Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Larsen (WA)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Oberstar
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—194

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wynn

NOT VOTING—17

Berkley
Brady (TX)
Conyers
Deal (GA)
DeLauro
Evans
Kennedy (RI)
Lewis (GA)
Manzullo
Miller (MI)
Nussle
Payne
Reichert
Sessions
Strickland
Weldon (PA)
Wu

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes left in this vote.

□ 1614

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, on June 13, 2006, I missed the following rollcall votes:

(1) Rollcall No. 261, Previous Question on H. Res. 865.

(2) Rollcall Vote No. 262, Adoption of H. Res. 865, the Rule for H.R. 5576—Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, the District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act for FY07.

Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" to rollcall vote 261, and "aye" to rollcall vote 262.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 261 and 262, I was unavoidably detained giving a speech to a policy conference sponsored by Brookings Institute.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on 261 and "aye" on 262.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5576, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 865 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5576.

□ 1616

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5576) 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, 2007, and for other purposes, with Mr. DREIER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

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

I am pleased to present the House H.R. 5576, the fiscal year 2007 Transportation-Treasury-HUD appropriations bill, which was passed out of committee by a voice vote on June 6.

As you know, this is only the subcommittee's second year with its current jurisdiction, and I believe the product before the House is worthy of strong support. It is a fiscally responsible bill funding high priority programs and eliminating Federal funds for other programs that are duplicative or ineffective.

I am aware of a number of amendments that would seek to undo these decisions, but I want people to know we made these decisions by looking at program performance, effectiveness and a balance of other priorities in the bill.

The bill before us is at our 302(b) allocation of $67.8 billion in BA, and provides total budgetary resources, including transportation obligation limitations and mandatory spending of $139.7 billion, an increase of $8.5 billion over last year and $1 billion over the request.

Many of the increases over the budget request are due to House rule mandating certain funding levels for highways, transit and aviation programs; restoring CDBG funding in the bill; and some scoring differences between CBO and OMB.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to salute the hard work of the subcommittee

members, both on the majority and minority side of the aisle. The bill before us is the product of numerous budget hearings and thoughtful input of each member of the subcommittee, and they deserve to be saluted.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to acknowledge the role the subcommittee's ranking member, the gentleman from Massachusetts, played in assembling this bill. I consider Mr. OLVER a partner in creating the product before you because his input has been invaluable. I believe this bill is stronger because of the input that Mr. OLVER has provided.

And without much fanfare, I would like to give a quick overview of what we have been able to accomplish under our allocation.

In transportation, we have met all of the guarantees for surface transportation and safety and aviation infrastructure as included in SAFETEA–LU and Vision-100. For FAA operations, we have provided funds for 132 net new controllers, plus an additional $16 million over the request for safety inspectors.

I realize there will be a lot of attention paid to Amtrak today, tonight, and perhaps even tomorrow. The bill provides $900 million, the same as the budget request, and $394 million below last year's enacted level. The bill continues our tough stance requiring Amtrak to reduce losses and achieve operational efficiencies with close supervision by the Inspector General.

I would emphasize this is not the ''Amtrak'' bill. There are a number of priorities in this bill and any amendment seeking to just slash other accounts, accounts that everyone will agree cannot sustain the cuts proposed by these amendments, is just plainly irresponsible.

The subcommittee had two priorities to meet for HUD in 2007. First and foremost was the full funding of Section 8 renewals. Failure to fully meet these commitments would have resulted in thousands of families losing their assistance and becoming homeless. We have met those needs.

Our second priority is to restore, to the maximum extent possible, the formula funding for cities and towns across America through the Community Development Block Grant. As you know, the administration proposed to cut this program by $1 billion which was funded at $4.2 billion last year. I am pleased to say we were able to fully restore funding for CDBG for fiscal year 2007.

To achieve this, however, the committee had to do a broad sweep of duplicative and lower priority programs throughout the Department, including boutique programs that have typically been funded by reducing the amounts in the formula CDBG program. It is never easy to stop funding a program once it starts getting Federal funds, but we have to make these decisions in order to meet our main funding objectives.

For the IRS, the bill provides $10.5 billion, $110 million below the budget request and $63 million below last year's enacted level. This level of funding will allow the IRS to maintain current services with some hard choices. I should warn everyone that further cuts to the IRS would severely impact their ability to meet their mission. I also note we took the first step to restructure the IRS accounts to more closely align with their core missions, taxpayer services and enforcement.

For the Judiciary, the bill provides sufficient funding to maintain the current services of the Federal Judiciary, including rent and personnel increases.

For the District of Columbia, we provided the budget request for Federal payments to the District for tuition assistance, court costs and school improvement. We were able to fund the Navy Yard Metro Station through FTA's New Starts program, and provide $1 million for the Central Library improvements. As for the District of Columbia's local budget, the bill appropriates the budget and financial plan by reference, carries many of the same general provisions of the past, and includes no new riders.

We restored funding for the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program to $227 million, slightly more than last year. Executive Office of the President programs are funded at the requested levels.

All in all, after much hard work and discussion, I believe we have a balanced bill before us. No, we didn't fund every program, but we did fund the higher priorities under our jurisdiction that will deliver the best results to the most people, and that I believe is our responsibility. Also, we have included Member priorities in this bill.

I would especially like to note that Member projects in this bill are less than one-third of what they were in last year's bill. I will repeat that: Less than one-third of what they were in last year's bill, demonstrating yet again the committee's commitment to earmark reform and the fact that it is real. Each project was a part of the budget request or authorized under an existing program in law, and requested by a Member of Congress as being important to the district and the people they represent.

This is a fiscally sound bill, scored repeatedly by CBO. There are no gimmicks, no date changes, no unreal savings.

Again, Mr. Chairman, this is a balanced bill and I urge the Committee's support for it.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan and his staff for the constructive relationship we continue to build. As Chairman KNOLLENBERG put this bill together, he and his staff considered concerns raised by the majority and the minority coming from subcommittee members, full committee members, and the general membership of the House. Where he could help, he resolved many of those concerns, and I thank him for that.

I also want to thank the excellent staff on both sides of the aisle for their hard work on this legislation. On the majority side, Dena Baron, the majority clerk, Cheryle Tucker, Jason Woolwine, Tom McLemore, Tammy Hughes, David Napolielo, Alice Hogans and Peter Lee.

And on the minority side, Kate Hallahan and Bob Bonner, and from my staff Matt Washington and David Pugach.

This is only the second time this complex bill has come to the House floor, and I appreciate the work and the long hours that each and every one of those staff members have put in.

I am grateful for the increase in the subcommittee's outlay allocation adopted in the full Appropriations Committee, but I said in the subcommittee markup and full committee markup as well that the allocation to this subcommittee is inadequate to meet the needs, and that is still true. The allocation, even as revised, forced Chairman KNOLLENBERG and staff into a struggle to plug as many holes as they could as creatively as they could. In that process, several serious omissions and cuts proposed in the President's budget have been restored, notably CDBG funding, essential air services, additionally safety inspectors under FAA, and for construction of elderly and disabled housing, and for funding the important Navy Yard Metro Station in our capital city. That was no small feat.

I particularly want to commend Chairman KNOLLENBERG for his thoughtful approach to our capital city's budget which is part of this bill. While the District of Columbia makes up only a small portion of our combined bill, the value of the initiatives funded through this bill cannot be understated, and I thank Chairman KNOLLENBERG for his commitment to ensuring no new policy riders were placed on the District of Columbia. I sincerely hope that we can continue to work on striking a balance between the congressional responsibilities for the District of Columbia with the desire of Washingtonians to have a direct say with how the District is governed.

Mr. Chairman, I will support this bill on final passage, but if this were a conference report I would have to oppose its passage, and I want to take a few minutes to examine what I believe drives this bill this year and in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I am very concerned about the impact that meeting SAFETEA–LU guarantees is having on other agencies and accounts in the bill. I believe that the transportation guarantees placed on this subcommittee by the authorizers ties the hands of this committee from properly funding other domestic programs included in this bill that are just as important.

As this bill was drafted, authorized guarantees had to be met or this bill is subject to a point of order. For example, in FHWA the President's budget met all of the SAFETEA–LU guarantees. However, in FAA and FTA, the President's budget was well below the authorized level. The President's request was $607 million below the authorized level in the facilities and equipment account and $950 million below in airport improvement. In FTA, the Capital Investment Grants Program was $100 million below the authorized level. These shortfalls come to a total of over $1.6 billion. The monies being added to the subcommittee's allocation allowed the chairman to bring these items to the guaranteed level.

I believe that the transportation guarantees are strangling other agencies in our bill. Without honoring the SAFETEA guarantees, the gentleman from Michigan could have increased funding for several key programs in this bill. For example, in HUD we could have used these funds for brownfields, HOPE VI and rural housing, which were all zeroed out. The additional funds could have been used to shore up the underfunded public housing operating fund and the public housing capital fund, or to add to section 8 tenant and project-based voucher programs which were cut below the President's request. The items that I have listed are only the tip of the iceberg, and the process I have described can only get worse as the years go by.

Most of these shortfalls that I believe must be improved are within HUD, but also includes the lone transportation item that does not have the protection of an authorization; namely, Amtrak. I had planned to offer an amendment to increase funding for these programs; but, unfortunately, the majority of this House has once again shown that tax cuts for the wealthiest few in our society are more important than housing programs for our most needy citizens.

Mr. Chairman, I am troubled by the cuts that we have been forced to bring forward. I hope that we will be able to continue to improve the bill as it moves forward in the process. We are early in the process. There is much work to be accomplished on this bill between now and a final conference report.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) for a colloquy with the chairman.

□ 1630

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG).

Mr. Chairman, I was disappointed to learn that this bill did not contain funding for the SouthEast Service Line of Metra, the Chicago area's commuter rail service. I have provided the chairman with a letter from Phil Pagano, the executive director of Metra, which I will include in the RECORD.

In the letter, Mr. Chairman, Metra states that it has a package of New Start projects called Metra Connects that were authorized by SAFETEA–LU. The SouthEast Service and the Star Line are two projects in that package that are new rail projects. Both are significant commuter rail projects for the northeastern Illinois region, and both projects currently are progressing on the same time schedule and are at similar stages of development. During the deliberation SAFETEA–LU bill, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee agreed that both lines would move forward and be funded equitably. Without funding for the SouthEast Service, this agreement is in jeopardy.

I, along with the rest of the Illinois delegation, appreciate and would like to thank the chairman for the money already included for Metra's other new Star projects, and I understand that money overall is tight.

Will the chairman work with me to try to fund this funding in conference?

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Yes, I most certainly will work with the gentleman from Illinois on this project.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the chairman, and I look forward to working with him to make sure that the transportation needs of northeastern Illinois are met.

NORTHEAST ILLINOIS REGIONAL,
COMMUTER RAILROAD CORPORATION,
Chicago, IL, June 13, 2006.

Chairman JOE KNOLLENBERG,
Appropriation Subcommittee on Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, and District of Columbia, House Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN KNOLLENBERG: I am writing to express Metra's concern that funds were provided for the STAR Line but not for the SouthEast Service (SES) New Start project as part of the FY '07 Transportation Appropriations Bill.

As you know, Metra has a package of New Start projects called Metra Connects that were authorized in SAFETEA–LU. The SouthEast Service and the STAR Line are two projects in that package that are new rail projects. Both are significant commuter rail projects for the northeast Illinois region. Currently, both projects are progressing on the same time schedule and are at similar stages of development. During the deliberation of the SAFETEA–LU bill, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee agreed that both lines would move forward and be funded equitably. Without funding for the SouthEast Service, this agreement is in jeopardy.

We urge the chairman to correct this in conference. Thank you again for your support for Metra and our New Start programs.

Sincerely,

PHILIP A. PAGANO,
Executive Director.

Mr. OLVER. And I can assure the gentleman that I too will work to try to correct this inequity.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER).

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage the chairman in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that included in the Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2007 is $227 million for the Office of National Drug Control Policy's High Impact Drug Trafficking Areas Program, an increase of $2.27 million over last year's enacted level; is that correct?

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, the Nevada HIDTA office has done an outstanding job making my State's communities safer. Last year alone, they were successful in removing $12 million worth of narcotic from the streets of Nevada. While the HIDTA office is currently funded at a baseline of 1.4 million, rather than the 2.5 million or more that the other 26 HIDTA offices are funded at, in my district in southern Nevada, which sees thousands of new people a month moving into the area and tens of millions of visitors a year, coupled with the epidemic of methamphetamine and other drug abuses, would the chairman agree that the Nevada HIDTA office funding should be increased to a level more reflective of the challenges the district faces?

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to respond.

I share your concerns. And I thank my colleague for raising this very important issue today. He correctly points out that the bill includes $227 million for HIDTA, the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas program. The subcommittee has funded this important program again this year, even though the President requested that the program be transferred to the Department of Justice at a reduced level of funding.

I would be happy to work with the gentleman from Nevada as this bill moves forward. We can work together to make sure that the issue of methamphetamine and other drug trafficking as it relates to Nevada is forthrightly addressed in the final budget for this account.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his offer and look forward to working with him.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) to engage in a colloquy.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman and ranking member, some public housing authorities nationwide are feeling the crunch from several years worth of budget constraints and the New York City Housing Authority, the largest PHA in the country, is not different. NYCHA is facing a $168 million shortfall in part because of lack of flexibility in how they can use the three main funding streams: section 8, public housing operating and capital funds. Limited fungibility of funding streams will go a long way in helping PHAs to creatively address funding constraints.

Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that as the appropriations process moves forward we can continue to discuss a solution to alleviate these funding constraints by providing limited flexibility in the use of funding streams.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I recognize the difficult situation that some PHAs across the country are facing. Providing flexibility to housing agencies while at the same time ensuring that HUD can effectively manage its programs is a no-cost solution that, if administered properly, will ensure continued service to low-income families. However, at the same time, NYCHA and other PHAs need to make sure that they are taking full advantage of the current flexibility that exists between the public housing operating and capital funds. As this process continues, I look forward to working with the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. I appreciate the Chairman's willingness to work on this issue.

Mr. OLVER. I appreciate the gentlewoman for bringing forward this issue. Public housing authorities and the families they serve are struggling. And I thank the chairman for his willingness to continue to engage in these discussions as we have already had part of that discussion at an earlier stage in the process.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure now to yield to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), for whatever time he may wish to consume.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I appreciate very much the chairman. I must say I have come to the floor simply to express my deep appreciation for the work that the chairman is doing on this very important measure, a bill that drives much of the infrastructure of the country, as well as providing housing programs. He and Mr. OLVER have done a great job on this bill under circumstances where they are under great pressure. There is never quite enough money available to do all that we might like, so it takes very, very positive bipartisan effort to make sure that we provide balance as we restrain spending at the same time.

It is a very fine bill. And I might mention further that these gentlemen, together, are now today producing the eighth bill out of 11 FY 07 Appropriations bills off the floor. It is our intention to complete all those bills by the 4th of July break. You are giving us a fantastic demonstration today that anything is possible if people are willing to work together. So it is great to be with you. And thank you very much for your effort.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to explain to the House that at this point it appears that there are more than 70 amendments pending, and that if each and every one of them only takes 10 minutes, 5 minutes a side, we will be here through all of today, through all of Wednesday, through all of Friday and perhaps into next week. So I would ask Members to keep that in mind and, if possible, to relinquish their ability to offer conflicting or duplicative amendments. I think points can be made without beating a dead horse five times over.

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), who is a member of the subcommittee.

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman KNOLLENBERG for your leadership, sir, Michigander, appreciate working with you. And to our ranking member, Mr. OLVER, thank you very much for working together. As I always say, when the chairman and ranking members work together, it certainly makes our subcommittee work better.

I rise in support of our TTHUD bill, that is Transportation, Treasury, HUD, IRS and several other agencies put together in an acronym we call TTHUD, the TTHUD bill, some $67 billion bill for transit agencies, for our roads and bridges, for our housing needs, and Treasury and the like.

I think the bill is a good bill for what we had to work with, but it is far short of the needs that America has to fund its highway system, to fund its transit system, also for community development. I think housing in this bill takes a major hit, and it is so unfortunate. HOPE VI, which is a program for distressed housing in mainly urban America, has been zeroed out. I think that is unfortunate. And I know you can't fund a war at over $350 billion and think we can, at the same time, invest in America. That is why I think we must bring our troops home in the most practical time, and redeploy our troops around the theater area so that America is safe, and that we protect our interests at the same time.

But working with the dollars that we have, the HUD part of this bill has been devastated. The brownfield area has been zeroed out. Together, the EPA, which has money in it for remediation of land that will be developed, there is a small amount of money there. It is only there for remediation. The HOPE VI monies are for building, the actual building of houses, and together with the Community Development Block Grant money will help distressed areas and mainly urban areas of our country be able to put people in affordable housing, to have people live in safe housing, to offer their children hope for the future because a house is the most basic thing they need, one of the most basic things. This bill does not do a good job with that. And I know as we go on, you will hear more amendments trying to put back brownfield money, trying to put back HOPE VI money, and I support that.

I also want to bring up in this bill the section 8 housing choice voucher program. The way that the money is distributed in that program needs to be fixed. They take a snapshot of 3 months of the expenses, rather than a 12-month snapshot of the expenses in those section 8 housing use. Thereby, States like mine, we lose millions of dollars that could be helpful in families needing housing, adequate, safe clean housing. So I would hope that as we go on, we take a look at that. And as I asked the chairman last year to take a look at our State's, not just our State's, but our choice house voucher program, where we are being penalized and losing money that we ought to have because of a flawed formula. This does not look at the 12-month expenses, but only the 3-month expenses. And I might add not the 3 months expenses that have the higher home heating costs.

But overall, the TTHUD bill is one that can be supported. There will be amendments offered. Some of them are some that I will support. Housing development and providing assistance to urban America has to be strengthened.

I look forward to working with the chairman and our ranking member to make sure that we can build back some of these real programs that America needs. This administration has no urban program for development, for our schools, for our health centers; and I contend as we move forward in this process, we must pay attention to adequate, safe, clean housing. This bill falls far short.

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN), also a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished ranking member for the time. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend our subcommittee Chair, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, and my ranking member, Mr. OLVER. We have a very interesting subcommittee. We cover a lot of ground, a lot of very interesting subject matters. And I must tell you that our chairman not only permits a wide range of debate and discussion and questioning, perhaps he even encourages it, because he certainly hasn't stopped me and he has been very, very generous in the way he has treated the members of the minority, and I thank him.

My ranking member shows great leadership on all of our issues, and his work is reflected in this bill which, while we all wish there were a lot more money because more money is deserving for this bill, I believe he has managed to reach the kind of compromises that were possible, given this shortage in money. Of course, I am disappointed in the amount of money for Amtrak. I am disappointed in some other matters; but as a former mayor, for example, I am delighted at the Community

Development Block Grant money because that money is so critical.

□ 1645

And, of course, I would be remiss if I did not thank the majority staff and the minority staff for tolerating my obsession with various items, including Teterboro Airport, and once again the subcommittee has chosen to protect this airport from abuse. It is not a partisan matter, as the majority and minority have acknowledged. It is a matter that appeals to all the people in my district, and, again, I am just so grateful.

I want to again thank the chairman and the ranking member for their kindness and cooperation throughout this year in the consideration of this bill.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) for a colloquy.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage in a colloquy with Chairman KNOLLENBERG on this particular issue.

First of all, I want to thank the chairman and I want to thank the ranking member, Mr. OLVER, for their hard work on this particular bill. I also appreciate this opportunity to speak to Chairman KNOLLENBERG on this issue that is very important to my congressional district.

My congressional district abuts the U.S.-Mexico border, which is very dependent on trade. Interstate Highway 35, the ''NAFTA Corridor,'' runs from Laredo in my district, throughout the San Antonio area, all the way up to San Marcos, all three areas which are large population centers.

Zapata County, which is in my district, is sandwiched between Webb County and Starr County, both Border Commercial Zones. Zapata is not currently designated a Border Commercial Zone, and consequently it loses out on economic development opportunities since Mexican trucks cannot conduct business in Zapata County. The Zapata business community has been asking for this designation. This area of the country is economically challenged, and the opportunity to engage in trade with Mexico will make a big difference in local business community development.

For example, the Zapata County master plan initiative includes an airport expansion project that includes a cargo facility and will offer shorter, direct flights into Zapata from Monterrey, Mexico. Freight companies in Mexico have expressed a desire to build warehouses and open a facility. In order to get a commercial zone, it takes an application process, but it is a long, burdensome process for a goal that is quite simple.

I am asking for your help, Mr. Chairman, to expedite Zapata County's application to be designated a Border Commercial Zone. Getting this locality on the fast track will be good for the local residents and businesses in this area for economic development.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your support to help Zapata County apply for and expedite the process to become a Border Commercial Zone, and I thank you for the opportunity.

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

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I would just say that I agree to work with you on this. I appreciate your bringing it forward. And we will also work with the FMCSA on this issue. So thank you.

Mr. CUELLAR. I thank the chairman.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say I would be happy, especially after that trip through his district, to work with the gentleman from Texas on the issue that he has raised.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy in permitting me to speak on this bill, and I too understand that there are tremendous challenges that are faced by the subcommittee with its interesting and broad jurisdiction.

I rise to speak on one particular element that actually should help the subcommittee, and that is dealing with the Small Starts provision. The Small Starts provision was carefully crafted in last year's reauthorization after 3 years of work with people around the country to provide a simple, cost-effective way to reduce congestion, to promote economic development, and to streamline the bureaucracy, instead of the massive effort that is undertaken for the New Starts, the elaborate cost-effectiveness, the massive amount of money that is involved, and I know and appreciate that. I appreciate what the committee has done in approving the administration's recommendation for a project in my community. These are difficult, expensive, hard projects. That is why I have been working on the Small Starts. The Small Starts projects are ones that do not need massive Federal outlay. Small Starts do not mean that you have to rip up communities for weeks, months, in some cases years to construct them. The technology is available now to build a streetcar, a trolley, 3 weeks per block face. That's three weeks per block. They do not need to be massive projects with huge amounts of money.

The program of Small Starts was designed to be smaller amounts that will deal with relieving congestion and relieving the necessity of other more elaborate efforts for economic development.

We have 84 communities around the country with people that are looking at the streetcar technology and using the Small Starts program. If the committee will work with us and the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee with what we have authorized in SAFETEA–LU, we have the potential of providing the same sort of economic jolt and the relief of congestion without the costs, without the elaborate procedure, without the delay, and without the community disruption that are attendant with light rail and heavy rail.

I was disappointed that the subcommittee decided not to be funding it, but I am more concerned about the language in the subcommittee report that betrays a lack of understanding about why we developed this program to begin with. It is something that can help large cities like Chicago, where there is great interest in it; small cities like Kenosha, Wisconsin; and cities in between like Little Rock and Charlotte. And I would hope that as this legislation works its way through Congress that we will be able to work with the subcommittee and people in the other body to be able to harness the potential savings, economic development, congestion mitigation that can be a part of the Small Starts program.

I would think given the very difficult task that this subcommittee faces, with which I sympathize, that we ought to embrace this approach because in the long run it will give you more bang for the buck, more satisfied communities, more reduction in congestion, and more economic opportunities.

I appreciate the opportunity to talk about this for a moment and look forward to working with the subcommittee.

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

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

I would just like to point out to the gentleman from Oregon that in fact the guarantee, and it is a guarantee under the TEA–LU bill, is included in what is called the Capital Investments Fund. So there is money available there. But I need also to point out that we have been told at the subcommittee level that the Department of Transportation, the FTA, will not have rules and regulations until at least a year from now, maybe 15 months from now, which is the very end of the next fiscal year.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, we are having some interesting ongoing conversations with the Department of Transportation. I went across the street to visit with him at FTA immediately after the enactment of the legislation. There is no need for us to delay this process for months and years.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I agree with that point. I think that if people from the authorizing committee will make that point strongly to the Department of Transportation, that would be very helpful because I agree with virtually everything the gentleman has said. This is a process that ought to get moving, but the money is there. We can deal with this later on in this process. We are at

an early stage in the process. They need to get the rules and regulations out faster than 15 months from now.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, for the first time in 4 years, I will not offer an amendment to this bill to block the implementation of the May 2003 Office of Management and Budget Circular A–76 regulations for contracting out work that is performed by Federal employees around the country.

The difference this year, Mr. Chairman, is that Chairman KNOLLENBERG and Ranking Member OLVER agreed to my request to include satisfactory language in the bill that is before us. I want to thank them for addressing this issue this year.

Both Federal Government employees and private contractors had serious legitimate concerns and complaints about the A–76 competitive sourcing process. The amendment I offered in past years essentially required OMB to go back to the drawing board and develop a uniform competitive sourcing process that addresses everybody's concerns. Despite strong objections and veto threats from the White House, we had spirited debates in the three previous appropriations cycles on the Van Hollen amendment, and each year the House approved the amendment with bipartisan majorities.

We passed the Van Hollen amendment for the last 3 years because we recognized that the contracting out process was unfair. That was evidenced by the fact that we passed a number of bills to change the contracting out process on an ad hoc basis in numerous Federal agencies, including Defense, Homeland Security, Interior and Agriculture. But the result was a patchwork of inconsistent regulations. The Van Hollen amendment was intended to replace that patchwork of inconsistent regulations with a uniform set of rules fair to all. It did not get rid of the competitive sourcing rules. In essence, it required OMB to go back to the rules that were in place before May 2003 until it fashioned a new set of rules that make sense for everybody.

In fiscal year 2005 the Senate approved language similar to the Van Hollen amendment, but even though both Houses approved similar language it did not survive a closed-door TTHUD conference. Last year, in fiscal year 2006, the Senate approved language that was widely viewed as acceptable to the White House, however begrudgingly, and that language survived the conference and was signed into law. That language provided funding for A–76 competitions that allowed Federal workers to present their own most efficient organization, MEO, bid in a competitive sourcing competition, and required private contractor bids to provide for a minimum cost differential, MCD, savings of at least 10 percent or $10 million over the MEO bid. While these public-private competition requirements did not address all of the concerns of Federal employees pertaining to appeal rights, these requirements were considerable improvements in the competitive sourcing process.

But now, Mr. Chairman, we are in a brand new fiscal year cycle and once again we need to address critical matters related to the contracting out process. We should not have to do this every year in the appropriations process, Mr. Speaker, but we will repeat this debate year after year until Congress takes definitive action and authorizes competitive sourcing regulations that are fair to Federal employees and private contractors.

This year is somewhat different, however. This year, Chairman KNOLLENBERG and Ranking Member OLVER have had the foresight to include competitive souring language in the base fiscal year 2007 appropriations bill that mirrors the MEO/MCD language that was signed into law last year. Therefore, there is no need to offer the amendment I have offered in the past.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the TTHUD appropriations bill on the floor today includes forward-looking language pertaining to A–76 competitive sourcing that precludes the need to offer my amendment again this year. I look forward to working with the leadership of the Appropriations Committee and with the authorizers on the House Committee on Government Reform in the future to devise a permanent fix to the A–76 process that is fair to Federal workers and private contractors and that provides American taxpayers with the efficient, cost-effective and quality services they demand and deserve.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my disappointment that the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 2007 does not fully fund the Help America Vote Act, HAVA.

HAVA was passed in the wake of the 2000 election, and authorized almost $4 billion to improve the administration of elections in this country. The 2004 election was a strong indication that there is much work yet to be done in the area of election reform in this country. And yet here we are, fast approaching Federal elections which are to be the first ones that take place under virtually all of HAVA's requirements, and hundreds of millions of dollars in funds authorized under the bill remain unappropriated.

Although the appropriations bill before us includes almost $17 million in funding for the Election Assistance Commission, EAC, which is nearly $3 million more than was appropriated to the EAC for fiscal year 2006, it still provides no funding whatsoever to help States meet their voting system requirements—especially the disability and language access requirements—under title III of the act. HAVA authorized $3 billion in so-called ''requirements payments,'' and has to date appropriated only $2.328 billion. States across the Nation are struggling to meet HAVA's voting system requirements, and $672 million in authorized funds remain unappropriated. And not one dime of that amount has been requested in the President's fiscal year 2007 budget nor provided for in this appropriations measure.

HAVA also authorized $100 million to promote access to the polls for disabled voters, of which only $44 million has been appropriated to date, and $40 million for protection and advocacy systems, of which just under $17 million has been appropriated to date. I understand that the Labor and Health and Human Services appropriations bill to be reported out of committee today will include approximately $11 million in funding for the former accessibility grants, and approximately $5 million in additional funding for the latter protection and advocacy systems. However, these new appropriations still leave a total of approximately $63 million in authorized disability access payments unappropriated.

There are certainly many important demands upon us, but I ask you, Mr. Chairman, what is more important in a democracy than the fairness and integrity of the electoral system. I rise today to register my disappointment that the measure before us provides no funding to help States meet their title III requirements under HAVA, and to urge my colleagues to work with me when the Departments and Labor and Health and Humans Services appropriations bill comes to the floor next week to fully fund HAVA's disability access payments.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5576, the appropriations act for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development.

I want to note two important Houston-area projects that received funding in this legislation: METRO Solutions and the Harrisburg grade separation.

The $2.5 million for METRO is a very small amount compared to our need for transit investment in Houston, particularly for light rail.

However, we are very grateful for this amount, because in previous years members of our Houston delegation blocked any funding in this bill for Houston light rail.

We will never know how many millions went to other projects around the country because our delegation was not united behind a plan.

Thankfully, this situation has now changed, and we have a commitment from our delegation to pursue $1 billion over 10 years for Houston light rail.

Unfortunately, it does not look like we will be able to meet that commitment. As a result, the process at the FTA is taking on much greater importance.

METRO must cut through the red-tape at FTA and get approval for their project and a full funding grant agreement if the Northside Line and East End Line are going to be a reality.

We are going to need all the funding we can get if we want to upgrade the BRT to light rail as quickly as possible to meet the expectations of the voters in the referendum.

The other important project for Houston is the Harrisburg Grade Separation. The bill contains $300,000 to get this project started in the design phase.

East End Houston has entirely too many inconvenient and unsafe grade crossings, and a grade separation at Harrisburg will provide easy access and prevent rail/auto/truck accidents for area residents.

We have just started construction on our Manchester grade separation, so it is fitting that we are starting at the beginning of the process for another very important intersection.

This project will fit in well with the effort to reorganize the freight rail system for Harris County and surrounding counties, because the most relief from freight rail traffic needs to be in the areas with the most impact.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee and the full committee for their work on this bill and also thank our Houston area appropriator, JOHN CULBERSON for his help, particularly with the METRO funding.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

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

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5576

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary, $92,558,000, of which not to exceed $2,255,000 shall be available for the immediate Office of the Secretary; not to exceed $717,000 shall be available for the immediate Office of the Deputy Secretary; not to exceed $15,681,000 shall be available for the Office of the General Counsel; not to exceed $11,684,000 shall be available for the Office of the Under Secretary of Transportation for Policy; not to exceed $10,002,000 shall be available for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs; not to exceed $2,319,000 shall be available for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs; not to exceed $25,108,000 shall be available for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration; not to exceed $1,932,000 shall be available for the Office of Public Affairs; not to exceed $1,478,000 shall be available for the Office of the Executive Secretariat; not to exceed $707,000 shall be available for the Board of Contract Appeals; not to exceed $1,286,000 shall be available for the Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization; not to exceed $2,722,000 for the Office of Intelligence and Security; not to exceed $12,281,000 shall be available for the Office of the Chief Information Officer; and not to exceed $4,386,000 shall be available for the Office of Emergency Transportation: *Provided,* That the Secretary of Transportation is authorized to transfer funds appropriated for any office of the Office of the Secretary to any other office of the Office of the Secretary: *Provided further,* That no appropriation for any office shall be increased or decreased by more than 5 percent by all such transfers: *Provided further,* That notice of any change in funding greater than 5 percent shall be submitted for approval to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $60,000 shall be for allocation within the Department for official reception and representation expenses as the Secretary may determine: *Provided further,* That notwithstanding any other provision of law, excluding fees authorized in Public Law 107–71, there may be credited to this appropriation up to $2,500,000 in funds received in user fees.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KNOLLENBERG

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KNOLLENBERG:

Page 2, line 11, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,000)''.

Page 72, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $20,748,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to reaching ahead in the amendment process to get to this point?

Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, following the full committee amendment process, CBO's scoring of our bill resulted in slightly more than $20.7 million in savings.

This amendment will place this funding in the IRS operations support account, which was reduced by $50 million below the President's request.

I understand that this has been cleared with the minority, and therefore I ask for the adoption of this amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LATOURETTE

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LATOURETTE:

Page 2, line 11, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $23,814,000)''.

Page 2, line 11, after the second dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $79,000)''

Page 2, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $26,000)''.

Page 2, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $650,000)''.

Page 2, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $150,000)''.

Page 2, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,602,000)''.

Page 2, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $2,319,000)''.

Page 2, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $3,297,000)''.

Page 2, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,932,000)''.

Page 2, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,478,000)''.

Page 3, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $12,281,000)''.

Page 4, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $4,090,000)''.

Page 37, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $34,650,000)''.

Page 38, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $129,000,000)''.

Page 39, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $85,000,000)''.

Page 58, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $2,693,000)''.

Page 58, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $2,693,000)''.

Page 192, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,179,990)''.

Page 194, line 1, after ''2007'' insert the following: ''(reduced by $559,641,000)''.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on my amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 20 minutes, 10 minutes by the proponent and 10 minutes by the opponent, equally divided and controlled by each.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 10 minutes.

□ 1700

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today offering this amendment with my good friend, Mr. OBERSTAR from Minnesota, the ranking member of the full Transportation Committee. I will yield him half of my time when he arrives on the floor.

Unlike aviation, highways and transit, there is no dedicated funding for investing in our Nation's passenger rail service. This is a pretty simple amendment. All it does is restore $214 million to the Amtrak account, taking it to $1.114 billion, which is still about $300 million less than we had during the course of last year's discussion.

As the chairman of the Railroad Subcommittee, we have had exhaustive hearings, oversight hearings, dealing with the Amtrak situation, and we have done a number of things. The CEO has been fired by the board. We have looked at their food service. They have entered into a new food service contract. If you look at this bill, and I want to commend Mr. KNOLLENBERG, because last year he had an impossible task. The President sent up a budget of zero for Amtrak. We had an amendment process that we went through this time.

This time we are up to $900 million in the bill, which I give him great credit for. But if you look at that $900 million, there is only $500 million for capital expenditures, out of which has to come a debt service of $280 million, which only leaves $220 million for the capital needs of this country for Amtrak, for passenger rail.

There is nothing for operation, and I know that the response to that is going to be that there are some incentive grants in the bill. But that really does not get the thing done.

Mr. Chairman, we have tried to be judicious with this amendment and looked for pots of money located within the bill solely within the jurisdiction of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. I think we have achieved that.

I believe it is a good amendment and I urge adoption by my colleagues.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member seek time in opposition to the amendment?

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would increase funding for Amtrak by gutting and eliminating critical programs, including safety programs, resulting in reductions in force at several agencies.

This bill was put together by making some very difficult decisions to balance a wide variety of critical needs from some very diverse programs. The amendment would undermine the difficult work done by the subcommittee by haphazardly making unrealistic and undisciplined cuts throughout the bill.

It would cut the Office of the Secretary of Transportation by 25 percent. That is well below the fiscal year for 2006. This will result in reductions in force for OST and will impact mission critical operations, including security planning as well as coordination and response efforts.

These areas proved critical during last year's hurricanes, and we have now entered the hurricane season again. It would eliminate the critical rail safety research programs under the Federal Railroad Administration. This is a little confusing, because several years ago it is this research program that pinpointed the problem associated with Amtrak's brakes on the Acela and found the solution and allowed Acela to get up and running again.

The amendment would severely reduce funds for the Federal Maritime Commission and the Surface Transportation Board, resulting in RIFs for both of these agencies, and cutting the Federal Buildings Fund by $560 million will leave the fund without the resources it needs to build critical, secure crossings on our Southern border with Mexico.

Mr. Chairman, it would not strengthen the Federal buildings against threatening terrorism attacks. Let me repeat this. Vote for this amendment and you are voting against building border crossings on the U.S.-Mexico border and against funding to secure the Federal buildings against terrorism.

Let me go a little further and explain that these cuts would completely eliminate GSA's new construction of six border stations at the crossing at McAllen, Texas, at El Paso, Texas, Santa Teresa, New Mexico, Columbus, New Mexico, Calexico, California, and Nogales, Arizona.

In addition, the amendment would eliminate the Food and Drug Administration Montgomery County, Maryland Project, as well as remove the delivery facility in Anacostia for mail sorting for the Federal Government, something that is sadly needed, and with the threat of anthrax and other deadly substances in government mail.

Repairs and alterations to Federal buildings will be stopped or slowed, repairs and alterations that are needed to secure government workers and the general public from possible terrorist attacks.

Mr. Chairman, cutting border security and funds to protect Federal workers against terrorism is irresponsible. I ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, can I ask how much time I used, please?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SCHWARZ).

Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, while I credit my colleague from Michigan for doing a great deal of work on this bill, and I know it is a tremendously difficult bill, rail passenger service in the United States is the worst in all of the industrialized world.

It does not have to be that way. Germany, France, the United Kingdom, Italy, the Scandinavian countries, Spain and Portugal have better rail service, more rapid rail service, more frequent rail service, more efficient rail service than the United States. It does not have to be this way.

The degradation of the Amtrak system goes on apace, whether it is the right-of-way or equipment. Equipment needs to be replaced. Right-of-way needs to be maintained. The Canton area, the electric, the Canton area in the Northeast Corridor needs to be maintained as well. Witness the blackout just 2 weeks ago.

We need to have a modern, efficient, dependable rail passenger service in the United States. The only way we can do it is to fund it. It is the most efficient way to carry people. And I must say that no system in any industrialized country in the world is profitable. They are all subsidized. It is part of the cost of doing business. It is part of the cost of running an efficient government. It is part of the cost of keeping our economy going.

Please support the LaTourette amendment.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire about how much time is left on our side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to a member of the subcommittee, TODD TIAHRT from Kansas.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Treasury, Housing and Urban Development has done a fine job. We are a nation of priorities. Each year we must decide where the resources that have been given to us by the taxpayers will be spent.

This bill is a good example. The chairman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) made good decisions on the allocations within this bill. The subcommittee worked its will, making sure that the allocations were filled to the best of our ability.

Then the bill went to the full committee appropriations process, and the amendments were conducted. And again the will of the committee was worked. Not all of the requests were funded. It is the same with Amtrak. Their request was not funded, and it is because Amtrak is undergoing some financial stress that they have asked for more funding.

But this is not new to our economy. Other portions of our economy have also been under financial stress. For example, the airlines have been faced with similar shortfalls in revenue. And yet when they were faced with these shortfalls, they undertook a search of every cost. They went to their workers. They went to their pilots. They went to their flight attendants. They went to the mechanics. And they asked them, could you help out under this current period of financial stress? And the unions and the workers all weighed in to help with the cost structure.

The same thing happened in our auto manufacturing industry, where the United Auto Workers weighed in and helped bear some of the reductions in costs so that they could keep their companies afloat.

They came to the table, they did the right thing for their jobs, for their families, and they made themselves more competitive in times of financial stress. Now we come to Amtrak. Amtrak has looked at some of their costs, but their workers have never weighed in.

Mr. Chairman, I think when you look at the costs that Amtrak is asking for, we need to look across the spectrum, at the union agreements, at the wages that are being paid, at the benefits, as well as the cost of the infrastructure, the cost to operate, the energy costs, so that each and every facet of Amtrak weighs into these costs. We have done that. The reforms are in place. We hope to see the reforms completed,

Mr. Chairman, I think it is time that we have these reforms that we have put in the bill become enacted, so that we can take each facet of the cost in Amtrak into the formula to come up with a plan to make sure that Amtrak is solvent in the future.

I thank the gentleman from Michigan for spending the time on these allocations within this bill. I think he has done a fine job. I would oppose the gentleman from Ohio's amendment, let the reforms take place and make sure that Amtrak is solvent in the future.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that we still have 7 minutes remaining on our side of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to Mr. OBERSTAR from Minnesota, the co-author of the amendment, and ask unanimous consent that

he be permitted to yield time from that 5 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

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

Mr. Chairman, I think that this amendment shows quite clearly how difficult the job was for the chairman in the first place, and that it is very difficult to find offsets for the kind of money that was necessary to put together this amendment.

But all of the offsets come out of the jurisdiction of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, the full Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. And I think that it makes it clear that if the offsets are used in this way to fund Amtrak, which is needed, that then we will go to the later stages in the process and try to make corrections in the later stages of the process.

Mr. Chairman, it will be no more difficult to re-fund the items that have been taken out of their own jurisdiction, out of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee's jurisdiction, it will be no more difficult to fund them later than it is to fund Amtrak now.

Clearly with this amendment, we will still be $180 million below the enacted number for 2006, and the Amtrak board has asked this year for $1.598 billion. That is the most recently appointed board of members from the President.

So we are still very far short of what they believe is necessary to run the national rail passenger system. So I am, with some trepidation, supporting the amendment that has been put forward. I certainly intend to vote for the amendment.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, again I would like to inquire about the time remaining for our side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Minnesota has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, by the way, let me thank Mr. LATOURETTE for suggesting the 20-minute situation divided by two. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues, giving Amtrak more money would be like giving at this point an alcoholic another drink and asking him to sober up.

I sort of feel like I am repeating, Mr. Chairman, the Ground Hog Day. We have been through this debate over and over, and we keep putting more and more taxpayer dollars into Amtrak. And I have no problem with subsidizing mass transit or any type of long distance service or high speed service. We will need to subsidize it. But, folks, Amtrak has been and remains out of control. I served on the Rail Subcommittee for most of my time in Congress. Let us just review, if we give them a little bit more money, where that is going to go.

Right now we subsidize every ticket for $47. That is absolutely outrageous, ladies and gentlemen. In fact, some tickets are subsidized—I have the report right here, the latest information—$627. Could you imagine that type of subsidy? They will tell you, oh, we give it to airlines. That is not true. No one is subsidized like Amtrak is.

Food service. For every dollar that we take in in food service on Amtrak, it costs the taxpayers $2. That is it, just give them a little bit more money and things work out. Legal services. They spend more money on legal services than they do on equipment.

The debt has risen to some $6 or $7 billion. The maintenance backlog is between $5 and $6 billion. So even if you add additional money, whoever is in this well 1 year from now will be back here trying to feed the Amtrak monster.

We must have the reforms. Some of them are in the bill. The committee has done a great job in trying to get their attention, to try to get their finances in order. Their finances and accounting is worse than Enron's.

□ 1715

It is time that we demand accountability, that we demand a better operating mass transit and public long distance service; and I have no problem with underwriting that. But we should look at what the private sector can do. They have 26 million, I believe, passengers.

In England, they have a new route, north-south. They have 34 million. They actually have made a profit and turned a dividend and returned it back to the taxpayers.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I find no small irony to what we just heard. This bill contains billions of dollars of subsides to the airline industry on top of hundreds of billions of dollars that was spent in the past for an industry that has produced a net profit of zero in its 75-year history.

Why does Amtrak have problems? We have consistently underinvested in their capital needs. Any objective analysis suggests that they need to be adequately funded for capital, but this Congress consistently underfunds it. We cut it by another $200 million, and we will not even pass the authorizing legislation.

We are not going to kill Amtrak, because the public won't allow Amtrak to be killed; but it is time for us to stop this charade, give a modest amount of money to meet its capital needs, be able to reverse the outrageous act where they fired David Gunn, an operational genius who was dealing with the management problems of Amtrak, and they fired him. It is time to stop the criminal mismanagement of Amtrak by the political process.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I would yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, regardless of your opinion about Amtrak, if you are concerned about border security and want to do a better job of protecting our border, you need to vote against this amendment. Because according to the CBO's scoring, this $560 million cut from the Federal Building Fund would come primarily out of the repairs, alterations, and construction account.

The President has asked for six new border stations on the border between Texas, California, New Mexico, and Arizona. These cuts would leave the building fund without the money they need to build secure, critical border crossings with Mexico.

This is not just about Amtrak. This is taking critically needed money to build these border crossings and maintain not just Federal structures across the country but, more importantly, the secure, critical border crossings with Mexico.

I urge Members to vote against this amendment. Whether you oppose Amtrak, you should vote against the amendment, as I would, because I am concerned about Amtrak's accounting, but because I am concerned about border security as the highest priority of this Congress, you need to vote ''no'' on this amendment so we can build these secure, critical border crossings.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. REHBERG).

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, before I begin, may I have a parliamentary inquiry to have unanimous consent to interject a letter into the RECORD? Do I do that during this debate?

The CHAIRMAN. That will have to be done in the full House as opposed to in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. REHBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Mr. LATOURETTE's amendment. One of the things you heard talked about was the fact that Amtrak was making changes. That is absolutely incorrect.

I have an article I am going to interject into the RECORD: ''Passenger Railroad Improves Service on Long-Haul Trains to Lure Travelers.'' The Empire Builder, which is in Montana, is the rolling laboratory for some of these changes.

I represent a district that spans the distance of Washington, D.C. to Chicago. Think about it: Washington, D.C. to Chicago. In many areas, this is the only form of transportation we have.

Many of you have airlines. We do not in northern Montana. Many of you have bus service. We do not in northern Montana. We use this service for essential service to get our people to hospitals, to doctors, to school, to visit relatives.

This is not just something we are wasting money on. This is an essential service, an essential product for the people of America. If you are going to build a more secure future for the people of Montana, then you have to be realistic.

You don't gut and undermine the effort that they are attempting to make at this time to improve the service of the Empire Builder in Amtrak. I ask you, please support Mr. LATOURETTE.

[From Business Focus, Mar. 17, 2006]

PASSENGER RAILROAD IMPROVES SERVICE ON LONG-HAUL TRAINS TO LURE TRAVELERS

(By Daniel Machalaba)

SHELBY, MONTANA.—Karyn Hamilton, like many Amtrak riders, had a dim view of the nation's passenger railroad as low-class, uncomfortable and not much better than a bus. But the marketing director of a financial-management firm in Portland, Ore., changed her mind during a trip last August on the Empire Builder, an Amtrak long-distance train undergoing a dramatic makeover that includes new carpeting and colors, pleasant staff, and upgraded food service.

After years of financial and political crisis, Amtrak is making a calculated gamble: To boost revenue on its longer-haul trains, the railroad is altering its longstanding one-size-fits-all approach to passengers.

The changes began with a major makeover of the Empire Builder last summer. Now, Amtrak plans to extend the changes to some other long-haul trains, while also attacking bloated food-service expenses. Amtrak's board also is considering cuts to its headquarters overhead by streamlining repair shops, maintenance operations, reservation call centers and train stations.

The shakeup is an acknowledgment by Amtrak officials that they are running out of chances to stave off pressure from the Bush administration to break up or even liquidate the federally subsidized—and unprofitable—railroad. ''We're living on borrowed time,'' says David Laney, Amtrak's chairman. ''We have to demonstrate what we can do on our own before it is taken out of our hands.''

Last year the Bush administration proposed eliminating subsidies to Amtrak, which has been kept afloat with $30 billion in federal aid since 1971, according to the Department of Transportation. While Congress approved $1.3 billion in funding for the current fiscal year, the Bush administration latest budget request includes $900 million—a 31 percent cut— for fiscal 2007. And the DOT would hold back nearly half of the money until Amtrak demonstrated continued progress on reform. Yesterday, Amtrak said it would ask Congress for $1.598 billion for fiscal 2007, almost all the increase for capital spending.

As part of the do-or-die overhaul, Mr. Laney fired Amtrak President David Gunn last November. Mr. Gunn had been widely praised for stabilizing Amtrak's finances,

Jump starting repairs to the Northeast Corridor and restoring credibility with Congress. But Mr. Laney, a Dallas lawyer and Republican loyalist appointed to the Amtrak board in 2002, concluded that Mr. Gunn was standing in the way of more-drastic reforms. Mr. Gunn says he was fired because he opposed the Bush Administration's Amtrak strategy.

Mr. Laney ways the next crucial step for Amtrak is to fix some notorious customer-service problems, ranging from dirty cars to unhelpful and rude onboard employees. About 30 percent of all Amtrak trains are late. Rep. John Mica, a Republican from Florida and longtime Amtrak critic, complains Amtrak can ''rival some of the Third World and former Soviet Union rail experiences.'' Mr. Laney acknowledges that passenger service by Amtrak is ''in some cases superb and in some cases miserable.''

The restructuring likely puts Amtrak on a collision course with its 17,000 unionized workers, two-thirds of whom haven't had a new contract for about five years. Amtrak officials estimate union restrictions cost the railroad about $100 million a year. Edward Wytkind, president of the AFL–CIO union's Transportation Trades Department, said in a statement that the Bush administration's reform effort is an attempt to ''scapegoat workers for the failures of the federal government and the current Amtrak board.''

Some of Amtrak's worst problems are beyond its control. Formed to relieve freight railroads of money-losing passenger trains, Amtrak shares nearly 22,000 miles of track with the freight trains, and congestion is worsening. Still, Amtrak believes better service will lure riders and shrink losses on long-distance lines. On long-distance routes that are primarily used by passengers for basic transportation, starting with the Texas Eagle and the City of New Orleans, the railroad is rolling out a new type of dining service that makes greater use of precooked meals and introduces disposable plastic plates. Those changes are designed to cut the number of dining-car employees to three per train from five or six.

Meanwhile, Amtrak is replacing mandatory meal-serving periods with more flexible hours. Over the next few years, it plans to rebuild dining cars to replace traditional table seating and allow passengers to sit at the bar or watch passing scenery from crescent-shaped booths that face the windows. Meal service will then be available as much as 18 hours a day, up from about eight hours now, allowing Amtrak to serve more people and boost revenue. Amtrak hopes to cut $32 million from its annual food-service loss of $123 million.

The Empire Builder is the rolling laboratory for some of the changes. Its on-time record is about 68 percent, and it posted an average loss or $78.57 per passenger in the fiscal year ended Sept. 30.

While the Empire Building is so far sticking with the traditional dining-car format, staffing level and made-to-order food, its added amenities and upgraded service are noticeable. Amtrak put a small fleet of rebuilt passenger cars with hip blue-and-white interiors on the line—a big improvement over the drab orange and brown that dominated older cars. Employees now must introduce themselves to passengers. Conductors must stay up all night in the dining car in case they are needed.

So far, the Empire Builder makeover appears to be enticing more passengers, particularly during the off-season when ridership typically declines. But David Hughes, Amtrak's acting president, says it is impossible to ever make long-distance trains like the Empire Builder profitable. Those trains are expected to generate $382 million in fiscal 2006, or about one-fourth of overall Amtrak revenue, but post losses of more than $493 million, or about $125 for every passenger.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise in opposition to the amendment, not to speak against Amtrak, but really where these funds would come from.

As the previous speaker under Mr. KNOLLENBERG's time, Mr. CULBERSON said it comes out of our border security infrastructure. Much of that is right in the heart of Arizona. The Nogales/Mariposa Port of Entry and the San Luis Port of Entry are located on the Arizona-Mexico border, not in my district, but in the area and will enhance security while promoting economic development and improving the quality of life in the border region.

The first project is the reconfiguration of the Nogales/Mariposa Port of Entry. It is the principal commercial crossing on the southern border during much of the year. It processes half of all the winter fruits and vegetables entering the United States. It was built in the 1970s, and it was never built to handle the volume of traffic it now receives.

During the peak season, it is absolutely overwhelmed. Trucks line up for hours and miles and miles and miles into Mexico waiting to cross. In addition the post-9/11 requirements of the Bioterrorism Act and other security measures have added to the congestion of the port. This is a project that would be cut under this amendment.

The second project is the construction of the new port of entry at San Luis, and that is the highest priority on the southern border and President's requested $42 million.

I urge that we defeat this amendment because of where the funds are being taken from.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment because the funding it would remove from the bill would be terribly detrimental to our border security infrastructure, at precisely the time when we are finally turning our attention towards fixing our border and stopping illegal immigration.

The Nogales/Mariposa Port of Entry and San Luis Port of Entry are located on the Arizona-Mexico border and will enhance security while promoting economic development and improving the quality of life in the border region and across the country.

The first project is the reconfiguration of the Nogales/Mariposa Port of Entry to expand the port and enhance border security. Mariposa is one of the principal commercial crossings on the southern border; it processes half of the winter fruits and vegetables entering the United States. Built in the 1970's, Mariposa was never intended to handle the volume of traffic it now receives. During the peak season, it is overwhelmed, as trucks line up for miles and wait many hours to cross. In addition, the new post 9/11 requirements under the Bioterrorism Act and other security measures have added to the congestion at the port. U.S. Customs and Border Protection therefore placed this project high on its list of priorities and the President requested $9 million for design funds in his budget. That funding is in this bill and would be cut by this amendment.

The second project is the construction of a new Port of Entry at San Luis. U.S. Customs

and Border Protection has also listed this project as its highest priority on the southern border and the President requested $42 million for design funds in the Fiscal Year 2007 budget.

Clearly, these vital projects must not be cut precisely when we are trying to fix our broken borders. In light of our heightened security needs, particularly at our southern border, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

First of all, the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Arizona are dead wrong. Our offset does not touch the border stations. In fact, the Nogales is registered in the bill at $9.8 million; San Luis has $42 million. We do not touch any of the border stations.

In fact, the offsets are minor repair and alteration, $375 million. Minor construction, $10 million. Building operations, that is cleaning, $119 million; and the DC Old Executive Office Building at $56 million to cover the offsets for Amtrak. None of this is border stations, none of it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN).

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Once again, we are up here fighting for the life of Amtrak, 35 years of service to the public. It just amazes me that constantly people, the Chair of aviation, billions of dollars that we have put in aviation, billions of dollars, and yet it doesn't pay for itself, and we do not want zero funding for Amtrak.

This administration constantly, constantly cut down the funds for Amtrak. This administration has come up with a lot of wacky ideas, but let me tell you something. When gasoline will go up to $4 a gallon, you are going to see a lot of people lining up to take Amtrak.

With the passage of the latest emergency funding, President Bush will have spent over $439 billion on the war in Iraq, but we don't want to spend money for Amtrak. During Hurricane Katrina, the way the victims and first responders were able to leave the gulf region and the New Orleans area was through Amtrak, Amtrak.

Mr. Chairman, this year, Amtrak is celebrating 35 years of public service to this nation through it's commitment to passenger rail.

I travel all over the country and the people I talk to love Amtrak. It is a great way to commute to work, it takes cars off our already congested highways, and in many areas of the country is the only mode of transportation available. In fact, ridership has increased in 8 of the last 9 years reaching a record level of over 25 million passengers last year. It is also important to note that Amtrak's long distance trains are the only inner city passenger trains in half the states in America.

Amtrak was also a First Responder during hurricane Katrina, and helped evacuate thousands of Gulf region residents while President Bush and his Administration were nowhere to be found. Now they are becoming a key part in each states future evacuation plans.

Now what I can't understand is why the Bush Administration is trying to destroy passenger rail in this country. Every Industrialized country in the world is investing heavily in rail infrastructure because they realize that this is the future of transportation. But sadly, as there systems get bigger and better, our system gets less and less money.

President Bush has a lot of wacky ideas for dealing with the high gas prices he created, but I can assure him that as prices climb to $4 per gallon, you are going to see American's lining up to use a passenger rail system that has been neglected by this very Administration. But what more do you expect when you put J.R. Ewing in the White House.

Once again we see the Bush Administration paying for its failed policies by cutting funds to vital public services and jeopardizing more American jobs. This Administration sees nothing wrong with taking money from the hard working Amtrak employees who work day and night to provide top quality service to their passengers. These folks are trying to make a living for their families, and they don't deserve this shabby treatment from the President.

With the passage of the latest emergency funding for the war, President Bush will have spent over $439 Billion on the war in Iraq, but

* * * * *

million, major infrastructure projects have been completed. All with a workforce that has been reduced by over 4,000 employees.

We still have a lot of work ahead of us when it comes to Amtrak. But we're starting $900 million dollars closer to our goal, and I know with the help of the American public, we can fully fund Amtrak at $1.6 Billion and keep Amtrak running long into the future.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), who offered a similar amendment during the full committee markup to try to save Amtrak.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, in the brief time I have, I want to just say that I want to echo the words of my friend, Mr. REHBERG, that Amtrak is an essential service in my part of the country. But we have had this debate every year, and we go through this process in each of those years.

Last year, in particular, we had a very strong and vigorous debate in which we were threatened with a veto at one point and demanded reforms. This $900 million allocation is a shutdown number for Amtrak, and it would come at the worst possible time to shut down Amtrak.

This is because it is part of those reforms. Amtrak was required to institute new acting procedures. It was required to institute new service contracts and plans. It was required to put in place a new business plan. The Department of Transportation Inspector General just issued a report from September 2005 to March 2006.

Amtrak has saved in excess of $19 million with the institution of these new reform plans that we demanded of them. To now shut them down would go back on our word. Let me also say that Amtrak promotes fuel conservation. At this time, when we are all sensitive about that, it is something that we ought to consider.

A recent study by the Oak Ridge National Laboratory shows Amtrak consumes 17 percent less energy per passenger than automobiles and 18 percent less than planes. Amtrak is an essential service. Support this amendment.

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

The Inspector General at the DOT has said to maintain the currently configured system in a steady state of repair, Amtrak would need $1.4 billion. They can't function at a lesser number. But despite chronic underfunding, Amtrak has made significant performance improvements, reducing costs, increasing revenues, implementing reasonable operational reforms, building key infrastructure over its 730 route miles. Even with a starvation budget, this service has performed remarkably.

Support the amendment.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to restore funding for Amtrak. I appreciate Mr. LATOURETTE's work on this effort and I thank the chairman for his willingness to work with Members on this extremely important issue.

While I strongly agree that reforming our rail system is essential, and I am supportive of efforts to ensure the Inspector General plays a key role in the rail system's oversight, the level of funding included in this bill is simply unrealistic.

Unlike aviation and highways, there is no dedicated fund for investing in passenger rail development. Although these other modes rely on user fees for a great deal of their funding, they still receive a large amount from the general fund. In addition, these other modes all operate on predominantly federally owned or federally assisted infrastructure, and rely largely on Government-supported security, research, and traffic controllers.

Rather than constantly looking for ways to shortchange passenger rail, we should be working on a comprehensive strategy to make Amtrak the best high-speed rail system in the world.

When you consider the fact that 20 percent of all Americans live in the North-East and approximately 1,700 commuter trains travel the Northeast Corridor everyday, we need to seriously consider the amount of congestion and overcrowding that would occur if these trains stopped running.

Passenger rail can be extremely effective in relieving congestion, cutting pollution, and lowering our demand for oil while creating jobs and increasing security. We have barely scratched the surface of passenger rail's potential, and a commitment from Congress to improving the viability of this system could lead to greatly expanded possibilities.

In addition, it is my firm belief that improving passenger rail service in this country depends on strong and experienced leadership at Amtrak. Unfortunately, over the past year, the Amtrak Board has made several important decisions, despite the fact that close to half of its seats remain empty.

Frankly, I believe the failure to appoint a fully functioning Amtrak Board is disgraceful,

and it stands as an enormous disadvantage for this rail system. Members of Congress can stress the need for accountability and reform until we turn blue in the face—but in the end, what Amtrak really needs is leaders with vision, who attend and participate in board meetings and who are genuinely committed to improving passenger rail.

Everything starts with the leadership provided by this board, and as we work to ensure adequate funding for passenger rail, it is crucial that Congress continue to advocate for a fully functioning Amtrak Board of Directors.

The facts are clear; Amtrak needs Federal support to survive, just like highways, ports, and airlines. America is a world leader in all other modes of transportation. When it comes to rail, we are quickly falling behind.

Mr. Chairman, many Americans, including thousands in my state, depend on Amtrak for both business and pleasure. Instead of short-changing the organization, we should work together to improve passenger rail.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the amendment offered by Representative LATOURETTE to fully fund Amtrak.

In fiscal year 2006, the Bush administration attempted to only provide $360 million to maintain commuter and freight service operated by Amtrak. With a great deal of support from many parts of America, Amtrak funding was restored to $1.3 billion.

Once again we are considering a bill that underfunds Amtrak needs to maintain its current operations. Amtrak is funded at a mere 900 million to continue its operations and make capital improvements. This is 33 percent less than current funding levels for Amtrak. This is $698 million less than Amtrak requested to continue operations and invest in capital. The Oberstar/LaTourette amendment increases funding for Amtrak to $1.114 billion.

The Northeast Corridor relies heavily on Amtrak's infrastructure and skilled workers. New Jersey Transit estimates that over 77 percent of its daily passengers would be affected if—New Jersey Transit could no longer operate its trains over tracks owned by Amtrak.

Many of my colleagues contend that the Northeast Corridor is the only area that depends on Amtrak. This is simply not true. According to a report recently published by the Government Accountability Office, across the country 18 different commuter agencies depend on the infrastructure and services that Amtrak provides, including commuter rail agencies in Dallas and Seattle. There are currently seven new agencies being planned across the country as well. If we do not continue to fund Amtrak at the levels they need to function, a shutdown is imminent. This would be detrimental to commuter rail agencies that depend on Amtrak-owned tracks and infrastructure and skilled Amtrak employees.

The GAO confirms the effect a shutdown of Amtrak would cause: "Given the dependence of more commuter rail agencies on Amtrak for services and infrastructure, an abrupt Amtrak cessation would likely result in major disruption or shutdowns of commuter rail service throughout the country."

We have a responsibility to promote mass transit and provide adequate funding for States and local transit authorities to move passengers effectively. Rail transportation is essential for easing traffic congestion in our most densely populated areas, reducing wear and tear on roads, protecting our environment, and preserving open space across the country.

On May 1, Amtrak celebrated 35 years of service to our Nation. We celebrated Amtrak for its ability to integrate small communities with large cities by providing economic expansion, increased mobility, and environmentally sound transit.

That is why I support the amendment offered by Representative LATOURETTE that would increase Amtrak funding. Now is not the time for us to cut funding for mass transportation. I urge my colleagues to support Amtrak and vote for the Oberstar/LaTourette amendment.

Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, as cochair of the Passenger Rail Caucus, I urge you to support th LaTourette-Oberstar amendment to the FY07 Transportation, Treasury and HUD Appropriations bill. The amendment will increase funding for Amtrak to a total of $1.114 billion, an increase of $214 million.

The FY 2007 TTHUD appropriations bill provides only $900 million for Amtrak, $412 million less than the FY 2006 enacted level and $698 million less than Amtrak requested in order to continue operation and invest in capital. I am concerned that the current funding level in the bill would leave the rail system incapable of providing sufficient service to Amtrak's 25 million customers—many of whom are my constituents of the 8th Congressional District of Pennsylvania on the Northeast Corridor.

The Department of Transportation's Inspector General has stated that the status quo funding option for Amtrak is unsustainable. The Inspector General also stated that postponement of maintenance—especially on heavily traveled Northeast Corridor increases the risk of accident.

Today, as Americans are facing skyrocketing energy prices and increasingly overcrowded roads, it is crucial that we invest in our national passenger rail system.

I urge you to join us in preserving transportation options for our constituents and support the LaTourette-Oberstar amendment.

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

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. 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 will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KUCINICH

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KUCINICH:

Page 2, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by $70,000)".

Page 37, line 4, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by $70,000)".

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise today out of deep concern for the safety of children who ride school buses over railroad tracks in Ohio and across the country. My amendment will ensure that there is a person working full time in the Federal Railroad Administration who can help us resolve the inadequate reporting.

That reporting is necessary to ensure that railroad crossings frequently used by school buses are in compliance with Federal safety requirements. Title 23, section 646.214 of the Code of Federal regulations requires that crossings be equipped with "automatic gates with flashing light signals" when a "substantial number of school buses cross."

Setting aside the issue that any school bus with children in it is substantial, when it comes to children's safety, it is impossible for school districts, public utility commissions, and the Department of Transportation to know whether any school buses are crossing gated or ungated tracks if this information is not reported.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUCINICH. I certainly would.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I would be happy to accept the amendment. Your amendment, I think, is a good one.

Mr. KUCINICH. I want to thank the chairman for his assistance, and I know that the parents of school children all over this country will be grateful to you for your concern. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1730

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. BEAN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. BEAN:

Page 2, line 11, after the first dollar amount, insert the following "(reduced by $2,700,000)".

Page 2, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by $2,700,000)".

Page 4, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by $4,000,000)".

Page 32, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $6,700,000)".

Page 32, line 23, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by $6,700,000)".

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Ms. BEAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that would increase funding for the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's Operations and Research account by $6.7 million. The amendment offsets this increase by decreasing $2.7 million in funding from the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration and $4 million from transportation planning and research account.

The intent of my amendment is to direct the Office of Fuel Economy to use these funds to assess how to best incentivize the auto industry to increase corporate average fuel economy,

CAFE, standards by the year 2015. It is my hope that this will accelerate adoption of increased fuel efficiency standards by having the office considering options like tax credits to retooling their manufacturing processes for production of more fuel efficient vehicles. This would provide manufacturers with an economically viable way to increase fuel economy for passenger cars and light trucks.

Particularly in suburban districts like mine, families are plagued by heavy traffic and congestion and are burdened by the price of gasoline. The high gas prices we are facing today can only be addressed by a serious, long-term effort to reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

By voting for my amendment, we can give the Office of Fuel Economy the resources necessary to start providing solutions on the demand side of the energy equation.

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

I appreciate the intent of the gentlewoman's amendment. We all want better fuel economy. However, I must oppose the gentlewoman's amendment for a number of reasons.

There are times when throwing additional money at a problem is not going to solve it, and this is one of those times. All that is needed here is time.

Giving the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration more money will not speed up the process whereby fuel economy standards would be raised. Even if Congress passed a bill tomorrow ordering NHTSA to raise fuel economy standards, it would take a minimum of 9 months for a rule to be proposed and finalized. This is because NHTSA would need the detailed product plans from every major auto manufacturer on every model they make before they could draft such a rule, and assembling these documents takes time.

Moreover, under law, there would have to be a reasonable comment period of 90 days so the public could weigh in on any proposed rule.

Finally, any proposed rule would have to be cleared by the Office of the Secretary of Transportation and the Office of Management and Budget, and that is just the beginning.

Auto makers also need time, which they are provided under the law, to retool their product lines to comply with the new regulations. For instance, the auto makers are already developing their product lines for the 2010 model year.

As I said at the beginning, this just takes time, roughly 27 months worth of time. NHTSA has already been tasked with studying the feasibility and effects of reducing the use of fuel for automobiles. This report, required by section 773 of the energy bill, is due to Congress later this year.

I would also like to point out to Members that this committee has already significantly increased funding for NHTSA's CAFE office over the past several years. The office, which was funded at $60,000 in fiscal year 2001, was funded at almost $1.3 million last year. Giving NHTSA's CAFE office an extra $6.7 million would likely result in the money simply being unspent.

I am unsure what benefit will be gained by the public if the CAFE office were to be given $6.5 million that they realistically cannot spend. Certainly, it would not result in fuel economy standards being raised faster, which I assume is the gentlewoman's ultimate intent.

So I strongly urge opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am going to support this amendment. It seems to me that if we are to move toward energy independence, and particularly, if we are ever going to get away from our dependence on Middle Eastern oil, with all the uncertainty and all of the problems that go along with that, which we have seen much of, then our largest and fastest gains that can possibly be made are in increasing the efficiency of the use of our motor vehicles.

At least a third of all of the oil that we use in this country goes into our transportation sector and to the use of our motor vehicles, and we desperately need to increase the efficiency of those. That is the fastest thing that we can put into place, much faster than the work on a hydrogen economy or an ethanol economy or fuel cells or any one of those. The efficiency of the present fleet and vehicles to be sold in the near future becomes important.

So I think it is very important that when the Energy and Commerce Committee bill, H.R. 5359, which provides the authority for the Secretary of Transportation to set economy standards for passenger cars, when that which is pending on the House calendar, it has been reported out of the Energy and Commerce Committee and it is pending on the House calendar, that when that is passed that there be the resources available at NHTSA to be able to evaluate the technologies and capability of the automobile industry to improve fuel economy as fast as it can reasonably be done.

When NHTSA was first created 30 years ago, and I guess it was when they were first given the job at looking at CAFE standards, they were given $10 million at the first instance 30 years ago to set fuel economy standards, and now $10 million today would probably be something like $40 million.

All the gentlewoman from Illinois is asking for here is an increase from $1.3 million to which the NHTSA account for fuel economy has been reduced to bring that up to $8 million, and the offsets in this instance are $2.7 million, which still leaves the account for the Office of the Secretary at 7 percent, almost $6 million above what it was in fiscal year 2006, even after that $2.7 million is taken out. The other part of the offset is $4 million taken from the transportation planning research and development which with $9 million left in the account still has more than the President requested in his budget submission by almost $100,000.

So I think this is a worthwhile place to put some money and make certain that NHTSA can deal with that as quickly as possible.

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

Mr. OLVER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Ms. BEAN. Mr. Chairman, the American people are looking to Congress for leadership in addressing rising energy costs. In the last few weeks, different proposals for increasing our energy supply have come before us. However, few proposals have been offered to address the demand side of the energy equation.

For too long, Congress has allowed a stalemate on innovation and fuel efficiency. This amendment does not mandate increases but, instead, funds research into options.

My amendment gives this Congress an opportunity to strike a balance between keeping auto makers competitive, by addressing the economic impact on them, with the pressing needs of American drivers, because both manufacturers and consumers are looking for an economically viable solution toward the advancement in the fuel efficiency of the cars and trucks we drive.

Let us help the Office of Fuel Economy facilitate public/private partnership solutions to meet the energy demand challenges our Nation is facing.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. BEAN).

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

Ms. BEAN. 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 Illinois will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ISRAEL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ISRAEL:

Page 2, line 11, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $4,724,000)''.

Page 49, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $9,448,000)''.

Page 63, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $4,724,000)''.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment restores funding for certain advanced energy research programs to last year's levels. That research is absolutely critical to reducing our dependence on foreign oil.

The funding in this bill for research and university resource centers is $9,448,000 below last year's levels, and those are the very centers that are researching and developing hydrogen and hybrid and other advanced transportation technologies.

Now, we all understand how vital that research and development is. The President of the United States on this floor during the State of the Union proclaimed that we must reduce our addiction to foreign oil. Anyone in their cars at a gas station today, as we are on the floor, paying over $3 a gallon for gas understands how important it is that we reduce that addiction to foreign oil.

I am a member of the Armed Services Committee. Our military understands how critical that is. Last year, the Department of Defense spent $10 billion on basic energy costs. Of that, $4.7 billion was spent to buy one thing, fuel for Air Force planes.

I was in Iraq last month and was on a wonderful Stryker combat vehicle. It gets about 10 miles to the gallon.

It is dangerous, Mr. Chairman, when we have to borrow money from China to fund defense budgets to buy oil from unstable Persian Gulf countries to fuel our military to protect us from China and unstable Persian Gulf countries.

We have all talked about having men on the Moon, research and development programs to end that dangerous dependence on foreign oil. We have talked about having new Apollo programs to research and develop new vehicles, not lunar landing modules that will put people on the Moon, but hydrogen and hybrid vehicles that will make it easier and safer and less expensive for people to drive on our roads here on Earth. And yet, this bill cuts $9.5 million from the very research centers that are engaged in deploying those vehicles.

This is not a giant leap for mankind. This is not even one small step for mankind. It is a step backwards, and so my amendment does not go above last year's level. It does not take a giant leap that I think we need. All it does is it keeps us steady so we do not continue to lose ground to the very adversaries we have around the world who are willing to use oil as a weapon against us and use oil to blackmail us and compromise our capabilities.

This amendment simply offsets salaries in the Treasury and Transportation accounts and restores $9,448,000 for basic research at the research and university research centers to continue our vital work, and I hope that the House will agree to it and support it.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The account he seeks to increase is transit research, not fuel research, and I appreciate his sentiment, but we already gave more than the guarantees, and the guarantees are killing other programs, both transportation and everything else. Repeatedly I see already that the Treasury continues to get hit over and over.

We provide a greater level of funding in 2007 to address two problems. We needed to fix a problem with SAFETEA–LU since the authorizing committee identified more projects and activities than were provided for under the guarantees. We covered that problem and found the money for the fix in order to keep the program going. We added these funds to cover some initiatives important to other Members.

The gentleman proposes to add money for alternative fuels research. However, most of that research is funded out of DOE and NHTSA. This account is for research into transit, as I repeated, and I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

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

This amendment that is offered by my good friend from New York, this amendment does exactly what I had spoken about in my opening remarks in relation to this bill and which the chairman of the subcommittee has pointed out as well, that this amendment starts by adding money, assuring money to already what is one of the guaranteed items under the TEA–LU guarantees, which those guarantees had to be provided in order to bring the bill to the floor at all.

This is not a rearrangement of moneys as the previous case was where I had supported the Amtrak amendment because, in that instance, the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee was moving money around totally within its jurisdiction, and I thought that was something that was worth supporting.

□ 1745

In this instance, what we are doing is taking money from one of the places in the bill which has no guarantees for minima along the way, namely the Treasury, a totally different unit of the bill, a totally different title of the bill, and simply grabs those and moves them over to an area which is already under the guarantees of the TEA-LU bill.

Under those circumstances, I must, regretfully for the gentleman from New York, oppose the amendment; and I hope that it will not be adopted.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF CIVIL RIGHTS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Civil Rights, $8,821,000.

TRANSPORTATION PLANNING, RESEARCH, AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses for conducting transportation planning, research, systems development, development activities, and making grants, to remain available until expended, $13,000,000.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

Necessary expenses for operating costs and capital outlays of the Working Capital Fund, not to exceed $120,000,000, shall be paid from appropriations made available to the Department of Transportation: *Provided*, That such services shall be provided on a competitive basis to entities within the Department of Transportation: *Provided further*, That the above limitation on operating expenses shall not apply to non-DOT entities: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated in this Act to an agency of the Department shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund without the approval of the agency modal administrator: *Provided further*, That no assessments may be levied against any program, budget activity, subactivity or project funded by this Act unless notice of such assessments and the basis therefor are presented to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and are approved by such Committees.

MINORITY BUSINESS RESOURCE CENTER PROGRAM

For the cost of guaranteed loans for short-term working capital, $495,000, as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 332: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed $18,367,000. In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, $396,000.

MINORITY BUSINESS OUTREACH

For necessary expenses of Minority Business Resource Center outreach activities, $2,970,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 49 U.S.C. 332, these funds may be used for business opportunities related to any mode of transportation.

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

In addition to funds made available from any other source to carry out the essential air service program under 49 U.S.C. 41731 through 41742, $67,000,000, to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, in determining between or among carriers competing to provide service to a community, the Secretary may consider the relative subsidy requirements of the carriers: *Provided further*, That, if the funds under this heading are insufficient to meet the costs of the essential air service program in the current fiscal year, the Secretary shall transfer such sums as may be necessary to carry out the essential air service program from any available amounts appropriated to or directly administered by the Office of the Secretary for such fiscal year: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, $1,000,000 shall be used to carry out the three marketing incentive programs authorized by section 41748 of title 49, United States Code.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against the paragraph beginning at the words ''to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund,'' beginning on page 5, line 23, and ending on line 24.

This provision violates clause 2 of rule XXI. It changes existing law and therefore constitutes legislating on an appropriations bill in violation of House rules.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The provision would provide that funding for payments to air carriers be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund. Authorization in law may exist for this funding from general revenues, but no specific authorization in law exists for this funding to be derived from the trust fund.

The Chair finds that in this latter respect the provision is not supported by an authorization in law. This is consistent with the ruling of the Chair of June 29, 2005. The point of order is sustained and the provision is stricken from the bill.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMPENSATION FOR AIR CARRIERS

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds made available under section 101(a)(2) of Public Law 107–42, $50,000,000 are rescinded.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION

SEC. 101. The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration may reimburse amounts made available to satisfy 49 U.S.C. 41742(a)(1) from fees credited under 49 U.S.C. 45303: *Provided*, That during fiscal year 2007, 49 U.S.C. 41742(b) shall not apply, and any amount remaining in such account at the close of that fiscal year may be made available to satisfy section 41742(a)(1) for the subsequent fiscal year.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against section 101.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against page 6, line 22, beginning with ''provided, that'' through line 26.

This proviso violates clause 2 of rule XXI. It changes existing law, which constitutes legislating on an appropriations bill in violation of House rules.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this proviso changes the application of existing law. The proviso therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. The point of order is sustained and the proviso is stricken from the bill.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 102. The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to transfer the unexpended balances available for the bonding assistance program from ''Office of the Secretary, Salaries and expenses'' to ''Minority Business Outreach''.

SEC. 103. None of the funds made available in this Act to the Department of Transportation may be obligated for the Office of the Secretary of Transportation to approve assessments or reimbursable agreements pertaining to funds appropriated to the modal administrations in this Act, except for activities underway on the date of enactment of this Act, unless such assessments or agreements have completed the normal reprogramming process for Congressional notification.

SEC. 104. None of the funds made available under this Act may be obligated or expended to establish or implement a program under which essential air service communities are required to assume subsidy costs commonly referred to as the EAS local participation program.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Administration, not otherwise provided for, including operations and research activities related to commercial space transportation, administrative expenses for research and development, establishment of air navigation facilities, the operation (including leasing) and maintenance of aircraft, subsidizing the cost of aeronautical charts and maps sold to the public, lease or purchase of passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, in addition to amounts made available by Public Law 108–176, $8,360,000,000, of which $4,843,000,000 shall be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, of which not to exceed $6,698,728,000 shall be available for air traffic organization activities; not to exceed $997,718,000 shall be available for aviation regulation and certification activities; not to exceed $11,985,000 shall be available for commercial space transportation activities; not to exceed $92,227,000 shall be available for financial services activities; not to exceed $87,850,000 shall be available for human resources program activities; not to exceed $272,821,000 shall be available for region and center operations and regional coordination activities; not to exceed $175,392,000 shall be available for staff offices; and not to exceed $36,799,000 shall be available for information services: *Provided*, That not to exceed 2 percent of any budget activity, except for aviation regulation and certification budget activity, may be transferred to any budget activity under this heading: *Provided further*, That no transfer may increase or decrease any appropriation by more than 2 percent: *Provided further*, That any transfer in excess of 2 percent shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 810 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the Federal Aviation Administration to finalize or implement any regulation that would promulgate new aviation user fees not specifically authorized by law after the date of the enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, foreign authorities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the provision of agency services, including receipts for the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities, and for issuance, renewal or modification of certificates, including airman, aircraft, and repair station certificates, or for tests related thereto, or for processing major repair or alteration forms: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, not less than $8,000,000 shall be for the contract tower cost-sharing program: *Provided further*, That funds may be used to enter into a grant agreement with a nonprofit standard-setting organization to assist in the development of aviation safety standards: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for new applicants for the second career training program: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for paying premium pay under 5 U.S.C. 5546(a) to any Federal Aviation Administration employee unless such employee actually performed work during the time corresponding to such premium pay: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act may be obligated or expended to operate a manned auxiliary flight service station in the contiguous United States: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act for aeronautical charting and cartography are available for activities conducted by, or coordinated through, the Working Capital Fund: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act may be obligated or expended for an employee of the Federal Aviation Administration to purchase a store gift card or gift certificate through use of a Government-issued credit card.

FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for acquisition, establishment, technical support services, improvement by contract or purchase, and hire of air navigation and experimental facilities and equipment, as authorized under part A of subtitle VII of title 49, United States Code, including initial acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; engineering and service testing, including construction of test facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; construction and furnishing of quarters and related accommodations for officers and employees of the Federal Aviation Administration stationed at remote localities where such accommodations are not available; and the purchase, lease, or transfer of aircraft from funds available under this heading; to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, $3,110,000,000, of which $2,662,100,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2009, and of which $447,900,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2007: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the establishment and modernization of air navigation facilities: *Provided further*, That upon initial submission to the Congress of the fiscal year 2008 President's budget, the Secretary of Transportation shall transmit to the Congress a comprehensive capital investment plan for the Federal Aviation Administration which includes funding for each budget line item for fiscal years 2008 through 2012, with total funding for each year of the plan constrained to the funding targets for those years as estimated and approved by the Office of Management and Budget.

RESEARCH, ENGINEERING, AND DEVELOPMENT

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for research, engineering, and development, as authorized under part A of subtitle VII of title 49, United States Code, including construction of experimental facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant, $134,000,000, to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this

appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred for research, engineering, and development.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For liquidation of obligations incurred for grants-in-aid for airport planning and development, and noise compatibility planning and programs as authorized under subchapter I of chapter 471 and subchapter I of chapter 475 of title 49, United States Code, and under other law authorizing such obligations; for procurement, installation, and commissioning of runway incursion prevention devices and systems at airports of such title; for grants authorized under section 41743 of title 49, United States Code; and for inspection activities and administration of airport safety programs, including those related to airport operating certificates under section 44706 of title 49, United States Code, $4,171,000,000 to be derived from the Airport and Airway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds under this heading shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of $3,700,000,000 in fiscal year 2007, notwithstanding section 47117(g) of title 49, United States Code: *Provided further*, That none of the funds under this heading shall be available for the replacement of baggage conveyor systems, reconfiguration of terminal baggage areas, or other airport improvements that are necessary to install bulk explosive detection systems: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, of funds limited under this heading, up to $74,971,000 shall be obligated for administration, up to $10,000,000 shall be available for the airport cooperative research program, up to $12,000,000 shall be available to carry out the Small Community Air Service Development Program, and up to $17,870,000 shall be for airport technology research, to remain available until expended.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against page 13, line 1, beginning with ''; for grants'' through page 13, line 6, ending with the word ''Code.''

This provision violates clause 2 of rule XXI. It changes existing law and therefore constitutes, again, legislating on an appropriations bill in violation of House rules.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the gentleman's point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The provision proposes to earmark certain funds in the bill. Under clause 2(a) of rule XXI, such an earmarking must be specifically authorized by law. The burden of establishing the authorization in law rests in this instance with the committee or other proponent of the provision.

Finding that this burden has not been carried, the point of order is sustained and the provision is stricken from the bill.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against another provision of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MICA. I raise a point of order against page 13, line 17, beginning with the words ''Provided further'' through line 25.

This provision also violates clause 2 of rule XXI. It changes existing law and therefore constitutes legislating on an appropriations bill in violation of House rules.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this proviso explicitly supercedes existing law. The proviso, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained and the proviso is stricken from the bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. WATERS

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to have it considered out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment may be considered at this time.

There was no objection.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. WATERS:

Page 11, line 8, after each of the dollar amounts, insert the following: ''(reduced by $261,000,000)''.

Page 85, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $261,000,000)''.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I believe that before this bill is enacted into law we must reverse an unwise pattern of disinvestment in the Nation's public housing. Therefore, I am introducing an amendment to restore the $261 million reduction in the Public Housing Capital Fund.

America's public housing inventory is a $100 billion public asset providing affordable housing to 1.1 million families. Just over half of these families are headed by the elderly or persons with disabilities, and children make up approximately 40 percent of all those we help. Public housing helps families and the elderly in large and small communities across the country in every congressional district.

In addition to safe, decent, affordable housing, public housing agencies connect people to the services they need, services that help adults become economically self-sufficient, provide children safe places to grow and learn, and allow the elderly and persons with disabilities to live independently.

Public housing funding has been declining since 2001. Despite the estimated $100 billion value of public housing assets to our communities, this bill does not provide funding necessary to maintain them for the long run. Total Federal funding for public housing has dropped precipitously over this decade. The bill before us provides $1.4 billion less than provided for funding year 2001, that is, the President's budget for funding year 2007 requests nearly $1.5 billion less for public housing than Congress provided for funding year 2001.

This drop in resources has constrained local agencies' ability to address safety and security needs, provide valuable services to those seeking economic self-sufficiency and independent living, and undermines agencies' ability to meet the recent surge in utility costs. This decline in funding is most egregious in the area of capital repair funding.

Public housing faces an estimated $18 billion backlog of capital repairs. According to a HUD-funded study, an additional $2 billion in capital repair needs accrues each year as buildings age. The President's budget and this bill cuts funding for the public housing capital funds for major repairs by $261 million, that is 11 percent compared with last year's funding. In fact, the capital fund has been cut each year since 2001, declining a total of 27 percent over 6 years if this budget is enacted.

The capital funds provided in this bill are barely sufficient to cover annually accruing needs, let alone address the backlog of need. The National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials estimates that $3.5 billion is necessary to begin to address the backlog of need in funding year 2007.

At the same time we are cutting basic capital repair funds, this bill also zeros out funding for the HOPE VI program for comprehensive revitalization of the most distressed public housing communities as requested by the administration. My colleague, JOHN OLVER, categorized this approach of cutting annual capital repair funding as, and I quote, ''penny-wise and pound foolish,'' and that is exactly what this is.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask my colleagues to embrace the intent of my capital fund amendment in order to secure the ongoing viability of this valuable affordable housing asset. Unless greater measures are taken by HUD to preserve this affordable asset called public housing, this unique asset and the larger continuum of a sound Federal affordable housing policy will be degraded and eventually lost. And that is a plan that our communities, our seniors, and our families with children cannot afford.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, let me just say that these are our most vulnerable citizens, and they need a safety net. While we want them to improve their lives, we want them to become independent. We are trying to have programs that will transition them to work and out of public housing. It is not going to happen unless we have reasonable and sensible investment to make these safe, sound, and secure places for our citizens to live.

Again, we need this in all of our congressional districts. As a matter of fact, the poor have nowhere else to turn. They are depending on us. I would ask us not to be penny-wise and pound-foolish, but rather to make what I think is one of the most prudent investments we can make.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 additional seconds to close this out.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman has asked unanimous consent to proceed for 30 additional seconds.

Is there objection to the gentlewoman's unanimous consent request? If not, the gentlewoman is recognized for an additional 30 seconds.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman for an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the time that has been allotted and I move to withdraw the amendment. I have not been able to find the funds to replace that which has been cut. I appreciate the time to at least explain it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

□ 1800

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

If I had been allowed to move to strike the last word, I would have been happy to yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman after I made a comment which relates to the amendment she offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman asked unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 30 seconds, and the Chair responded to her unanimous consent request and granted her the 30 seconds that she requested.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out that this is one of those cutting-the-baby-in-two kinds of situations that has been forced upon the TTHUD committee by the allocation and the relationship, the juxtaposition of guarantees under the transportation accounts and no such guarantees under some of the others.

The $261 million that the gentlewoman asked to be provided by an offset which would have placed the bill under point of order and is under point of order if she had not withdrawn the amendment. That $261 million would have protected a very important infrastructure investment that we have.

We have $100 billion worth of housing under the public housing capital fund, and it is that capital fund which does the renovations, the rehabilitations, the replacements of those facilities, and it is a very important piece which I have spoken about at each stage of this process, every one of the stages, even before, Mr. Chairman, your committee just last night about the need for additional funding in the public housing capital fund.

I am very much hopeful that we will be able to find before this process runs its course to the final conference report, that we will be able to find some additional money for the public housing capital fund so we can, in fact, do something about the huge backlog which has been listed by the gentlewoman as close to $20 billion of backlog in needs for capital repair and improvements in our $100 billion of housing stock.

So that is one of the dilemmas that the subcommittee, the chairman and the staff and the committee as a whole has been laboring under, and I hope to find a way to provide some relief for the problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS

(AIRPORT AND AIRWAY TRUST FUND)

(RESCISSION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

Of the amounts authorized for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007 and prior years under sections 48103 and 48112 of title 49, United States Code, $25,000,000 are rescinded.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 110. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, airports may transfer without consideration to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) instrument landing systems (along with associated approach lighting equipment and runway visual range equipment) which conform to FAA design and performance specifications, the purchase of which was assisted by a Federal airport-aid program, airport development aid program or airport improvement program grant: *Provided,* That the Federal Aviation Administration shall accept such equipment, which shall thereafter be operated and maintained by FAA in accordance with agency criteria.

SEC. 111. None of the funds in this Act may be used to compensate in excess of 380 technical staff-years under the federally funded research and development center contract between the Federal Aviation Administration and the Center for Advanced Aviation Systems Development during fiscal year 2006.

SEC. 112. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to pursue or adopt guidelines or regulations requiring airport sponsors to provide to the Federal Aviation Administration without cost building construction, maintenance, utilities and expenses, or space in airport sponsor-owned buildings for services relating to air traffic control, air navigation, or weather reporting: *Provided,* That the prohibition of funds in this section does not apply to negotiations between the agency and airport sponsors to achieve agreement on ''below-market'' rates for these items or to grant assurances that require airport sponsors to provide land without cost to the FAA for air traffic control facilities.

SEC. 113. Amounts collected under section 40113(e) of title 49, United States Code, shall be credited to the appropriation current at the time of collection, to be merged with and available for the same purposes of such appropriation.

SEC. 114. None of the funds appropriated or limited by this Act may be used to change weight restrictions or prior permission rules at Teterboro Airport in Teterboro, New Jersey.

SEC. 115. (a) Section 44302(f)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''2006,'' each place it appears and inserting ''2007,''.

(b) Section 44303(b) of such title is amended by striking ''2006,'' and inserting ''2007,''.

SEC. 116. None of the funds made available in this Act shall be used for engineering work related to an additional runway at Louis Armstrong New Orleans International Airport.

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Necessary expenses for administration and operation of the Federal Highway Administration, not to exceed $372,504,000 shall be paid in accordance with law from appropriations made available by this Act to the Federal Highway Administration together with advances and reimbursements received by the Federal Highway Administration.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the implementation or execution of programs, the obligations for which are in excess of $39,086,464,683 for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs for fiscal year 2007: *Provided,* That within this obligation limitation on Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs, not more than $429,800,000 shall be available for the implementation or execution of programs for transportation research (chapter 5 of title 23, United States Code; sections 111, 5505, and 5506 of title 49, United States Code; and title 5 of Public Law 109–59) for fiscal year 2007: *Provided further,* That this limitation on transportation research programs shall not apply to any authority previously made available for obligation: *Provided further,* That the funds authorized pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 110 for the motor carrier safety grant program, and the obligation limitation associated with such funds provided under this heading, shall be transferred to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration: *Provided further,* That the Secretary may, as authorized by section 605(b) of title 23, United States Code, collect and spend fees to cover the costs of services of expert firms, including counsel, in the field of municipal and project finance to assist in the underwriting and servicing of Federal credit instruments and all or a portion of the costs to the Federal government of servicing such credit instruments: *Provided further,* That such fees are available until expended to pay for such costs: *Provided further,* That such amounts are in addition to administrative expenses that are also available for such purpose, and are not subject to any obligation limitation or the limitation on administrative expenses under section 608 of title 23, United States Code.

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For carrying out the provisions of title 23, United States Code, that are attributable to

Federal-aid highways, not otherwise provided, including reimbursement for sums expended pursuant to the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 308, $39,086,464,683 or so much thereof as may be available in and derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account), to remain available until expended.

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances of funds apportioned to each State under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, $2,000,000,000 are rescinded: *Provided,* That such rescission shall not apply to the funds distributed in accordance with 23 U.S.C. 130(f), 23 U.S.C. 133(d)(1) as in effect prior to the date of enactment of Public Law 109–59, the first sentence of 23 U.S.C. 133(d)(3)(A), 23 U.S.C. 104(b)(5), or 23 U.S.C. 163 as in effect prior to the enactment of Public Law 109–59.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS)

SEC. 120. (a) For fiscal year 2007, the Secretary of Transportation shall—

(1) not distribute from the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways amounts authorized for administrative expenses and programs by section 104(a) of title 23, United States Code; the highway use tax evasion program; and the Bureau of Transportation Statistics;

(2) not distribute an amount from the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways that is equal to the unobligated balance of amounts made available from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) for Federal-aid highways and highway safety programs for previous fiscal years the funds for which are allocated by the Secretary;

(3) determine the ratio that—

(A) the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways, less the aggregate of amounts not distributed under paragraphs (1) and (2), bears to

(B) the total of the sums authorized to be appropriated for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs (other than sums authorized to be appropriated for provisions of law described in paragraphs (1) through (9) of subsection (b) and sums authorized to be appropriated for section 105 of title 23, United States Code, equal to the amount referred to in subsection (b)(10) for such fiscal year), less the aggregate of the amounts not distributed under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection;

(4)(A) distribute the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways, less the aggregate amounts not distributed under paragraphs (1) and (2), for sections 1301, 1302, and 1934 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users; sections 117 (but individually for each project numbered 1 through 3676 listed in the table contained in section 1702 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users) and 144(g) of title 23, United States Code; and section 14501 of title 40, United States Code, so that the amount of obligation authority available for each of such sections is equal to the amount determined by multiplying the ratio determined under paragraph (3) by the sums authorized to be appropriated for that section for the fiscal year; and

(B) distribute $2,000,000,000 for section 105 of title 23, United States Code;

(5) distribute the obligation limitation provided for Federal-aid highways, less the aggregate amounts not distributed under paragraphs (1) and (2) and amounts distributed under paragraph (4), for each of the programs that are allocated by the Secretary under the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users and title 23, United States Code (other than to programs to which paragraphs (1) and (4) apply), by multiplying the ratio determined under paragraph (3) by the amounts authorized to be appropriated for each such program for such fiscal year; and

(6) distribute the obligation limitation provided for Federal-aid highways, less the aggregate amounts not distributed under paragraphs (1) and (2) and amounts distributed under paragraphs (4) and (5), for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs (other than the amounts apportioned for the equity bonus program, but only to the extent that the amounts apportioned for the equity bonus program for the fiscal year are greater than $2,639,000,000, and the Appalachian development highway system program) that are apportioned by the Secretary under the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users and title 23, United States Code, in the ratio that—

(A) amounts authorized to be appropriated for such programs that are apportioned to each State for such fiscal year, bear to

(B) the total of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for such programs that are apportioned to all States for such fiscal year.

(b) EXCEPTIONS FROM OBLIGATION LIMITATION.—The obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways shall not apply to obligations: (1) under section 125 of title 23, United States Code; (2) under section 147 of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1978; (3) under section 9 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1981; (4) under subsections (b) and (j) of section 131 of the Surface Transportation Assistance Act of 1982; (5) under subsections (b) and (c) of section 149 of the Surface Transportation and Uniform Relocation Assistance Act of 1987; (6) under sections 1103 through 1108 of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991; (7) under section 157 of title 23, United States Code, as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century; (8) under section 105 of title 23, United States Code, as in effect for fiscal years 1998 through 2004, but only in an amount equal to $639,000,000 for each of those fiscal years; (9) for Federal-aid highway programs for which obligation authority was made available under the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century or subsequent public laws for multiple years or to remain available until used, but only to the extent that the obligation authority has not lapsed or been used; (10) under section 105 of title 23, United States Code, but only in an amount equal to $639,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2005, 2006 and 2007; and (11) under section 1603 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users, to the extent that funds obligated in accordance with that section were not subject to a limitation on obligations at the time at which the funds were initially made available for obligation.

(c) REDISTRIBUTION OF UNUSED OBLIGATION AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary shall, after August 1 of such fiscal year, revise a distribution of the obligation limitation made available under subsection (a) if the amount distributed cannot be obligated during that fiscal year and redistribute sufficient amounts to those States able to obligate amounts in addition to those previously distributed during that fiscal year, giving priority to those States having large unobligated balances of funds apportioned under sections 104 and 144 of title 23, United States Code.

(d) APPLICABILITY OF OBLIGATION LIMITATIONS TO TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH PROGRAMS.—The obligation limitation shall apply to transportation research programs carried out under chapter 5 of title 23, United States Code, and title V (research title) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users, except that obligation authority made available for such programs under such limitation shall remain available for a period of 3 fiscal years and shall be in addition to the amount of any limitation imposed on obligations for Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs for future fiscal years.

(e) REDISTRIBUTION OF CERTAIN AUTHORIZED FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the distribution of obligation limitation under subsection (a), the Secretary shall distribute to the States any funds that—

(A) are authorized to be appropriated for such fiscal year for Federal-aid highways programs; and

(B) the Secretary determines will not be allocated to the States, and will not be available for obligation, in such fiscal year due to the imposition of any obligation limitation for such fiscal year.

(2) RATIO.—Funds shall be distributed under paragraph (1) in the same ratio as the distribution of obligation authority under subsection (a)(6).

(3) AVAILABILITY.—Funds distributed under paragraph (1) shall be available for any purposes described in section 133(b) of title 23, United States Code.

(f) SPECIAL LIMITATION CHARACTERISTICS.—Obligation limitation distributed for a fiscal year under subsection (a)(4) for the provision specified in subsection (a)(4) shall—

(1) remain available until used for obligation of funds for that provision; and

(2) be in addition to the amount of any limitation imposed on obligations for Federal-aid highway and highway safety construction programs for future fiscal years.

(g) HIGH PRIORITY PROJECT FLEXIBILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), obligation authority distributed for such fiscal year under subsection (a)(4) for each project numbered 1 through 3676 listed in the table contained in section 1702 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users may be obligated for any other project in such section in the same State.

(2) RESTORATION.—Obligation authority used as described in paragraph (1) shall be restored to the original purpose on the date on which obligation authority is distributed under this section for the next fiscal year following obligation under paragraph (1).

(h) LIMITATION ON STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the distribution of obligation authority under subsection (a)(4)(A) for each of the individual projects numbered greater than 3676 listed in the table contained in section 1702 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against section 120.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his point of order.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, this provision violates clause 2 of rule XXI. It changes existing law and therefore constitutes legislating on an appropriation bill in violation of House rules.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the gentleman's point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this section imparts direction to the executive. The

section, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the section is stricken from the bill.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 121. Notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, funds received by the Bureau of Transportation Statistics from the sale of data products, for necessary expenses incurred pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 111 may be credited to the Federal-aid highways account for the purpose of reimbursing the Bureau for such expenses: *Provided*, That such funds shall be subject to the obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction.

SEC. 122. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds authorized under section 110 of title 23, United States Code, for fiscal year 2007 shall be apportioned to the States in accordance with section 1105(f) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (Public Law 109–59; 119 Stat. 1144, 1166), except that before allocations in accordance with section 1105(f)(3) of such Act are made, $300,000,000 shall be set aside for the Transportation, Community, and System Preservation Program under section 1117 of such Act (119 Stat. at 1177–1179) and administered in accordance with section 1117(g)(2) of such Act.

SEC. 123. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds provided in Public Law 102–143 in the item relating to ''Highway Bypass Demonstration Project'' shall be available for the improvement of Route 101 in the vicinity of Prunedale, Monterey County, California.

SEC. 124. Of the unobligated balances made available under Public Law 101–516, Public Law 102–143, Public Law 102–240, Public Law 103–331, Public Law 105–178, Public Law 106–346, Public Law 107–87, and Public Law 108–7, $12,177,193.53 are rescinded.

SEC. 125. Of the unobligated balances made available under section 188(a)(1) of title 23, United States Code, as in effect prior to the date of enactment of Public Law 109–59, and under section 608(a)(1) of such title, $100,000,000 are rescinded.

SEC. 126. Of the amounts made available under section 104(a) of title 23, United States Code, $14,460,721 is rescinded.

SEC. 127. Of the unobligated balances made available for fiscal year 2005, under title 5 of Public Law 109–59, for the implementation or execution of programs for transportation research, $37,815,112 is rescinded.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against section 127.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may state his point of order.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, this provision violates clause 2 of rule XXI. It changes existing law and therefore constitutes legislating on an appropriation bill in violation of House rules.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the gentleman's point of order? If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

Under clause 2(b) of rule XXI, the Committee on Appropriations may recommend rescissions only of appropriations that were contained in prior appropriations Acts, but not rescissions of contract authority that is contained in other laws.

Therefore, the point of order is sustained. The section is stricken from the bill.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 128. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds provided under section 378 of the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001 (Public Law 106–346, 114 Stat. 1356, 1356A–41), for the reconstruction of School Road East in Marlboro Township, New Jersey, shall be available for the Spring Valley Road Project in Marlboro Township, New Jersey.

SEC. 129. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available or limited by this Act shall be used for (1) the development, planning, design, or construction of a bridge joining the Island of Gravina to the Community of Ketchikan, Alaska; (2) the development, planning, design, or construction of the Knik Arm Bridge, Alaska; or (3) any administrative expense of the Federal Highway Administration to provide payment or reimbursement for any expense incurred by the State of Alaska in carrying out an activity described in paragraph (1) or (2).

FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out sections 31102, 31104(a), 31106, 31107, 31109, 31309, 31313 of title 49, United States Code, and sections 4126 and 4128 of Public Law 109–59, $294,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the implementation or execution of programs, the obligations for which are in excess of $294,000,000, for ''Motor Carrier Safety Grants''; of which $197,000,000 shall be available for the motor carrier safety assistance program to carry out sections 31102 and 31104(a) of title 49, United States Code; $25,000,000 shall be available for the commercial driver's license improvements program to carry out section 31313 of title 49, United States Code; $32,000,000 shall be available for the border enforcement grants program to carry out section 31107 of title 49, United States Code; $5,000,000 shall be available for the performance and registration information system management program to carry out sections 31106(b) and 31109 of title 49, United States Code; $25,000,000 shall be available for the commercial vehicle information systems and networks deployment program to carry out section 4126 of Public Law 109–59; $3,000,000 shall be available for the safety data improvement program to carry out section 4128 of Public Law 109–59; and $7,000,000 shall be available for the commercial driver's license information system modernization program to carry out section 31309(e) of title 49, United States Code.

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY OPERATIONS AND PROGRAMS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For payment of obligations incurred in the implementation, execution, and administration of the motor carrier safety operations and programs pursuant to section 31104(i) of title 49, United States Code, and sections 4127 and 4134 of Public Law 109–59, $223,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account), together with advances and reimbursements received by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, the sum of which shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds derived from the Highway Trust Fund in this Act shall be available for the implementation, execution or administration of programs, the obligations for which are in excess of $223,000,000, for ''Motor Carrier Safety Operations and Programs'', of which $10,296,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 2009, is for the research and technology program and $1,000,000 shall be available for commercial motor vehicle operator's grants to carry out section 4134 of Public Law 109–59: *Provided further*, That none of the funds under this heading for outreach and education shall be available for transfer.

MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

(RESCISSION)

Of the amounts made available under this heading in prior appropriations Acts, $27,122,669 in unobligated balances are rescinded.

NATIONAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY PROGRAM

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

(RESCISSION)

Of the amounts made available under this heading in prior appropriations Acts, $3,419,816 in unobligated balances are rescinded.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 130. Funds appropriated or limited in this Act shall be subject to the terms and conditions stipulated in section 350 of Public Law 107–87, including that the Secretary submit a report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees annually on the safety and security of transportation into the United States by Mexico-domiciled motor carriers.

NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary to discharge the functions of the Secretary, with respect to traffic and highway safety under subtitle C of title X of Public Law 105–59, chapter 301 of title 49, United States Code, and part C of subtitle VI of title 49, United States Code, $122,000,000, of which $48,405,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated or expended to plan, finalize, or implement any rulemaking to add to section 575.104 of title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations any requirement pertaining to a grading standard that is different from the three grading standards (treadwear, traction, and temperature resistance) already in effect.

OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 403, $107,750,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the total obligations for which, in fiscal year 2007, are in excess of $107,750,000 for programs authorized under 23 U.S.C. 403.

(RESCISSION)

Of amounts made available under this heading in prior appropriations Acts, $6,772,751 in unobligated balances are rescinded.

NATIONAL DRIVER REGISTER

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out chapter 303 of title 49, United States Code, $4,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account) and remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the implementation or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of $4,000,000 for the National Driver Register authorized under chapter 303 of title 49, United States Code.

(RESCISSION)

Of amounts made available under this heading in prior appropriations Acts, $8,553 in unobligated balances are rescinded.

HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of 23 U.S.C. 402, 405, 406, 408, and 410 and sections 2001(a)(11), 2009, 2010, and 2011 of Public Law 109–59, to remain available until expended, $587,750,000 to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund (other than the Mass Transit Account): *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the planning or execution of programs the total obligations for which, in fiscal year 2007, are in excess of $587,750,000 for programs authorized under 23 U.S.C. 402, 405, 406, 408, and 410 and sections 2001(a)(11), 2009, 2010, and 2011 of Public Law 109–59, of which $220,000,000 shall be for ''Highway Safety Programs'' under 23 U.S.C. 402; $25,000,000 shall be for ''Occupant Protection Incentive Grants'' under 23 U.S.C. 405; $124,500,000 shall be for ''Safety Belt Performance Grants'' under 23 U.S.C. 406; $34,500,000 shall be for ''State Traffic Safety Information System Improvements'' under 23 U.S.C. 408; $125,000,000 shall be for ''Alcohol-Impaired Driving Countermeasures Incentive Grant Program'' under 23 U.S.C. 410; $17,750,000 shall be for ''Administrative Expenses'' under section 2001(a)(11) of Public Law 109–59; $29,000,000 shall be for ''High Visibility Enforcement Program'' under section 2009 of Public Law 109–59; $6,000,000 shall be for ''Motorcyclist Safety'' under section 2010 of Public Law 109–59; and $6,000,000 shall be for ''Child Safety and Child Booster Seat Safety Incentive Grants'' under section 2011 of Public Law 109–59: *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be used for construction, rehabilitation, or remodeling costs, or for office furnishings and fixtures for State, local or private buildings or structures: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $500,000 of the funds made available for section 410 ''Alcohol-Impaired Driving Countermeasures Grants'' shall be available for technical assistance to the States: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $750,000 of the funds made available for the ''High Visibility Enforcement Program'' shall be available for the evaluation required under section 2009(f) of Public Law 109–59.

(RESCISSION)

Of amounts made available under this heading in prior appropriations Acts, $5,646,863 in unobligated balances are rescinded.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—NATIONAL HIGHWAY TRAFFIC SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 140. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or limitation on the use of funds made available under section 403 of title 23, United States Code, an additional $130,000 shall be made available to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, out of the amount limited for section 402 of title 23, United States Code, to pay for travel and related expenses for State management reviews and to pay for core competency development training and related expenses for highway safety staff.

FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

SAFETY AND OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses of the Federal Railroad Administration, not otherwise provided for, $150,083,000, of which $13,870,890 shall remain available until expended.

RAILROAD RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses for railroad research and development, $34,650,000, to remain available until expended.

RAILROAD REHABILITATION AND IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to issue to the Secretary of the Treasury notes or other obligations pursuant to section 512 of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 (Public Law 94–210), as amended, in such amounts and at such times as may be necessary to pay any amounts required pursuant to the guarantee of the principal amount of obligations under sections 511 through 513 of such Act, such authority to exist as long as any such guaranteed obligation is outstanding: *Provided*, That pursuant to section 502 of such Act, as amended, no new direct loans or loan guarantee commitments shall be made using Federal funds for the credit risk premium during fiscal year 2007.

CAPITAL AND DEBT SERVICE GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

To enable the Secretary of Transportation to make quarterly grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation for the maintenance and repair of capital infrastructure owned by the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, including railroad equipment, rolling stock, legal mandates and other services, $500,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $280,000,000 shall be for debt service obligations: *Provided*, That the Secretary of Transportation shall approve funding for capital expenditures, including advance purchase orders, for the National Railroad Passenger Corporation only after receiving and reviewing a grant request for each specific capital grant justifying the Federal support to the Secretary's satisfaction: *Provided further*, That none of the funds under this heading may be used to subsidize operating losses of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation: *Provided further*, That none of the funds under this heading may be used for capital projects not approved by the Secretary of Transportation and on the National Railroad Passenger Corporation's fiscal year 2007 business plan.

EFFICIENCY INCENTIVE GRANTS TO THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount to be made available to the Secretary for efficiency incentive grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation, $400,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Secretary may make grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation for an additional sum for operating subsidies at any time during the fiscal year for the purpose of maintaining the operation of existing or new Amtrak routes: *Provided further*, That nothing in the previous proviso should be interpreted either to encourage or discourage the Corporation with respect to adjusting existing routes or frequencies: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Transportation shall reserve $60,000,000 of the funds provided under this heading and is authorized to transfer such sums to the Surface Transportation Board, upon request from said Board, to carry out directed service orders issued pursuant to section 11123 of title 49, United States Code, to respond to the cessation of commuter rail operations by the National Railroad Passenger Corporation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Transportation shall make the reserved funds available to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation through an appropriate grant instrument not earlier than September 1, 2007 to the extent that no directed service orders have been issued by the Surface Transportation Board as of the date of transfer or there is a balance of reserved funds not needed by the Board to pay for any directed service order issued through September 30, 2007: *Provided further*, That upon the receipt and approval of Amtrak's fiscal year 2007 business plan and if the Secretary deems it in the best interests of the transportation system, in his sole discretion, the Secretary may make grants to the Corporation at such times and in such amounts for intercity passenger rail, including coverage of operating losses of the Corporation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall approve funding to cover operating losses for the Corporation only after receiving and reviewing a grant request for each specific train route: *Provided further*, That each such grant request shall be accompanied by a detailed financial analysis, revenue projection, and capital expenditure projection justifying the Federal support to the Secretary's satisfaction: *Provided further*, That the Corporation is directed to achieve savings through the operating efficiencies including, but not limited to, modifications to food and beverage service and first class service and efficiencies in overhead: *Provided further*, That the Inspector General of the Department of Transportation shall report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations beginning three months after the date of the enactment of this Act and quarterly thereafter with estimates of the savings accrued as a result of all operational reforms instituted by the Corporation: *Provided further*, That if the Inspector General cannot certify that the Corporation has achieved operational savings by July 1, 2007, none of the funds in this Act may be used after July 1, 2007, to subsidize the net losses of food and beverage service and sleeper car service on any Amtrak route: *Provided further*, That not later than 120 days after enactment of this Act, Amtrak shall transmit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a detailed plan to improve the financial performance of food and beverage service and a detailed plan to improve the financial performance of first class service (including sleeping car service) so that these services are revenue neutral or better on a fully allocated cost basis no later than October 1, 2008: *Provided further*, That these plans shall include milestones and target dates for implementation and projected cost savings in fiscal years 2007 and 2008 and that Amtrak shall report quarterly to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations on its progress in implementing these plans, quantify savings realized to date on a monthly basis compared to those projected in the plans, identify any changes in the plans or delays in implementing these plans, and identify the causes of delay and proposed corrective measures: *Provided further*, That not later than 120 days after enactment of this Act, Amtrak shall transmit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a report on its overhead expenses as of October 1, 2006, identifying those that are directly associated with a specific route or group of routes or lines of

business and those system overhead expenses not directly charged to specific trains, routes or other lines of business, and a plan to reduce system overhead expenses by 10 percent annually through strategic investments, transfer of responsibilities to entities that request Amtrak provide specific services, and other measures: *Provided further*, That as part of its report and plan to reduce overhead expenses, Amtrak shall include a report on the expenses associated with intercity passenger rail reservations and ticketing, including a comparison of such expenses to those associated with domestic airlines and intercity bus service, and a plan, including milestones and target dates, for reducing the expenses associated with its reservations and ticketing including technology enhancements, the use of electronic ticketing, and such other measures that will result in expense savings, enhanced revenue, and assure accurate manifests of passengers on specific trains at all times: *Provided further*, That not later than October 1, 2008, Amtrak shall reduce its system overhead expenses by 10 percent from the level identified as existing on October 1, 2006, and in each subsequent fiscal year, reduce system overhead expenses by 10 percent of the level existing on October 1 of the immediate preceding year: *Provided further*, That if the Inspector General deems it necessary for the continued development and implementation, not less than $5,000,000 of the funds provided under this section shall be expended for the managerial cost accounting system, which includes average and marginal unit cost capability: *Provided further*, That within 30 days of the development of the managerial cost accounting system, the Department of Transportation's Inspector General shall review and comment to the Secretary and the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations upon the strengths and weaknesses of the system and how it best can be implemented to improve decision making by the Board of Directors and management of the Corporation: *Provided further*, That no later than 120 days after enactment of this Act, Amtrak shall transmit to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations a detailed plan, including milestones, target dates and cost estimates, to improve its management cost accounting system and integrate such system with the Corporation's other processes including budgeting, financial forecasting and modeling, and accounting, to permit more informed decisions by management and the Board of Directors as to the financial ramifications of proposed changes to routes and services: *Provided further*, That, as part of the plan to improve its management cost accounting system, Amtrak shall include a plan to improve or replace the Corporation's Route Profitability System (RPS) to provide more current, accurate, and clear information on revenues and expenses on all of the Corporation's routes and services, including the allocation of expenses not directly charged to specific trains, routes, or other business lines: *Provided further*, That not later than 60 days after the enactment of this Act, the Corporation shall transmit, in electronic format, to the Secretary, the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation a comprehensive business plan approved by the Board of Directors for fiscal year 2007 under 49 U.S.C. 24104(a): *Provided further*, That the business plan shall include, as applicable, targets for ridership, revenues, and capital and operating expenses: *Provided further*, That the plan shall also include a separate accounting of such targets for the Northeast Corridor; commuter service; long-distance Amtrak service; State-supported service; each intercity train route, including Autotrain; and commercial activities including contract operations: *Provided further*, That the business plan shall include a description of the work to be funded, along with cost estimates and an estimated timetable for completion of the projects covered by the business plan: *Provided further*, That the Corporation shall continue to provide monthly reports in electronic format regarding the pending business plan, which shall describe the work completed to date, any changes to the business plan, and the reasons for such changes, and shall identify all sole source contract awards which shall be accompanied by a justification as to why said contract was awarded on a sole source basis: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act may be used for operating expenses, including advance purchase orders, not approved by the Secretary and in the Corporation's fiscal year 2007 business plan: *Provided further*, That the Corporation shall display the business plan and all subsequent supplemental plans on the Corporation's website within a reasonable timeframe following their submission to the appropriate entities: *Provided further*, That none of the funds under this heading may be obligated or expended until the Corporation agrees to continue to abide by the provisions of paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 5, and 11 of the summary of conditions for the direct loan agreement of June 28, 2002, in the same manner as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may, at his discretion, condition the award of efficiency incentive grant funds on reform requirements for the Corporation and his assessment of progress towards such reform requirements: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act may be used after March 1, 2006, to support any route on which Amtrak offers a discounted fare of more than 50 percent off the normal, peak fare.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 150. The Secretary may purchase promotional items of nominal value for use in public outreach activities to accomplish the purposes of 49 U.S.C. 20134: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall prescribe guidelines for the administration of such purchases and use.

FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary administrative expenses of the Federal Transit Administration's programs authorized by chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, $85,000,000: *Provided*, That of the funds available under this heading, not to exceed $1,063,000 shall be available for the Office of the Administrator; not to exceed $7,654,000 shall be available for the Office of Administration; not to exceed $4,273,000 shall be available for the Office of the Chief Counsel; not to exceed $1,394,000 shall be available for the Office of Communication and Congressional Affairs; not to exceed $8,403,000 shall be available for the Office of Program Management; not to exceed $9,259,000 shall be available for the Office of Budget and Policy; not to exceed $4,876,000 shall be available for the Office of Demonstration and Innovation; not to exceed $3,272,000 shall be available for the Office of Civil Rights; not to exceed $4,718,000 shall be available for the Office of Planning; not to exceed $22,420,000 shall be available for regional offices; and not to exceed $17,668,000 shall be available for the central account: *Provided further*, That the Administrator is authorized to transfer funds appropriated for an office of the Federal Transit Administration: *Provided further*, That no appropriation for an office shall be increased or decreased by more than a total of 5 percent during the fiscal year by all such transfers: *Provided further*, That any change in funding greater than 5 percent shall be submitted for approval to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That any funding transferred from the central account shall be submitted for approval to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided or limited in this Act may be used to create a permanent office of transit security under this heading: *Provided further*, That of the funds in this Act available for the execution of contracts under section 5327(c) of title 49, United States Code, $2,000,000 shall be reimbursed to the Department of Transportation's Office of Inspector General for costs associated with audits and investigations of transit-related issues, including reviews of new fixed guideway systems: *Provided further*, That upon submission to the Congress of the fiscal year 2008 President's budget, the Secretary of Transportation shall transmit to Congress the annual report on new starts, including proposed allocations of funds for fiscal year 2008.

FORMULA AND BUS GRANTS

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY)

(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of 49 U.S.C. 5305, 5307, 5308, 5309, 5310, 5311, 5316, 5317, 5320, 5335, 5339, and 5340 and section 3038 of Public Law 105–178, as amended, $3,925,000,000, to be derived from the Mass Transit Account of the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds available for the implementation or execution of programs authorized under 49 U.S.C. 5305, 5307, 5308, 5309, 5310, 5311, *5316*, 5317, 5320, 5335, 5339, and 5340 and section 3038 of Public Law 105–178, as amended, shall not exceed total obligations of $7,262,775,000 in fiscal year 2007: *Provided further*, That $28,660,920 in unobligated balances are cancelled.

RESEARCH AND UNIVERSITY RESEARCH CENTERS

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5306, 5312–5315, 5322, and 5506, $65,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That $9,300,000 is available to carry out the transit cooperative research program under section 5313 of title 49, United States Code, $4,300,000 is available for the National Transit Institute under section 5315 of title 49, United States Code, $7,000,000 is available for university transportation centers program under section 5506 of title 49, United States Code: *Provided further*, That $49,400,000 is available to carry out national research programs under sections 5312, 5313, 5314, and 5322 of title 49, United States Code.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT GRANTS

(INCLUDING RESCISSION)

For necessary expenses to carry out section 5309 of title 49, United States Code, $1,566,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That $17,760,000 in unobligated balances are cancelled.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 160. The limitations on obligations for the programs of the Federal Transit Administration shall not apply to any authority under 49 U.S.C. 5338, previously made available for obligation, or to any other authority previously made available for obligation.

SEC. 161. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds made available by this Act under ''Federal Transit Administration, Capital investment grants'' and bus and bus facilities under ''Federal Transit Administration, Formula and Bus Grants'' for projects

specified in this Act or identified in reports accompanying this Act not obligated by September 30, 2009, and other recoveries, shall be made available for other projects under 49 U.S.C. 5309.

SEC. 162. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds appropriated before October 1, 2006, under any section of chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, that remain available for expenditure may be transferred to and administered under the most recent appropriation heading for any such section.

SEC. 163. During fiscal years 2007 and 2008, each Federal Transit Administration grant for a project that involves the acquisition of rehabilitation of a bus to be used in public transportation shall be for 100 percent of the net capital costs of a factory-installed or retrofitted hybrid electric propulsion system and any equipment related to such a system: Provided, That the Secretary shall have the discretion to determine, through practicable administrative procedures, the costs attributable to the system and related-equipment.

SEC. 164. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, unobligated funds made available for a new fixed guideway systems projects under the heading ''Federal Transit Administration, Capital Investment Grants'' in any appropriations Act prior to this Act may be used during this fiscal year to satisfy expenses incurred for such projects for activities eligible in the year the funds were appropriated.

SEC. 165. Hereinafter, the non-Federal share of the net project cost of the San Gabriel Valley Metro Gold Line connecting Los Angeles, South Pasadena and Pasadena shall be counted toward satisfying the Federal matching requirements under 49 U.S.C. 5309 on any phase of the San Gabriel Valley Gold Line Foothill Extension continuing from Pasadena to Montclair.

SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

The Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to the Corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Corporation's budget for the current fiscal year.

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

(HARBOR MAINTENANCE TRUST FUND)

For necessary expenses for operations and maintenance of those portions of the Saint Lawrence Seaway operated and maintained by the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, $17,425,000, to be derived from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, pursuant to Public Law 99–662.

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

MARITIME SECURITY PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to maintain and preserve a U.S.-flag merchant fleet to serve the national security needs of the United States, $154,440,000, to remain available until expended.

OPERATIONS AND TRAINING

For necessary expenses of operations and training activities authorized by law, $116,442,000, of which $24,009,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2007, for salaries and benefits of employees of the United States Merchant Marine Academy; of which $14,850,000 shall remain available until expended for capital improvements at the United States Merchant Marine Academy; and of which $7,920,000 shall remain available until expended for the State Maritime Schools Schoolship Maintenance and Repair.

SHIP DISPOSAL

For necessary expenses related to the disposal of obsolete vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet of the Maritime Administration, $25,740,000, to remain available until expended.

MARITIME GUARANTEED LOAN (TITLE XI) PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS AND RESCISSION)

For administrative expenses to carry out the guaranteed loan program, not to exceed $3,317,000, which shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for Operations and Training: *Provided*, That of the unobligated balances available under this heading, $2,000,000 are cancelled.

NATIONAL DEFENSE TANK VESSEL CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

(RESCISSION)

All unobligated balances under this heading are rescinded.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 170. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Maritime Administration is authorized to furnish utilities and services and make necessary repairs in connection with any lease, contract, or occupancy involving Government property under control of the Maritime Administration, and payments received therefore shall be credited to the appropriation charged with the cost thereof: *Provided*, That rental payments under any such lease, contract, or occupancy for items other than such utilities, services, or repairs shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 171. No obligations shall be incurred during the current fiscal year from the construction fund established by the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1101 et seq.), or otherwise, in excess of the appropriations and limitations contained in this Act or in any prior appropriations Act.

PIPELINE AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY ADMINISTRATION

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For necessary administrative expenses of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, $17,721,000, of which $639,000 shall be derived from the Pipeline Safety Fund.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY

For expenses necessary to discharge the hazardous materials safety functions of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, $27,225,000, of which $2,111,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided*, That up to $1,200,000 in fees collected under 49 U.S.C. 5108(g) shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury as offsetting receipts: *Provided further*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, to be available until expended, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training, for reports publication and dissemination, and for travel expenses incurred in performance of hazardous materials exemptions and approvals functions.

PIPELINE SAFETY

(PIPELINE SAFETY FUND)

(OIL SPILL LIABILITY TRUST FUND)

For expenses necessary to conduct the functions of the pipeline safety program, for grants-in-aid to carry out a pipeline safety program, as authorized by 49 U.S.C. 60107, and to discharge the pipeline program responsibilities of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, $75,735,000, of which $18,810,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund and shall remain available until September 30, 2009; of which $56,925,000 shall be derived from the Pipeline Safety Fund, of which $24,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided*, That not less than $1,000,000 of the funds provided under this heading shall be for the one-call State grant program.

EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS GRANTS

(EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS FUND)

For necessary expenses to carry out 49 U.S.C. 5128(b), $198,000, to be derived from the Emergency Preparedness Fund, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided*, That not more than $28,328,000 shall be made available for obligation in fiscal year 2007 from amounts made available by 49 U.S.C. 5116(i) and 5128(b)–(c): *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available by 49 U.S.C. 5116(i), 5128(b), or 5128(c) shall be made available for obligation by individuals other than the Secretary of Transportation, or his designee.

RESEARCH AND INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGY ADMINISTRATION

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses of the Research and Innovative Technology Administration, $6,367,000, of which $1,120,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, to be available until expended, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General to carry out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $64,143,000: *Provided*, That the Inspector General shall have all necessary authority, in carrying out the duties specified in the Inspector General Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. 3), to investigate allegations of fraud, including false statements to the government (18 U.S.C. 1001), by any person or entity that is subject to regulation by the Department: *Provided further*, That the funds made available under this heading shall be used to investigate, pursuant to section 41712 of title 49, United States Code: (1) unfair or deceptive practices and unfair methods of competition by domestic and foreign air carriers and ticket agents; and (2) the compliance of domestic and foreign air carriers with respect to item (1) of this proviso.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Surface Transportation Board, including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $25,618,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed $1,250,000 from fees established by the Chairman of the Surface Transportation Board shall be credited to this appropriation as offsetting collections and used for necessary and authorized expenses under this heading: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced on a dollar-for-dollar basis as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2007, to result in a final appropriation from the general fund estimated at no more than $24,368,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 180. During the current fiscal year applicable appropriations to the Department of Transportation shall be available for maintenance and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase

of liability insurance for motor vehicles operating in foreign countries on official department business; and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902).

SEC. 181. Appropriations contained in this Act for the Department of Transportation shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for an Executive Level IV.

SEC. 182. None of the funds in this Act shall be available for salaries and expenses of more than 110 political and Presidential appointees in the Department of Transportation: *Provided*, That none of the personnel covered by this provision may be assigned on temporary detail outside the Department of Transportation.

SEC. 183. None of the funds in this Act shall be used to implement section 404 of title 23, United States Code.

SEC. 184. (a) No recipient of funds made available in this Act shall disseminate personal information (as defined in 18 U.S.C. 2725(3)) obtained by a State department of motor vehicles in connection with a motor vehicle record as defined in 18 U.S.C. 2725(1), except as provided in 18 U.S.C. 2721 for a use permitted under 18 U.S.C. 2721.

(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary shall not withhold funds provided in this Act for any grantee if a State is in noncompliance with this provision.

SEC. 185. Funds received by the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, and Federal Railroad Administration from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training may be credited respectively to the Federal Highway Administration's ''Federal-Aid Highways'' account, the Federal Transit Administration's ''Research and University Research Centers'' account, and to the Federal Railroad Administration's ''Safety and Operations'' account, except for State rail safety inspectors participating in training pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 20105.

SEC. 186. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, rule or regulation, the Secretary of Transportation is authorized to allow the issuer of any preferred stock heretofore sold to the Department to redeem or repurchase such stock upon the payment to the Department of an amount determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 187. None of the funds in this Act to the Department of Transportation may be used to make a grant unless the Secretary of Transportation notifies the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations not less than 3 full business days before any discretionary grant award, letter of intent, or full funding grant agreement totaling $1,000,000 or more is announced by the department or its modal administrations from: (1) any discretionary grant program of the Federal Highway Administration other than the emergency relief program; (2) the airport improvement program of the Federal Aviation Administration; or (3) any program of the Federal Transit Administration other than the formula grants and fixed guideway modernization programs: *Provided*, That no notification shall involve funds that are not available for obligation.

SEC. 188. Rebates, refunds, incentive payments, minor fees and other funds received by the Department of Transportation from travel management centers, charge card programs, the subleasing of building space, and miscellaneous sources are to be credited to appropriations of the Department of Transportation and allocated to elements of the Department of Transportation using fair and equitable criteria and such funds shall be available until expended.

SEC. 189. Amounts made available in this or any other Act that the Secretary determines represent improper payments by the Department of Transportation to a third party contractor under a financial assistance award, which are recovered pursuant to law, shall be available—

(1) to reimburse the actual expenses incurred by the Department of Transportation in recovering improper payments; and

(2) to pay contractors for services provided in recovering improper payments or contractor support in the implementation of the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002: *Provided*, That amounts in excess of that required for paragraphs (1) and (2)—

(A) shall be credited to and merged with the appropriation from which the improper payments were made, and shall be available for the purposes and period for which such appropriations are available; or

(B) if no such appropriation remains available, shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall report annually to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations the amount and reasons for these transfers: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this section, the term ''improper payments'', has the same meaning as that provided in section 2(d)(2) of Public Law 107–300.

This title may be cited as the ''Department of Transportation Appropriations Act, 2007''.

TITLE II

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Departmental Offices including operation and maintenance of the Treasury Building and Annex; hire of passenger motor vehicles; maintenance, repairs, and improvements of, and purchase of commercial insurance policies for, real properties leased or owned overseas, when necessary for the performance of official business, $223,786,000, of which not to exceed $8,760,000 is for executive direction program activities; not to exceed $8,741,000 is for general counsel program activities; not to exceed $41,947,000 is for economic policies and programs activities; not to exceed $27,086,000 is for financial policies and programs activities; not to exceed $45,401,000 is for terrorism and financial intelligence activities; not to exceed $18,534,000 is for Treasury-wide management policies and programs activities; and not to exceed $73,317,000 is for administration programs activities: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to transfer funds appropriated for any program activity of the Departmental Offices to any other program activity of the Departmental Offices upon notification to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That no appropriation for any program activity shall be increased or decreased by more than three percent by all such transfers: *Provided further*, That any change in funding greater than three percent shall be submitted for approval to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, not to exceed $3,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008, for information technology modernization requirements; not to exceed $100,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and not to exceed $258,000 for unforeseen emergencies of a confidential nature, to be allocated and expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury and to be accounted for solely on his certificate: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, $5,114,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008, is for the Treasury-wide Financial Statement Audit and Internal Control Program, of which such amounts as may be necessary may be transferred to accounts of the Department's offices and bureaus to conduct audits: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority shall be in addition to any other provided in this Act.

DEPARTMENT-WIDE SYSTEMS AND CAPITAL INVESTMENTS PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For development and acquisition of automatic data processing equipment, software, and services for the Department of the Treasury, $34,032,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided*, That these funds shall be transferred to accounts and in amounts as necessary to satisfy the requirements of the Department's offices, bureaus, and other organizations: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority shall be in addition to any other transfer authority provided in this Act: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be used to support or supplement ''Internal Revenue Service, Operations Support'' or ''Internal Revenue Service, Business Systems Modernization''.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, not to exceed $2,000,000 for official travel expenses, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed $100,000 for unforeseen emergencies of a confidential nature, to be allocated and expended under the direction of the Inspector General of the Treasury, $17,352,000, of which not to exceed $2,500 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

TREASURY INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR TAX ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, including purchase (not to exceed 150 for replacement only for police-type use) and hire of passenger motor vehicles (31 U.S.C. 1343(b)); services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, at such rates as may be determined by the Inspector General for Tax Administration; not to exceed $6,000,000 for official travel expenses; and not to exceed $500,000 for unforeseen emergencies of a confidential nature, to be allocated and expended under the direction of the Inspector General for Tax Administration, $136,469,000; and of which not to exceed $1,500 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

AIR TRANSPORTATION STABILIZATION PROGRAM ACCOUNT

In fiscal year 2007, the Air Transportation Stabilization Board may charge fees to a borrower for the costs to the Air Transportation Stabilization Board associated with bankruptcy proceedings of the borrower. Such fees shall be collected and deposited in the Air Transportation Stabilization Program Account, to be available for such costs.

FINANCIAL CRIMES ENFORCEMENT NETWORK

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; travel and training expenses of non-Federal and foreign government personnel to attend meetings and training concerned with domestic and foreign financial intelligence activities, law enforcement, and financial regulation; not to exceed $14,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and for assistance to

Federal law enforcement agencies, with or without reimbursement, $84,066,000, of which not to exceed $14,012,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2009; and of which $8,651,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided*, That funds appropriated in this account may be used to procure personal services contracts.

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Financial Management Service, $233,654,000, of which not to exceed $9,220,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2009, for information systems modernization initiatives; and of which not to exceed $2,500 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

ALCOHOL AND TOBACCO TAX AND TRADE BUREAU

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of carrying out section 1111 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, $92,604,000; of which not to exceed $6,000 for official reception and representation expenses; not to exceed $50,000 for cooperative research and development programs for laboratory services; and provision of laboratory assistance to State and local agencies with or without reimbursement.

UNITED STATES MINT

UNITED STATES MINT PUBLIC ENTERPRISE FUND

Pursuant to section 5136 of title 31, United States Code, the United States Mint is provided funding through the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund for costs associated with the production of circulating coins, numismatic coins, and protective services, including both operating expenses and capital investments. The aggregate amount of new liabilities and obligations incurred during fiscal year 2007 under such section 5136 for circulating coinage and protective service capital investments of the United States Mint shall not exceed $30,200,000.

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

For necessary expenses connected with any public-debt issues of the United States, $180,789,000, of which not to exceed $2,500 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, and of which not to exceed $2,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2009, for systems modernization: *Provided*, That the sum appropriated herein from the general fund for fiscal year 2007 shall be reduced by not more than $3,000,000 as definitive security issue fees and Treasury Direct Investor Account Maintenance fees are collected, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2007 appropriation from the general fund estimated at $177,789,000. In addition, $70,000 to be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to reimburse the Bureau for administrative and personnel expenses for financial management of the Fund, as authorized by section 1012 of Public Law 101–380.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

To carry out the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–325), including services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the rate for ES–3, $40,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008, of which up to $12,800,000 may be used for administrative expenses, including administration of the New Markets Tax Credit, up to $6,000,000 may be used for the cost of direct loans, and up to $250,000 may be used for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program: *Provided*, That the cost of direct loans, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed $11,000,000.

INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

TAXPAYER SERVICES

For necessary expenses of the Internal Revenue Service to provide taxpayer services, including pre-filing assistance and education, filing and account services, taxpayer advocacy services, and other services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, at such rates as may be determined by the Commissioner, $2,059,151,000, of which up to $4,100,000 shall be for the Tax Counseling for the Elderly Program, and of which $8,000,000 shall be available for low-income taxpayer clinic grants.

ENFORCEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Internal Revenue Service to determine and collect owed taxes, to provide legal and litigation support, to conduct criminal investigations, to enforce criminal statutes related to violations of internal revenue laws and other financial crimes, to purchase (for police-type use, not to exceed 850) and hire of passenger motor vehicles (31 U.S.C. 1343(b)), and to provide other services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, at such rates as may be determined by the Commissioner, $4,757,126,000, of which not less than $55,584,000 shall be for the Interagency Crime and Drug Enforcement program: *Provided*, That up to $10,000,000 may be transferred as necessary from this account to the Internal Revenue Service Operations Support appropriation solely for the purposes of the Interagency Crime and Drug Enforcement program: *Provided further*, That this transfer authority shall be in addition to any other transfer authority provided in this Act.

OPERATIONS SUPPORT

For necessary expenses of the Internal Revenue Service to operate and support taxpayer services and tax law enforcement programs, including rent payments; facilities services; printing; postage; physical security; headquarters and other IRS-wide administration activities; research and statistics of income; telecommunications; information technology development, enhancement, operations, maintenance, and security; the hire of passenger motor vehicles (31 US.C. 1343(b)); and other services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, at such rates as may be determined by the Commissioner; $3,438,404,000, of which $1,447,451,000 shall be for information systems and telecommunications support; of which not to exceed $1,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2009, for research; of which not to exceed $1,500,000 shall be for the Internal Revenue Service Oversight Board; and of which not to exceed $25,000 shall be for official reception and representation: *Provided*, That of the amount made available for information systems and telecommunication support, $75,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2008, for information technology support.

BUSINESS SYSTEMS MODERNIZATION

For necessary expenses of the Internal Revenue Service for the business systems modernization program, $212,310,000, of which not less than $167,310,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2009, for the capital asset acquisition of information technology systems, including management and related contractual costs of said acquisitions, including contractual costs associated with operations authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided*, That none of the funds for capital asset acquisition of information technology systems may be obligated until the Internal Revenue Service submits to the Committees on Appropriations, and such Committees approve, a plan for expenditure that: (1) meets the capital planning and investment control review requirements established by the Office of Management and Budget, including Circular A–11; (2) complies with the Internal Revenue Service's enterprise architecture, including the modernization blueprint; (3) conforms with the Internal Revenue Service's enterprise life cycle methodology; (4) is approved by the Internal Revenue Service, the Department of the Treasury, and the Office of Management and Budget; (5) has been reviewed by the Government Accountability Office; and (6) complies with the acquisition rules, requirements, guidelines, and systems acquisition management practices of the Federal Government.

□ 1815

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARY G. MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California:

Page 73, line 8, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $15,000,000)''.

Page 92, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $15,000,000)''.

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I have a modest amendment to ensure HUD can continue to work the redevelopment of brownfield sites to local communities.

I would like to commend Chairman KNOLLENBERG. I am on the Financial Services Committee and Transportation Committee, and he has worked very hard and responsibly to fund the Nation's housing and transportation needs during this very, very tight budget year. I am pleased that the bill boosts highway spending, supports aviation, addresses America's critical housing needs, supports national anti-drug efforts.

This amendment today basically keeps the BEDI program going, which redevelops brownfields through the HUD administration. The estimate is 450,000 vacant sites lay idle throughout this country. They are underused industrial sites as a result of environmental contamination caused by chemical compounds and other hazardous substances.

The basic year's budget transfers all the funding to EPA. EPA has a completely different objective than HUD does through the BEDI Program. BEDI grants are basically used for economic development. We passed out a bill I offered last year, H.R. 280, that is in the Senate today to restructure the BEDI Program, making a simpler program more usable to local communities. Currently, to get a BEDI grant you have to apply for a section 108 loan, then in repayment you have to guarantee your CDBG funds and pledge those to repay that loan. Some communities don't receive CDBG funds directly, so they

could not apply for section 108. And the other communities who can, don't want to readily pledge those CDBG funds because many community organizations and efforts are undertaken with the utilization of these funds. These brownfield sites threaten our groundwater. They cost local communities jobs and revenues. It is estimated if we could clean these 450,000 brownfield sites up, it would generate an additional 550,000 jobs throughout this country and $2.4 billion in new tax revenues for its cities and towns.

The communities I represent and communities throughout this country want this program. The problem they have had is it has been a complex program in the past. I thank Chairman KNOLLENBERG. Last year you accepted an amendment of mine which kept this program going. And the understanding I had was we need to do legislation to modify the program in order to make it more accessible to communities. We have done that. It passed out of this floor on unanimous consent. It is in the Senate currently. And we hope to have that addressed in the Senate and made into law so we can keep this viable program going.

EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON has been a true partner working with me on this, and I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by commending the gentleman from Michigan, Chairman KNOLLENBERG, and the ranking member, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), for their good work on this bill in the midst of an extremely tight budget environment. Both gentlemen have had to make some very unpopular decisions.

However, as I stated last year, eliminating the funding for brownfield redevelopment programs should be reconsidered. As a result, I rise today in strong support of the Miller-Johnson amendment to H.R. 5576.

Similar to last year, the gentleman from California and I offered this amendment today because we both feel that it is time for this body to get really serious about eliminating the Nation's estimated 500,000 brownfields.

The amendment increases the Department of Housing and Urban Development Brownfields Redevelopment Program account by $15 million.

In its present form, H.R. 5576 provides no funding for a program that has helped to transform communities, large and small, throughout the country.

The amendment calls for a corresponding offset through a reduction of $15 million within the Business Systems Modernization Account in the Treasury title. Currently, the Business Systems Modernization Account is $45 million above the administration's request, and $15.3 million above last year's request.

While I respect the committee's view that HUD funding is no longer essential or appropriate due to the EPA's expanded authority and increased appropriations, this is certainly a view that I do not share.

First of all, I believe it is important to note that there are clear distinctions between EPA's Brownfields Program relative to HUD's.

Although both are equally important, EPA's program focuses primarily on cleanup, whereas the focus of HUD's program is on redevelopment of brownfield sites once cleanup is complete.

It is true that the authority of the EPA has been expanded. However, the consistent and chronic underfunding of the Brownfields Program by the President and the Congress leave much to be desired in terms of corresponding appropriations.

In fact, appropriations for brownfields assessment and cleanup peaked.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Appropriations for brownfields assessment cleanup peaked at $97.7 million in fiscal year 2002 and is only $89 million in this year's interior and environment appropriations bill.

Last week before the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, where I serve as ranking member, an EPA assistant administrator testified that for fiscal year 2006 EPA received nearly 700 proposals for Brownfield Grants. Unfortunately, EPA funded less than 45 percent of these.

Mr. Chairman, our communities are very deserving of these strong HUD-administered brownfields programs. If you watch the game tonight, look at the American Center. Oh, you won't see that one. It will be in Miami tonight. But that was a brownfield in Dallas.

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

I have always felt very strongly about Mr. MILLER and his ideas. I do have a problem with this particular amendment. I oppose any amendment to continue the Brownfields Program, which is recommended for elimination as part of a broad sweep of lower priority programs. We must reduce or eliminate these duplicative programs in order to free up the funds for the highest priorities in HUD, which is, among other things, assistance to extremely low-income families and restoring funds for community development.

Last year Congress recognized the lack of use of this program and rescinded $10 million in unused prior-year appropriations. The money wasn't being spent.

The activities of the Brownfields Program remain, as they have been, eligible uses for CDBG funds. States and communities can use these funds for this purpose if they choose to do so.

In addition, there are nearly two dozen Federal programs that can help communities in one way or another to assess, clean up and reuse brownfield sites.

EPA's Brownfield Program has awarded 883 assessment grants totaling $225.4 million, 202 revolving loan fund grants totaling $186.7 million, 238 cleanup grants totaling $42.7 million.

By comparison, HUD's program has been extremely slow and funds are often used as a loan loss reserve, rather than as grants for reconstructing sites.

HUD grants are a tiny fraction of project development costs. They represent just 2.3 percent of the total development costs on average. For each HUD dollar, there was $28 in private and $12 in State and local funds committed with an average of five State, local, and private sources of funding or financing for each project. HUD funding is not critical to any decision to proceed with a project or makes any difference to the completion of a project.

This amendment, and we are being hit already early in title II, this amendment cuts the IRS's Business Systems Modernization Program by $15 million. While it appears this account is $45 million above the President's request, it is actually just a restructuring of the IRS accounts. In fact, BSM is currently funded below last year's level. Cutting this $15 million will force IRS to lay off many of the 317 personnel. Let me repeat that: 317 personnel who are currently working on the BSM project, delaying all work on the modernization of IRS legacy systems.

So it is for those reasons that I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a final plea for this program. Even if there might be a few people less in these Departments, it does not compare with what a small investment does to get rid of brownfields anywhere they are, because once this property is put back on the tax rolls, it generates more than ever than what is put into it.

□ 1830

And I want to express my appreciation to Mr. KNOLLENBERG because he has been helpful. But I would make a plea that this is a lot larger than what was requested, and that is the reason why we chose to take it from there.

We all have to tighten our belts. We all have to give up a little more than what we had. But I can assure you that allowing property to not be on a tax roll will go a lot longer way when you put the money there, just a small amount of money, than doing without two or three staff people.

I just imagine that any Department in this Nation can function with just a

few less staff than what they have now and do the same job. If we cannot, then we are not doing as well as the private industry because they have cut half of their staff and are still doing the same job. That is called higher productivity, and maybe that is what we need in some of these Departments is higher productivity, while half of the people at home and the other half are doing the full job. But this will offer jobs. It puts property back onto the tax rolls by allowing it to be redeveloped, and I do not know a single city or rural area that could not use a little brownfield encouragement through their funds.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out that this is the second year in a row that we have had this discussion, and it is predicated on the idea that somewhere there is a sense that the EPA has a program for brownfields that does the same thing that this HUD program for brownfields does.

Now, to the very best of my knowledge, and very recently rechecked, the EPA does assessments of hazardous materials on old industrial sites but does nothing to redevelop those sites so that this program is, to the best of my knowledge, the only place that we have done redevelopment of otherwise old hazardous material sites, industrial sites that can be put back into use.

Now, last year, even though it had been zeroed out, we ended up with a final budget of $9.9 million by amendment adopted on the floor. The offset here is an unpalatable offset. But, again, my belief is that the Brownfields Program is at least as important as the IRS Business Systems Program. If this amendment is defeated, I will assure the gentlewoman from Texas that I will do my best to see that something better comes out of the final process and the conference process on this legislation.

In the meantime, I will join her in support of the legislation.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Miller Brownfields amendment. The Amendment provides $15 million in funding for the Brownfields program.

Again, let me thank the Chairman of the Subcommittee, JOE KNOLLENBERG and the Ranking Member, JOHN W. OLVER, for their work on this bill. HUD programs, however, have witnessed major cuts over the past several years. What I find interesting about this bill is that it does not provide any funding for the Brownfields Economic Development Initiatives (BEDI) program, but instead includes Brownfields redevelopment as an eligible activity under the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program. Of course, this does not take into account the existence of numerous Brownfields sites across the country. These sites are often located in strategically important areas of a city or county, where economic development projects have been planned. Without funding for the Brownfields program many of these projects will not be undertaken.

The estimate of the number of vacant and underused sites around the U.S. is more than 500,000. If we could put these sites into productive economic development uses we stand to increase jobs by 500,000 million, while generating $2.4 billion in new tax revenues. The Brownfields program that I would like to see funded is truly an economic development tool that has been very effective in assisting communities to reclaim important parcels of underused land. To the extent that we eliminate funding for the BEDI program we will seriously undermine economic development efforts across-the-board. In the City of Los Angeles and in Los Angeles County, the BEDI program supports a wide variety of projects, including developments with a strong business attraction, expansion and/or retentions component, as well employment creation.

One example is the use of a $1.75 million BEDI grant that was used to convert a contaminated 130 acre oil production and storage site facility into a warehouse and distribution center, which produced 679 jobs—the City of Sante Fe Springs Golden Springs Development Park.

As many of you know, the House last year unanimously approved an amendment to provide $24 million for Brownfields, and the conference report provided $10 million. In addition, the House recently passed H.R. 280, the Brownfields Redevelopment Enhancement Act to provide greater access to the BEDI program.

Whether you agree with the $15 million funding level is not important. What is really critical is that the program be in place to continue to assist communities to clean-up the mess made by industry, as well as the inadequate federal response. Many communities are at a critical stage in revitalizing themselves. A major tool at their disposal has been the BEDI program. As such, I urge your support for the Miller amendment.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Miller-Johnson amendment to restore funding for the HUD Brownfields program.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from California for his amendment. As a former mayor, I believe that this amendment will have a very positive impact on our Nation's cities.

Since the inception of its Brownfield programs, the federal government has allocated over $800 million in brownfield assessment and cleanup funds.

In addition, this investment has leveraged over $8 billion in cleanup and redevelopment dollars, a better than 10-to-1 return on investment. It has resulted in the assessment of more than 8,000 properties and helped create over 37,000 jobs.

This is because EPA and HUD grants work in conjunction with funding from state, local and private sources to address cleanup of brownfield sites.

Brownfields sites include inactive factories, gas stations, salvage yards, and abandoned warehouses.

These sites drive down property values, provide little or no tax revenue, and contribute to community blight.

HUD's brownfields program serves as a catalyst to spur private sector investment, job creation and economic development in communities.

HUD's program supports sustainable economic development that leverages investments from other public and private sources.

In comments from last year's floor debate, an opponent of the HUD Brownfields program stated that "HUD funds on average are just about 2.3 percent of the total development cost of each project. Moreover, for each HUD dollar, there are $28 in private and $12 in State and local funds committed to the project."

These statistics were cited as a reason to eliminate the HUD Brownfields program, but instead they demonstrate its unique value.

An initial influx of capital is often the greatest barrier to remediation of brownfields sites, and HUD's program provides that essential start up money.

The HUD program has been remarkably effective at leveraging private and local financial resources to achieve new successes on old properties.

This is an exciting time in the brownfields marketplace. Federal brownfields programs have provided the foundation on which state initiatives have flourished.

New Jersey has taken the lead creating a Federal Brownfields Inter-Agency Working Group comprised of 14 federal and state agencies.

This unprecedented coordination of agencies, community partners and private investors has enabled New Jersey to solve environmental problems while providing businesses a place to locate, create jobs, build housing and entertainment venues—all without having to go into farmlands and areas with open space.

This new business activity, housing or other types of redevelopment can restore the proud heritage of successful enterprise to our historic cities and other locales.

Throughout New Jersey and the country, there are thousands of abandoned structures that were once thriving businesses, often part of large industrial centers.

Economic development matched with environmental cleanup has resulted in the rebirth of many industrial and commercial properties and surrounding neighborhoods.

Anyone who cares about our nation's cities celebrates these successes, and welcomes the flexibility of the program. HUD's particular expertise in incorporating brownfields remediation into a larger strategy for economic development and community revitalization is essential to the success we have had and will continue to have in the future.

I urge my colleagues to support this very worthwhile amendment to restore funding for the HUD Brownfields program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY G. MILLER).

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

Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California. 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 California will be postponed.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMMONS) having assumed the chair, Mr. DREIER, 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. 5576) 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, 2007, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

LIMITING AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5576, TRANSPORTATION, TREASURY, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, THE JUDICIARY, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 5576 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 865, notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no further amendment to the bill may be offered except:

pro forma amendments offered at any point in the reading by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees for the purpose of debate;

an amendment by Ms. HARRIS or Mr. DAVIS of Alabama regarding funding for Public Housing Capital Fund, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

an amendment by Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts regarding funding limitation on tenant-based section 8 vouchers, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

an amendment by Mr. YOUNG of Alaska regarding funding for certain highway projects in Illinois;

an amendment by Mr. YOUNG of Alaska regarding funding for certain highway projects in Illinois;

an amendment by Mr. YOUNG of Alaska regarding funding for certain highway projects in Illinois;

an amendment by Mr. KUCINICH regarding certain IRS enforcement activities;

an amendment by Mr. AL GREEN of Texas regarding funding for the HUD–FHIP program;

an amendment by Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California regarding funding for the HUD Community Development Fund;

an amendment by Mr. THOMAS regarding section 209 of this bill;

an amendment by Mr. NADLER regarding the funding level for tenant-based section 8 vouchers;

an amendment by Mr. INSLEE regarding funding level for the Public Housing Capital Fund;

an amendment by Mr. NADLER regarding the funding level for the HOPWA program;

an amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas to change the funding availability for the HOME downpayment assistance program;

an amendment by Mr. JINDAL to make eligible certain individuals for HUD project-based rental assistance;

an amendment by Ms. HARRIS regarding funding levels for the HUD Elderly and Disabled program;

an amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding eligibility for HUD elderly housing;

an amendment by Ms. SLAUGHTER regarding the funding level for HUD lead-based paint activities;

an amendment by Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD regarding Election Assistance College Poll Work Program;

an amendment by Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts regarding section 325 of this bill;

an amendment by Ms. WATERS regarding funding for HUD section 108 loan guarantee program;

an amendment by Mr. SHAYS regarding the Privacy and Civil Liberties Board;

an amendment by Mr. SHAYS regarding the Privacy and Civil Liberties Board;

an amendment by Ms. HOOLEY regarding funding for HIDTA program;

an amendment by Mrs. MALONEY regarding the Privacy and Civil Liberties Board;

an amendment by Mr. WYNN regarding funding level for OPM administrative expense;

an amendment by Mr. BAIRD regarding funding limitation on transportation projects that fail to comply with section 1928 of SAFETEA–LU;

an amendment by Mr. BISHOP of New York regarding the 10th anniversary of TWA Flight 800;

an amendment by Mr. CLEAVER regarding item No. 87 of section 1702 of SAFETEA–LU;

an amendment by Mr. CUELLAR regarding limitation on obligations;

an amendment by Ms. DELAURO regarding funding limitation on corporate expatriation;

an amendment by Mr. DOOLITTLE regarding funding limitation on FEC certifications;

an amendment by Mr. ENGEL regarding funding limitation on purchase of alternative fuel vehicles;

an amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation on Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail in California;

an amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation on Fairfax County Virginia Park Authority field improvements in Annandale, Virginia;

an amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation on Strand Theater Arts Center in Plattsburg, New York;

an amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation on William Faulkner Museum in Oxford, Mississippi;

an amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation on multipurpose facility in Yucaupa, California;

an amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation on renovations to a city-owned pool in Banning, California;

an amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation on Agricenter Interchange in Tulare, California;

an amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation on Fairmont Gateway Connector System in West Virginia;

an amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation on road improvements in Monroe County, New York;

an amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation on the Bakersfield Beltway system in California;

an amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation on construction on the Spirit of South Carolina in Charleston;

an amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation on facilities construction in Weirton, West Virginia;

an amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation on construction of an Audubon Nature Center in Columbus, Ohio;

an amendment by Mr. FLAKE regarding funding limitation on religious activities in Cuba;

an amendment by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey regarding travel to overseas conferences;

an amendment by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey regarding a study on State transportation funding;

an amendment by Mr. GORDON regarding funding limitation on energy efficiency;

an amendment by Mr. HASTINGS of Florida regarding TRACON consolidation in high-threat urban areas;

an amendment by Mr. HEFLEY regarding reduction of funds;

an amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding denial of noise mitigation grants;

an amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding regulations on noise mitigation;

an amendment by Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota regarding funding limitation on FTA ratings system on the Northstar Corridor Rail project;

an amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa regarding funding limitation on naming of certain public works projects or programs;

an amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa regarding funding limitation on contracting practices based on racial preferences;

an amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa regarding funding limitation on construction of a center in Los Angeles;

an amendment by Mr. KIRK regarding funding limitation on certain bridge construction in Alaska;

an amendment by Ms. LEE regarding funding limitation on restrictions on education travel to Cuba;

an amendment by Mr. LIPINSKI regarding funding for rail line relocation program;

an amendment by Mr. MCHENRY regarding funding limitation on an interchange located at exit 131 in Catawba County, North Carolina;