000
Rural housing and economic development.....	23,808	---	10,000	-13,808	+10,000
Empowerment zones / enterprise communities.....	9,920	---	---	-9,920	---
Community development fund.....	4,671,328	---	4,151,500	-519,828	+4,151,500
Community development fund (sec. 424).....	30,752	---	---	-30,752	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L.108-324).....	150,000	---	---	-150,000	---
Section 108 loan guarantees:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(275,000)	---	---	(-275,000)	---
Credit subsidy.....	5,952	---	---	-5,952	---
Administrative expenses.....	992	---	---	-992	---
Brownfields redevelopment.....	23,808	---	---	-23,808	---
HOME investment partnerships program.....	1,899,680	1,941,000	1,900,000	+320	-41,000
Homeless assistance grants.....	1,240,511	1,440,000	1,340,000	+99,489	-100,000
Self-help homeownership opportunity program.....	---	30,000	60,800	+60,800	+30,800
Total, Community Planning and Development.....	8,338,479	3,679,000	7,747,300	-591,179	+4,068,300
Housing Programs					
Housing for the elderly.....	741,024	741,000	741,000	-24	---
Housing for persons with disabilities.....	238,080	119,900	238,100	+20	+118,200
Housing counseling assistance.....	---	39,700	---	---	-39,700

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 3058)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Manufactured housing fees trust fund.....	12,896	13,000	12,896	---	-104
Offsetting collections.....	-12,896	-13,000	-12,896	---	+104
Rental housing assistance.....	---	26,400	26,400	+26,400	---
Total, Housing Programs.....	979,104	927,000	1,005,500	+26,396	+78,500
Federal Housing Administration					
FHA - Mutual mortgage insurance program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(185,000,000)	(185,000,000)	(185,000,000)	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	---	---
Administrative expenses.....	354,051	355,000	355,000	+949	---
Offsetting receipts.....	-2,234,000	-1,309,000	-1,309,000	+925,000	---
Offsetting receipts (legislative proposal).....	---	18,000	---	---	-18,000
Administrative contract expenses.....	77,376	62,600	62,600	-14,776	---
Additional contract expenses.....	992	1,000	1,000	+8	---
FHA - General and special risk program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)	(35,000,000)	---	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	---	---
Administrative expenses.....	225,945	231,400	231,400	+5,455	---
Offsetting receipts.....	-248,000	-300,000	-339,000	-91,000	-39,000
Credit subsidy.....	9,920	8,800	8,800	-1,120	---
Non-overhead administrative expenses.....	85,312	71,900	71,900	-13,412	---
Additional contract expenses.....	3,968	4,000	4,000	+32	---
Total, Federal Housing Administration.....	-1,724,436	-856,300	-913,300	+811,136	-57,000
Government National Mortgage Association (GNMA)					
Guarantees of mortgage-backed securities loan guarantee program account:					
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	(200,000,000)	---	---
Administrative expenses.....	10,609	11,360	10,700	+91	-660
Offsetting receipts.....	-368,000	-368,000	-368,000	---	---
Total, Gov't National Mortgage Association.....	-357,391	-356,640	-357,300	+91	-660
Policy Development and Research					
Research and technology.....	45,136	69,738	60,600	+15,464	-9,138
Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity					
Fair housing activities.....	46,128	38,800	38,800	-7,328	---
Office of Lead Hazard Control					
Lead hazard reduction.....	166,656	119,000	119,000	-47,656	---
Management and Administration					
Salaries and expenses.....	542,819	579,000	579,000	+36,181	---
Transfer from:					
Limitation on FHA corporate funds.....	(560,673)	(562,400)	(562,400)	(+1,727)	---
GNMA.....	(10,695)	(10,695)	(10,700)	(+5)	(+5)
Community Development Loan Guarantees Program.....	(1,000)	---	---	(-1,000)	---
Native American Housing Block Grants.....	(150)	(146)	(150)	---	(+4)
Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund Program.....	(250)	(244)	(250)	---	(+6)
Native Hawaiian Housing Loan Guarantees.....	(35)	(34)	(35)	---	(+1)
Subtotal.....	(1,115,622)	(1,152,519)	(1,152,535)	(+36,913)	(+16)
Working capital fund.....	267,840	265,000	165,000	-102,840	-100,000
Office of Inspector General.....	79,360	79,000	79,000	-360	---
(By transfer, limitation on FHA corporate funds)..	(24,000)	(24,000)	(24,000)	---	---
Subtotal.....	(103,360)	(103,000)	(103,000)	(-360)	---

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 3058)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Office of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight.....	58,735	60,000	60,000	+1,265	---
Offsetting receipts.....	-58,735	-60,000	-60,000	-1,265	---
Total, Management and Administration.....	890,019	923,000	823,000	-67,019	-100,000
Rescissions:					
Housing certificate fund.....	-1,557,000	-2,500,000	-2,493,600	-936,600	+6,400
Public housing elimination grants.....	-5,000	---	---	+5,000	---
Revitalization of severely distressed public housing.....	---	-142,848	---	---	+142,848
Title VI credit subsidy.....	-21,000	---	---	+21,000	---
Indian housing credit subsidy.....	-33,000	---	---	+33,000	---
Rental housing assistance.....	-675,000	---	---	+675,000	---
GI/SRI credit subsidy.....	-30,000	---	---	+30,000	---
Subtotal.....	-2,321,000	-2,642,848	-2,493,600	-172,600	+149,248
Total, title III, Department of Housing and Urban Development.....	36,115,207	33,347,486	37,662,042	+1,546,835	+4,314,556
Current year advance appropriations.....	4,200,000	4,200,000	4,200,000	---	---
Net total, excluding current year advance.....	31,915,207	29,147,486	33,462,042	+1,546,835	+4,314,556
Appropriations.....	(32,841,438)	(29,622,334)	(33,844,538)	(+1,003,100)	(+4,222,204)
Rescissions.....	(-2,321,000)	(-2,642,848)	(-2,493,600)	(-172,600)	(+149,248)
Emergency appropriations.....	(150,000)	---	---	(-150,000)	---
Offsetting receipts.....	(-2,862,896)	(-1,972,000)	(-2,028,896)	(+834,000)	(-56,896)
Offsetting collections.....	(-58,735)	(-60,000)	(-60,000)	(-1,265)	---
Previously enacted advances.....	(4,166,400)	(4,200,000)	(4,200,000)	(+33,600)	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(100,000)	(100,000)	(100,000)	---	---
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(420,457,748)	(420,133,967)	(420,133,967)	(-323,781)	---
(Limitation on corporate funds).....	(596,803)	(597,519)	(597,535)	(+732)	(+16)

TITLE IV - THE JUDICIARY

Supreme Court of the United States

Salaries and expenses:					
Salaries of justices.....	1,985	2,000	2,000	+15	---
Other salaries and expenses.....	55,387	58,730	58,730	+3,343	---
Subtotal.....	57,372	60,730	60,730	+3,358	---
Care of the building and grounds.....	9,846	5,624	5,624	-4,222	---
Total, Supreme Court of the United States.....	67,218	66,354	66,354	-864	---

United States Court of Appeals
for the Federal Circuit

Salaries and expenses:					
Salaries of judges.....	2,257	2,000	2,000	-257	---
Other salaries and expenses.....	19,263	24,462	22,613	+3,350	-1,849
Total, US Court of Appeals for the Fed Circuit..	21,520	26,462	24,613	+3,093	-1,849

United States Court of International Trade

Salaries and expenses:					
Salaries of judges.....	1,757	2,000	2,000	+243	---
Other salaries and expenses.....	12,956	13,480	13,480	+524	---
Total, US Court of International Trade.....	14,713	15,480	15,480	+767	---

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 3058)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services					
Salaries and expenses:					
Salaries of judges and bankruptcy judges.....	289,877	305,145	301,000	+11,123	-4,145
Judges COLA.....	---	5,000	---	---	-5,000
Other salaries and expenses.....	3,835,444	4,172,744	4,047,780	+212,336	-124,964
Subtotal, Salaries and expenses.....	4,125,321	4,482,889	4,348,780	+223,459	-134,109
Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund.....	3,254	3,833	3,833	+579	---
Defender services.....	667,351	768,064	721,919	+54,568	-46,145
Fees of jurors and commissioners.....	60,713	71,318	60,053	-660	-11,265
Court security.....	327,565	390,316	379,461	+51,896	-10,855
Total, Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services.....	5,184,204	5,716,420	5,514,046	+329,842	-202,374
Administrative Office of the United States Courts					
Salaries and expenses.....	67,289	72,198	70,262	+2,973	-1,936
Federal Judicial Center					
Salaries and expenses.....	21,447	22,876	22,249	+802	-627
Judicial Retirement Funds					
Payment to judiciary trust funds.....	36,700	40,600	40,600	+3,900	---
United States Sentencing Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	13,126	14,700	14,046	+920	-654
Total, title IV, the Judiciary.....	5,426,217	5,975,090	5,767,650	+341,433	-207,440
Mandatory appropriations.....	332,576	351,745	347,600	+15,024	-4,145
Discretionary appropriations.....	5,093,641	5,623,345	5,420,050	+326,409	-203,295
TITLE V - DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA					
FEDERAL FUNDS					
Federal payment for Resident Tuition Support.....	25,395	33,200	33,200	+7,805	---
Federal payment for Emergency Planning and Security Costs in the District of Columbia.....	14,880	15,000	15,000	+120	---
Federal payment to the District of Columbia Courts....	189,274	221,693	221,693	+32,419	---
Defender Services in District of Columbia Courts.....	38,192	45,000	45,000	+6,808	---
Federal payment to the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia.....	178,560	203,388	203,388	+24,828	---
Federal payment to the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority.....	4,762	---	10,000	+5,238	+10,000
Federal payment for the Anacostia Waterfront Initiative.....	2,976	5,000	5,000	+2,024	---
Federal payment to the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council.....	1,290	1,300	1,300	+10	---
Federal payment for the Unified Communications Center.	5,952	---	---	-5,952	---
Federal payment for Public School Libraries.....	5,952	---	---	-5,952	---
Federal payment for the Family Literacy Program.....	992	---	---	-992	---
Federal payment for Transportation Assistance.....	2,480	---	---	-2,480	---
Federal payment for Foster Care Improvements in the District of Columbia.....	4,960	---	---	-4,960	---
Federal payment to the Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia.....	32,240	---	20,000	-12,240	+20,000
Federal payment for School Improvement.....	39,680	41,616	41,616	+1,936	---
Federal payment for Bioterrorism and Forensics Labs...	7,936	7,200	7,200	-736	---
Total, Title V, District of Columbia.....	555,521	573,397	603,397	+47,876	+30,000

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 3058)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE VI - EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT AND FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
The White House					
Salaries and expenses.....	---	183,271	---	---	-183,271
Compensation of the President and the White House Office:					
Compensation of the President.....	450	---	450	---	+450
Salaries and expenses.....	61,504	---	53,080	-8,424	+53,080
Executive Residence at the White House:					
Operating expenses.....	12,658	---	12,436	-222	+12,436
White House repair and restoration.....	1,885	---	1,700	-185	+1,700
Council of Economic Advisers.....	4,008	---	4,040	+32	+4,040
Office of Policy Development.....	2,282	---	3,500	+1,218	+3,500
National Security Council.....	8,861	---	8,705	-156	+8,705
Privacy and Civil Liberties Board.....	---	---	750	+750	+750
Office of Administration.....	91,531	---	89,322	-2,209	+89,322
Total, The White House.....	183,179	183,271	173,983	-9,196	-9,288
Office of Management and Budget.....	67,864	68,411	76,930	+9,066	+8,519
Office of National Drug Control Policy:					
Salaries and expenses.....	26,784	24,224	26,908	+124	+2,684
Counterdrug Technology Assessment Center.....	41,664	30,000	30,000	-11,664	---
Total, Office of National Drug Control Policy...	68,448	54,224	56,908	-11,540	+2,684
High intensity drug trafficking areas program.....	226,523	---	227,000	+477	+227,000
Other Federal drug control programs.....	211,990	213,300	213,292	+1,302	-8
Unanticipated needs.....	992	1,000	1,000	+8	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324).....	70,000	---	---	-70,000	---
Special Assistance to the President.....	4,534	4,455	4,455	-79	---
Official Residence of the Vice President: Operating expenses.....	330	325	325	-5	---
Total, title VI, Executive Office of the Presi- dent and Funds Appropriated to the President..	833,860	524,986	753,893	-79,967	+228,907
Appropriations.....	(763,860)	(524,986)	(753,893)	(-9,967)	(+228,907)
Emergency appropriations.....	(70,000)	---	---	(-70,000)	---
TITLE VII - INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Architectural and Transportation Barriers					
Compliance Board.....	5,641	5,941	5,941	+300	---
Consumer Product Safety Commission.....	62,149	62,499	62,449	+300	-50
Election Assistance Commission.....	13,888	17,612	15,877	+1,989	-1,735
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation: Office of Inspector General (transfer).....	(29,884)	(29,965)	(29,965)	(+81)	---
Federal Election Commission.....	51,742	54,600	54,700	+2,958	+100
Federal Labor Relations Authority.....	25,468	25,468	25,468	---	---
Rescission.....	-3,000	---	---	+3,000	---
Federal Maritime Commission.....	19,340	20,499	20,499	+1,159	---
General Services Administration					
Federal Buildings Fund:					
Limitations on availability of revenue:					
Construction and acquisition of facilities.....	(708,542)	(708,106)	(708,106)	(-436)	---
Repairs and alterations.....	(980,222)	(961,376)	(961,376)	(-18,846)	---
Installment acquisition payments.....	(161,442)	(168,180)	(168,180)	(+6,738)	---
Rental of space.....	(3,657,315)	(4,046,031)	(4,046,031)	(+388,716)	---
Building operations.....	(1,709,522)	(1,885,102)	(1,885,102)	(+175,580)	---
Subtotal.....	7,217,043	7,768,795	7,768,795	+551,752	---
Repayment of debt.....	(41,000)	(40,000)	(40,000)	(-1,000)	---

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 3058)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Government-wide policy.....	61,603	52,796	52,796	-8,807	---
Operating expenses.....	91,438	99,890	99,890	+8,452	---
Office of Inspector General.....	42,012	43,410	43,410	+1,398	---
Electronic Government Fund.....	2,976	5,000	3,000	+24	-2,000
Allowances and Office Staff for Former Presidents.....	3,081	2,952	2,952	-129	---
Federal Buildings Fund (rescission).....	-106,000	---	---	+106,000	---
Federal Citizen Information Center Fund.....	14,788	15,030	15,030	+242	---
Total, General Services Administration.....	109,898	219,078	217,078	+107,180	-2,000
Merit Systems Protection Board					
Salaries and expenses.....	34,400	34,400	35,600	+1,200	+1,200
Limitation on administrative expenses.....	2,605	2,605	2,605	---	---
Total, Merit Systems Protection Board.....	37,005	37,005	38,205	+1,200	+1,200
Morris K. Udall Foundation					
Morris K. Udall Trust Fund.....	1,980	---	2,000	+20	+2,000
Environmental Dispute Resolution Fund.....	1,299	700	1,900	+601	+1,200
Total, Morris K. Udall Foundation	3,279	700	3,900	+621	+3,200
National Archives and Records Administration					
Operating expenses.....	264,809	280,975	283,975	+19,166	+3,000
Electronic records archive.....	35,627	35,914	35,914	+287	---
Reduction of debt.....	-7,810	-8,488	-8,488	-678	---
Repairs and restoration.....	13,325	6,182	6,182	-7,143	---
National Historical Publications and Records Commission: Grants program.....	4,960	---	7,500	+2,540	+7,500
Total, National Archives and Records Admin.....	310,911	314,583	325,083	+14,172	+10,500
National Credit Union Administration:					
Central liquidity facility:					
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	---	---
(Limitation on admin expenses, corporate funds).....	(310)	(323)	(323)	(+13)	---
Community development revolving loan fund.....	992	950	950	-42	---
National Transportation Safety Board:					
Salaries and expenses.....	76,086	76,700	76,700	+614	---
Rescission of unobligated balances.....	-8,000	-1,000	-1,000	+7,000	---
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation.....	114,080	118,000	118,000	+3,920	---
Office of Government Ethics.....	11,148	11,148	11,148	---	---
Office of Personnel Management					
Salaries and expenses.....	124,496	124,521	119,952	-4,544	-4,569
Limitation on administrative expenses.....	127,434	100,017	102,679	-24,755	+2,662
Office of Inspector General.....	1,614	1,614	1,614	---	---
Limitation on administrative expenses.....	16,329	16,329	16,786	+457	+457
Govt Payment for Annuity, Employees Health Benefits	8,135,000	8,393,000	8,393,000	+258,000	---
Govt Payment for Annuity, Employee Life Insurance..	35,000	36,000	36,000	+1,000	---
Payment to Civil Svc Retirement and Disability Fund...	9,772,000	10,072,000	10,072,000	+300,000	---
Total, Office of Personnel Management.....	18,211,873	18,743,481	18,742,031	+530,158	-1,450
Office of Special Counsel.....	15,325	15,325	15,325	---	---
Selective Service System.....	26,090	25,650	24,000	-2,090	-1,650
United States Interagency Council on Homelessness.....	1,499	1,800	1,499	---	-301
United States Postal Service					
Payment to the Postal Service Fund.....	28,768	---	43,350	+14,582	+43,350
Advance appropriation provided in previous acts.....	36,229	61,709	61,709	+25,480	---
Subtotal, FY2006 funding.....	64,997	61,709	105,059	+40,062	+43,350

DEPARTMENTS OF TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 3058)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Advance appropriation provided in current year.....	61,709	87,350	73,000	+11,291	-14,350
Emergency preparedness.....	496,000	---	---	-496,000	---
Mail irradiation facility (emergency).....	6,944	---	---	-6,944	---
Total, United States Postal Service.....	629,650	149,059	178,059	-451,591	+29,000
United States Tax Court.....	40,851	48,998	48,998	+8,147	---
Total, title VII, Independent Agencies.....	19,755,915	19,948,096	19,984,910	+228,995	+36,814
Appropriations.....	(19,768,033)	(19,800,037)	(19,851,201)	(+83,168)	(+51,164)
Emergency appropriations.....	(6,944)	---	---	(-6,944)	---
Rescissions.....	(-117,000)	(-1,000)	(-1,000)	(+116,000)	---
Advance appropriation provided in previous act	(36,229)	(61,709)	(61,709)	(+25,480)	---
Advance appropriation provided in current year	(61,709)	(87,350)	(73,000)	(+11,291)	(-14,350)
(By transfer).....	(29,884)	(29,965)	(29,965)	(+81)	---
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	(1,500,000)	---	---
(Limitation on corporate funds).....	(310)	(323)	(323)	(+13)	---
Title VIII - General Provisions, This Bill					
HHS info match- new hires.....	-125,000	---	---	+125,000	---
Total, General provisions, This Bill.....	-125,000	---	---	+125,000	---
Grand total (net).....	87,431,033	83,889,540	90,118,050	+2,687,017	+6,228,510
Appropriations.....	(84,752,146)	(81,764,729)	(86,637,908)	(+1,885,762)	(+4,873,179)
Emergency appropriations.....	(1,459,044)	---	---	(-1,459,044)	---
Offsetting collections.....	(-2,862,896)	(-1,972,000)	(-2,028,896)	(+834,000)	(-56,896)
Rescissions.....	(-2,682,179)	(-2,718,248)	(-2,496,671)	(+185,508)	(+221,577)
Rescission of contract authority.....	(-1,640,685)	(-1,674,000)	(-469,000)	(+1,171,685)	(+1,205,000)
Negative subsidy receipts.....	-58,735	-60,000	-60,000	-1,265	---
Advance appropriation provided in previous act	(4,202,629)	(4,261,709)	(4,261,709)	(+59,080)	---
Advance appropriation provided in current year	(4,261,709)	(4,287,350)	(4,273,000)	(+11,291)	(-14,350)
(Limitation on obligations).....	(45,329,166)	(45,686,067)	(48,227,800)	(+2,898,634)	(+2,541,733)
(Exempt contract authority).....	(739,000)	(739,000)	(739,000)	---	---
(By transfer).....	(186,656)	(29,965)	(29,965)	(-156,691)	---
(Transfer out).....	(-156,127)	---	---	(+156,127)	---
Net total budgetary resources.....	(133,499,199)	(130,314,607)	(139,084,850)	(+5,585,651)	(+8,770,243)
Discretionary total.....	68,199,215	65,035,795	69,995,700	+1,796,485	+4,959,905

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make my colleagues aware of the failure of this bill to provide funding for a critically important economic development program. The Round II Empowerment Zone initiative provides Federal assistance to support the comprehensive revitalization of designated communities across the country. It is a 10-year program that targets Federal grants to distressed communities for social services and community redevelopment and provides tax and regulatory relief to attract and retain businesses.

In my district, the Cumberland County Empowerment Zone is a successful collaborative revitalization effort among the communities of Bridgeton, Millville, Vineland and Port Norris. Cumberland has committed nearly 100 percent of the \$25 million that has been made available by HUD so far. Over 1,400 jobs have been created to date and over 166 housing units have been renovated, rehabilitated, constructed or purchased in EZ neighborhoods. Cumberland County has funded over 120 initiatives through the EZ program and has established a \$4 million loan pool available to be reinvested back into the targeted communities. These projects are estimated to leverage a total of over \$238 million in private, public and tax exempt bond financing. Put plainly, the Cumberland EZ has leveraged nearly \$12 in private investment for every \$1 of public funding, a remarkable achievement that demonstrates the success and promise of the Zone.

While I am very proud of the accomplishments of the Cumberland EZ, I recognize the reluctance of the subcommittee to provide funding for the program. As the subcommittee has noted before, the IG, and HUD itself, have found too many of the other Zones have had problems spending grant funds, accounting for expenditures and spending funds consistent with their strategic plans. I further recognize the reluctance of the subcommittee to continue to provide funds for the program when the Senate has sought to eliminate this program for the past 2 years.

While I am tremendously disappointed this bill fails to fund the Round II Empowerment Zone program, I will reluctantly vote for it. I do so with the hope that the Senate will find funding for this program, and that if that should happen, I will have the opportunity to work the subcommittee to restore funding for this critical program.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, as we consider the FY06 Transportation, Treasury, HOD, Judiciary, and District of Columbia Appropriations Act today, I would like to take this opportunity to express my opposition to the proposed Runway 17–35 expansion at the Philadelphia International Airport. Over the past several months, I have strongly urged the FAA to investigate and pursue the construction of a new parallel runway, rather than continuing with its endorsement of Build Alternative 1, which is an ineffective use of taxpayer dollars.

The information presented in the final Environmental Impact Statement, EIS, indicates that there will be minimal gains in airport efficiency with the extension of Runway 17–35. The projected average delay per operation in 2007 is 15.3 minutes under the No-Action Alternative. The EIS indicated that Alternative 1 would cost the taxpayers approximately \$36 million, yet would only result in an 84-second

delay reduction. While this alternative purports a slightly greater reduction in the 2015 projected delays, the EIS indicated only a 6.5-minute delay reduction, which is less than the 7.5-minute delay reduction that was projected in the Draft EIS, DEIS. I think it would be a much better use of taxpayer funds to evaluate the potential installation of a new parallel runway rather than extending Runway 17–35; it makes no sense to spend \$36 million with no real ensuing benefits. The FAA still has not released the underlying data used to calculate projected delay reductions.

It greatly concerns me that the FAA has indicated that it does not have data indicating what percentage of delays at the Philadelphia International Airport are a direct result of airport runway problems, as opposed to other causes. Common sense would indicate that this information is necessary in order to determine that the proposed runway extension would be effective in increasing airport efficiency, particularly when the projected delay reduction achieved by this project was decreased by more than 13 percent between the time the DEIS was issued on October 15, 2004, and the issuance of the EIS on March 11, 2005.

The Record of Decision, ROD, indicates that Alternative 1 will have no significant noise impacts on the surrounding communities, which defies logic. The proposed runway extension would allow more and larger aircraft to utilize the runway, and common sense dictates that this would result in a substantial appreciation in noise levels for the southern New Jersey communities within the flight paths and directly across the Delaware River from the Philadelphia International Airport.

Again, I strongly urge the FAA to explore a parallel runway option so that all interested parties can evaluate the relevant facts and form a judgment on the potential benefit a new parallel runway would have to the entire Philadelphia region.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I was heartened by the way Members from both sides of the aisle worked together to produce an appropriations bill that truly reflects the will of Congress. While initially deeply flawed, the House was able to work together and pass amendments that restore funding to essential transportation and housing programs.

I was particularly pleased by the passage of an amendment offered by Representatives LATOURETTE and OBERSTAR that restored Amtrak funding to approximately \$1.2 billion. Public support of transportation modes is both necessary and desirable. Our past investments have made our country stronger and more secure.

I was also happy to see the passage of amendments that restored funding to important housing programs that aid in community and economic development and provide housing opportunities for the least well off in our society. I was particularly pleased to see the restoration of HOPE VI funding. A 2001 HOPE VI revitalization grant is enabling the Housing Authority of Portland to revitalize Columbia Villa, a dilapidated World War II era housing cluster, into a vibrant, mixed use, mixed income neighborhood, improving the livability of the surrounding region.

I am hopeful that the improvements that were adopted by the House during floor consideration of the bill will be preserved throughout the appropriations process and will not be

swept under the rug during conference committee.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Chairman, I rise against H.R. 3058, the Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, the District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006, because it shortchanges critical needs of the most vulnerable Americans while continuing to make room for tax breaks for millionaires and our unwinning quagmire in Iraq.

This bill eliminates funding for the Housing and Urban Development Brownfields program and Youthbuild. It cuts funding for the successful HOPE VI public housing redevelopment program by over \$80 million and for Community Development grants by \$250 million.

The Brownfields program helps cities develop abandoned and underused industrial sites. Youthbuild allows unemployed young people aged 16 to 24 to work toward their high school diploma while building housing for low-income people and the homeless.

All of these programs could have been fully funded for \$430 million more, or about the cost of 3 days of the Iraq occupation. I will not vote to deny a high school diploma to an underprivileged youth who's willing to build housing so that Halliburton can waste more than \$1 billion, including charges for 10,000 meals never served, \$152,000 in "movie library costs," and \$1.5 million for tailoring.

A Democratic colleague of mine wrote an amendment to reverse these cuts by reducing the 2006 tax break for individuals making more than \$1 million by a mere \$9,000. But the Republican majority would not even allow a vote on the issue. Perhaps a direct vote on their morally bankrupt priorities would have proved too uncomfortable.

Finally, this bill continues the Republican majority's pursuit of its right-wing social agenda against the citizens of the District of Columbia who have no voting representation in the Federal Government. The bill bars the District from using any Federal or local funds for needle exchange programs, which are proven effective in reducing the spread of HIV. It overturns the city's ban on handguns, blocks implementation of a medical marijuana program, prevents DC from forcing all insurers to offer full contraceptive coverage, and limits a woman's right to choose. Ironically, it also prevents the District Government from lobbying for voting representation so it can avoid suffering the social experiments of the modern day Pharisees.

While the bill could have been worse and funds some important programs, I cannot in good conscience support its misplaced priorities, and therefore I vote "no."

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Republican Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill. This legislation clearly illustrates the Republican party's values. The cuts to education, job training and health care in this bill are necessary because the majority's top priority is tax breaks for corporations and those making more than \$1 million a year. This bill is the consequence of the irresponsible Republican budget resolution passed earlier this year, and the American people will pay the price.

This bill provides \$1.6 billion less than the amount necessary to maintain current services and among its many mistakes, contains three major flaws: painful cuts in education, health

care, and job training. Republicans have cut No Child Left Behind and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, reducing funds for students and schools already struggling with Federal testing mandates. It slashes funding for health care training programs while we face a shortage of health care workers and the Preventive Health Block grant, which in Minnesota is used to address health care disparities. This bill cuts funding for job training, while we continue to have a faltering economy in which 7.6 million Americans are out of work.

The Republicans claim to have provided an increase for the National Institutes of Health, NIH. However, this paltry increase of 0.5 percent is far less than the NIH needs to keep up with current research costs. This disinvestment threatens future life-saving breakthroughs which have the possibility of improving the health of our country and saving limited health care dollars.

The Republican bill takes particular aim at the most vulnerable in our communities. Even with gas prices skyrocketing, this bill cuts funding for the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program. It essentially freezes funding for Head Start and the Child Care Block Grant, and provides only a 1 percent increase for senior nutrition programs.

Our priority as members of Congress should be the well-being of American families. We are not prioritizing children when we decrease the ability of schools to provide a quality education for all. We are not putting families first when we reduce the access to health care. And we are not on the side of the working men and women when we limit opportunities to provide for their families.

I support the Democratic alternative offered by Ranking Member OBEY. This amendment reflects the values of Minnesotans by investing in the American people's education, health and future. For example, the Democratic alternative would have increased funding for Pell grants to improve access to higher education, increased the Federal Government's contribution to special education, provided additional funding for reading and math for 1 million more students, funded community health centers and invested in biomedical research. My constituents know that our competitiveness, quality of life, and the health of our communities are at risk under the Republican plan. I will continue to fight to put families, and our future, first.

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my extreme disappointment that the fiscal year 2006 Housing and Urban Development Appropriations bill again reduces Federal support for Native American housing. The current bill shrinks the Native American Housing Block Grant, NAHBG, from \$622 million in 2005 to only \$555 million in 2006. Earlier this year, I requested that funding for NAHBG be increased to \$1 billion for fiscal year 2006.

Many tribal areas face severe housing shortages, leading to overcrowding and homelessness. On South Dakota's Pine Ridge Indian Reservation, it is not uncommon to find 25 individuals or more living in one housing unit. This problem is not localized to any one area and similar hardship can be found on reservations across the United States.

The historic underfunding of Native American housing programs has created a desperate need for housing in Indian Country. This year's HUD appropriations bill marks the

second consecutive year of NAHBG decrease compounding the problem many tribes face in providing for the most basic housing needs of their members. Even level funding would have perpetuated the problem; but another decrease in Federal support is egregious and irresponsible.

The Federal Government has a responsibility to meet its obligations to tribal governments. It is unfortunate that when we should be responding to the serious housing needs in Indian country, the House has again cut funding for this most fundamental program.

I sincerely hope our colleagues in the Senate will be more responsive to the housing situation facing tribal leaders and members across the United States.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, today the House debates funding important to all of our constituents who use our Nation's highways and transit systems, fly for business or pleasure, and who are concerned about the safety of our Nation's roadways.

Mr. Chairman, Americans are spending more time in traffic today than they ever have before. They're commuting hours to work, missing their children's soccer games, and losing their precious free time to traffic.

Commuters in my district in San Francisco's Bay Area are suffering in the second worst city in America for gridlock. They're losing a total of over \$2 million in wasted fuel and several hours each week, away from their offices and their families.

This week, the House will have to take up an eighth temporary extension of highway transit and highway safety programs. I have said time and time again, Mr. Chairman, that we must get our work done on the highway bill if we are to ensure increased investment in our Nation's transportation infrastructure. And yet, time and time again, this Congress has delayed action on the legislation.

While I am disturbed by our inability to finish the highway bill, I am pleased that the House will today adopt an appropriations bill which will continue to ensure that, while limited, federal investment is available for our Nation's transportation infrastructure.

Mr. Chairman, this bill however, is far from perfect. Shockingly, the legislation came to the Floor of the House with a funding level which would all but assure the end of Amtrak service in this Nation as we know it. The end of Amtrak would be devastating to the continued operation of inter-city rail throughout California and especially the Capitol Corridor line along the I-80 corridor in Northern California.

In 2004, over one million commuters used the Capitol Corridor and directly benefited from the fixed-price operating agreement between Amtrak and the Capitol Corridor. Because of this agreement, the Capitol Corridor is able to stabilize operating costs and reinvest revenues above business plan projections—or any other cost savings—into service enhancements. Without Amtrak's existence, these savings which have been realized year after year, would no longer exist.

I am pleased that the House adopted an amendment to adequately fund Amtrak and I hope that this funding will ensure the continued success of the inter-city passenger rail service in my district and throughout our Nation.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to voice my continued displeasure with the FAA's management of the Standard Terminal Automation Replacement (STARS) program.

As laid out in the latest Department of Transportation's Inspector General's report, the STARS program is 194% over-budget and delayed by seven years. A program which was first estimated to cost the FAA \$940 million has ballooned to a whopping \$2.7 billion. And yet, with ballooning costs, the FAA has failed to provide Congress with any analysis on the efficacy of continuing to move forward with the STARS program or how the agency plans on completing this program.

I was pleased to see that the House Report to H.R. 3058 echoes my concerns and I will continue to demand that the FAA provide Congress with a plan to address the overruns associated with the STARS program.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed in the way this bill has been considered.

Our colleague from Utah, Mr. MATHESON, wanted to offer an amendment that would have canceled the next scheduled cost-of-living increase in our salaries.

I would have voted for that amendment—but under the restrictive procedure under which the bill was considered, it could not even be offered.

In my opinion, it is a serious error for the Republican leadership to prevent the House from even debating and voting on that proposal—especially now, in wartime and a time of serious budget deficits caused by the recent recession, the costs of responding to terrorism and increasing homeland security, and the excessive and unbalanced tax cuts the Bush Administration has pushed through Congress.

That is why I voted to allow the amendment to be considered. Unfortunately, I was in the minority on that vote.

However, despite that, I think the bill itself, while far from perfect, is worth supporting.

The bill provides important resources to help support our Nation's infrastructure, community development, and courts. Examples of this include the \$37.0 billion for federal highway programs and \$8.5 billion for federal transit programs, which is an increase above the Fiscal Year 2005 allocation and the request made by the Bush Administration.

Further, thanks to adoption of several important amendments, the bill provides much more of the needed funding for Amtrak than the appropriations committee had originally allocated. This is important for Colorado, including many communities in my district as well as other parts of the state.

Additionally, I am pleased the legislation rejects the Bush Administration's "Strengthening America's Communities Initiative" that would consolidate a number of quality programs in Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) including the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) which provide decent housing and expands economic opportunities to cities and towns throughout Colorado.

Of course, I do not agree with all its priorities included in the legislation. I supported a number of amendments to improve the legislation, and am glad that at least some were adopted, including an increase in the Section 8 Tenant-Based assistance.

I also voted against some amendments, for various reasons.

I voted against an amendment to block enforcement of part of a local law adopted by the District of Columbia City Council dealing with firearms.

I did so because I think its enactment would be an abuse of our authority as Members of Congress and would reduce the right of self-government for one group of Americans—those who reside in Washington, D.C.

It's true the Constitution gives Congress the power "to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever" over the District of Columbia—even though the residents of the district are not fully represented in either the House of Representatives or the U.S. Senate. But Congress, through the Home Rule Act, has authorized the district's residents to elect a city council and mayor with immediate responsibility for governing the city.

I am convinced this was the right thing to do. I support home rule for Washington, D.C. because I think Americans who live in the district deserve to be able to govern themselves as much as possible consistent with the necessary functioning of the federal government. And this amendment flew in the face of that principle.

There is plenty of room to debate whether this D.C. law is good public policy, but I think that debate should not take place in Congress. The law the amendment would override was duly adopted by the elected government of the district and has not interfered with the orderly functioning of the federal government. So, in my opinion, decisions about retaining, amending, or repealing it should be made by the City Council, which is elected by and accountable to the people who are subject to it.

The effect of the amendment would be to substitute the judgment of Congress for that of the local elected government—in effect denying their constituents the right to govern themselves on this subject. We cannot—and we should not—do that to the residents of Colorado or any other state. I do not think we should do it to the people who live here in Washington, D.C. We may not think this local law is well-designed. But I think we should allow those covered by the law to decide that for themselves.

I also voted against an amendment to block funding to enforce a recent ruling of the U.S. Supreme Court dealing with the scope of a local government's authority to condemn private property.

I have serious concerns about that decision, but I voted against the amendment because I thought the amendment's approach was not an appropriate way to express those concerns.

If Members of Congress disagree with the Supreme Court's interpretation of a law or of the Constitution, that disagreement can be expressed in a resolution such as the one (H. Res. 340) dealing specifically with the eminent-domain decision. And if a Member thinks stronger action is required, he or she can seek to change the law or amend the Constitution.

But in the absence of such a change in the law or the Constitution, a court's decision—unless and until reversed—is settled law that must be respected, and Congress should not attempt to undermine it or attempt to use the power of the purse to influence the outcome of future cases.

Both those amendments were adopted, to my regret. I think the bill would have been better if they had been rejected. However, on balance, while the bill is not all that I had hoped for I think it deserves approval and I will vote for it.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise

and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM) having assumed the chair, Mr. MCHUGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3058) making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 342, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Pursuant to clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 18, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 358]

YEAS—405

Abercrombie	Boucher	Cox	Larson (CT)	Rehberg
Ackerman	Boyd	Cramer	Latham	Reichert
Aderholt	Bradley (NH)	Crenshaw	LaTourette	Renzi
Akin	Brady (PA)	Crowley	Leach	Reyes
Alexander	Brady (TX)	Cubin	Lee	Reynolds
Allen	Brown (OH)	Cuellar	Levin	Rogers (AL)
Andrews	Brown (SC)	Culberson	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (KY)
Baca	Brown, Corrine	Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (MI)
Bachus	Brown-Waite,	Cunningham	Lewis (KY)	Rohrabacher
Baird	Ginny	Davis (AL)	Linder	Ros-Lehtinen
Baker	Burgess	Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Rothman
Barrett (SC)	Burton (IN)	Davis (FL)	LoBiondo	Roybal-Allard
Barrow	Butterfield	Davis (IL)	Lofgren, Zoe	Royce
Bartlett (MD)	Buyer	Davis (KY)	Lowey	Ruppersberger
Barton (TX)	Calvert	Davis (TN)	Lucas	Rush
Bass	Camp	Davis, Jo Ann	Lungren, Daniel	Ryan (OH)
Bean	Cannon	Davis, Tom	E.	Ryan (WI)
Beauprez	Cantor	Deal (GA)	Lynch	Ryun (KS)
Becerra	Capito	DeFazio	Mack	Sabo
Berkley	Capps	DeGette	Maloney	Salaazar
Berman	Capuano	Delahunt	Manzullo	Sánchez, Linda
Berry	Cardin	DeLauro	Marchant	T.
Biggert	Cardoza	DeLay	Markey	Sanchez, Loretta
Bilirakis	Carnahan	Dent	Marshall	Sanders
Bishop (GA)	Carter	Diaz-Balart, L.	Matsui	Saxton
Bishop (NY)	Case	Diaz-Balart, M.	McCarthy	Schakowsky
Bishop (UT)	Castle	Dicks	McCaul (TX)	Schwartz (PA)
Blackburn	Chabot	Dingell	McCollum (MN)	Schwarz (MI)
Blumenauer	Chandler	Doggett	McCotter	Scott (GA)
Blunt	Chocola	Doolittle	McDermott	Scott (VA)
Boehlert	Clay	Doyle	McGovern	Serrano
Boehner	Cleaver	Drake	McHenry	Sessions
Bonilla	Clyburn	Dreier	McHugh	Shadegg
Bonner	Coble	Duncan	McIntyre	Shaw
Bono	Cole (OK)	Edwards	McKeon	Shays
Boozman	Conaway	Ehlers	McKinney	Sherman
Boren	Costa	Emanuel	McMorris	Sherwood
Boswell	Costello	Emerson	McNulty	Shimkus
			Meehan	Shuster
			Meek (FL)	Simmons
			Meeks (NY)	Simpson
			Melancon	Skelton
			Menendez	Slaughter
			Mica	Smith (NJ)
			Michaud	Smith (TX)
			Millender-	Smith (WA)
			McDonald	Snyder
			Miller (MI)	Sodrel
			Miller (NC)	Solis
			Miller, Gary	Souder
			Miller, George	Spratt
			Mollohan	Stearns
			Moore (KS)	Strickland
			Moore (WI)	Stupak
			Moran (KS)	Sullivan
			Moran (VA)	Sweeney
			Murphy	Tanner
			Murtha	Tauscher
			Musgrave	Taylor (NC)
			Myrick	Terry
			Nadler	Thomas
			Napolitano	Thompson (CA)
			Neal (MA)	Thompson (MS)
			Neugebauer	Thornberry
			Ney	Tiahrt
			Northup	Tiberi
			Norwood	Tierney
			Nunes	Towns
			Nussle	Turner
			Oberstar	Udall (CO)
			(TX)	Udall (NM)
			Jefferson	Upton
			Jenkins	Van Hollen
			Jindal	Velázquez
			Johnson (CT)	Owens
			Johnson (IL)	Oxley
			Johnson, E. B.	Pallone
			Johnson, Sam	Pascarell
			Jones (OH)	Pastor
			Kanjorski	Payne
			Kaptur	Pearce
			Keller	Pelosi
			Kelly	Pence
			Kennedy (MN)	Peterson (MN)
			Kennedy (RI)	Petri
			Kildee	Pickering
			Kilpatrick (MI)	Pitts
			King (IA)	Platts
			King (NY)	Poe
			Kirk	Pombo
			Kline	Pomeroy
			Knollenberg	Porter
			Kolbe	Price (GA)
			Kucinich	Price (NC)
			Kuhl (NY)	Pryce (OH)
			LaHood	Putnam
			Langevin	Radanovich
			Lantos	Rahall
			Larsen (WA)	Ramstad
				Regula
				Young (AK)
				Young (FL)

NAYS—18

Baldwin	Hefley	Otter
Carson	Jones (NC)	Paul
Conyers	Kind	Sensenbrenner
Cooper	Matheson	Stark
Flake	Miller (FL)	Tancredo
Franks (AZ)	Obey	Taylor (MS)

NOT VOTING—10

Boustany	McCrery	Schiff
Everett	Peterson (PA)	Waters
Harman	Rangel	
Kingston	Ross	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1902

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 358 I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EXTENSION ACT OF 2005, PART II

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Committee on Science, and the Committee on Ways and Means be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3104) to provide an extension of highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund pending enactment of a law reauthorizing the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, House and Senate negotiators are meeting daily and making great progress in trying to finalize a multi-year reauthorization bill. It is accurate to say that we are closer to completing a conference report than we have ever been in the past.

But these are complicated issues and as we work through all the difficult questions, we need additional time to complete policy issues and resolve the distribution of funds to the States. This is an intricate puzzle that must be put together to ensure all the moving pieces fit and work together in a coherent way.

I know Members may be impatient and I join them in that sentiment. But I can assure Members that we are meeting and working every day. We are trying to meet the overwhelming demands placed on this program and develop a conference report that can be passed by both bodies.

To that end, I urge support for H.R. 3104, which will extend our highway, transit and safety programs through July 19.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the 19-day extension of the surface transportation bill. This is our ninth time extending our Nation's transportation bill. Our transportation bill is over 18 months, late.

Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member OBERSTAR, I applaud your good faith efforts to complete negotiations on a balanced con-

ference report by the July 4th recess. Unfortunately, it was not to be.

As Members of Congress, we will all have to answer to our constituents and businesses about the state of our transportation infrastructure when we return home tomorrow. The Fourth of July is one of the busiest travel holidays of the year and our transportation infrastructure will be put to the test, as it is every day.

In parts of my district, Long Beach, California, as we celebrate the Fourth of July, under the colorful umbrella of our annual fireworks display when we look out over the Pacific Ocean, we will be reminded just how much we need this transportation bill.

Ships are lined up against the horizon of the California coastline because the congestion on our highways is impeding the movement of goods through our ports.

Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member OBERSTAR, you have heard me say this before: 80 percent of the goods that come into this country from the Pacific Rim and upwards, of 45 percent of all containerized goods come through the ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles. Fifteen percent of our Nation's economy travels on the I-710 annually, which is a corridor of national significance and the lifeline of our national economy.

Our national and regional economy begins in Long Beach. We need this bill. We need to invest in our infrastructure and our economy. I look forward to completing this bill when we return from recess.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3104

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005, Part II".

SEC. 2. ADVANCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2(a)(1) of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2004, Part V (23 U.S.C. 104 note; 118 Stat. 1144; 119 Stat. 324) is amended by striking "and the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005" and inserting "the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005, and the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005, Part II".

(b) PROGRAMMATIC DISTRIBUTIONS.—

(1) SPECIAL RULES FOR MINIMUM GUARANTEE.—Section 2(b)(4) of such Act (119 Stat. 324) is amended by striking "\$2,100,000,000" and inserting "\$2,240,000,000".

(2) EXTENSION OF OFF-SYSTEM BRIDGE SET-ASIDE.—Section 144(g)(3) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking "June 30" inserting "July 19".

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—Section 1101(1)(1) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (118 Stat. 1145; 119 Stat. 324) is amended by striking "\$25,521,678,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005" and inserting "\$27,223,123,200 for the period of October 1, 2004, through July 19, 2005".

(d) LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS.—Section 2(e) of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2004, Part V (118 Stat. 1146; 119 Stat. 324) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking "June 30" and inserting "July 19";

(B) by striking "and the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005" and inserting "the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005, and the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2005, Part II"; and

(C) by striking "%½" and inserting "80 percent"; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking "June 30, 2005, shall not exceed \$26,025,000,000" and inserting "July 19, 2005, shall not exceed \$27,760,000,000"; and

(B) by striking "\$479,250,000" and inserting "\$511,200,000"; and

(3) in paragraph (3) by striking "June 30" and inserting "July 19".

SEC. 3. ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

Section 4(a) of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2004, Part V (118 Stat. 1147; 119 Stat. 325) is amended by striking "highway program" and all that follows through "2005" and inserting "highway program \$281,619,200 for fiscal year 2005".

SEC. 4. OTHER FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAMS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS UNDER TITLE I OF TEA-21.—

(1) FEDERAL LANDS HIGHWAYS.—

(A) INDIAN RESERVATION ROADS.—Section 1101(a)(8)(A) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (112 Stat. 112; 118 Stat. 1147; 119 Stat. 325) is amended—

(i) in the first sentence by striking "\$206,250,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005" and inserting "\$220,000,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through July 19, 2005"; and

(ii) in the second sentence by striking "\$9,750,000" and inserting "\$10,400,000".

(B) PUBLIC LANDS HIGHWAYS.—Section 1101(a)(8)(B) of such Act (112 Stat. 112; 118 Stat. 1148; 119 Stat. 325) is amended by striking "\$184,500,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005" and inserting "\$196,800,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through July 19, 2005".

(C) PARK ROADS AND PARKWAYS.—Section 1101(a)(8)(C) of such Act (112 Stat. 112; 118 Stat. 1148; 119 Stat. 325) is amended by striking "\$123,750,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005" and inserting "\$132,000,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through July 19, 2005".

(D) REFUGE ROADS.—Section 1101(a)(8)(D) of such Act (112 Stat. 112; 118 Stat. 1148; 119 Stat. 326) is amended by striking "\$15,000,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005" and inserting "\$16,000,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through July 19, 2005".

(2) NATIONAL CORRIDOR PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT AND COORDINATED BORDER INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAMS.—Section 1101(a)(9) of such Act (112 Stat. 112; 118 Stat. 1148; 119 Stat. 326) is amended by striking "\$105,000,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005" and inserting "\$112,000,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through July 19, 2005".

(3) CONSTRUCTION OF FERRY BOATS AND FERRY TERMINAL FACILITIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 1101(a)(10) of such Act (112 Stat. 113; 118 Stat. 1148; 119 Stat. 326) is amended by striking "\$28,500,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005" and inserting "\$30,400,000 for the period of October 1, 2004, through July 19, 2005".

(B) SET ASIDE FOR ALASKA, NEW JERSEY, AND WASHINGTON.—Section 5(a)(3)(B) of the Surface Transportation Extension Act of 2004, Part V (118 Stat. 1148; 119 Stat. 326) is amended—

(i) in clause (i) by striking "\$7,500,000" and inserting "\$8,000,000";

(ii) in clause (ii) by striking "\$3,750,000" and inserting "\$4,000,000"; and

(iii) in clause (iii) by striking "\$3,750,000" and inserting "\$4,000,000".