United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 152 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 28, 2006 No. 86

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC.
June 28, 2006.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DENNIS R. REHBERG to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend Karl D. Eastlack, Senior Pastor, Eastern Hills Wesleyan Church, Williamsville, New York, offered the following prayer:

Dear God and Father of all, we pause in this quiet moment, before the full day comes rushing at us from all sides, to give You thanks and praise. Your world, even with its wrinkles and problems, is still the most beautiful place in which to live.

I thank You, God, for the incredible talent and brain power in this room. The qualities of strong leadership and personal confidence are evident everywhere I turn. May You, O Lord, help us to balance these power gifts with heart gifts of compassion and humility.

For as smart as we are, we confess that the times are too complicated, the issues too large and looming for us to think that we can deal with them without Your guidance. So I ask, on behalf of these who have come to this Hall in order to lead, that You would grant us humility and wisdom for this hour. For we need You today more than ever.

Also, I ask that You please grant protection and courage to the young men and women serving in our military today.

This is our confession and our prayer in Your Holy, Awesome and Majestic Name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SHIMKUS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 801. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 300 North Hogan Street, Jacksonville, Florida, as the ''John Milton Bryan Simpson United States Courthouse''.

S. 2650. An act to designate the Federal courthouse to be constructed in Greenville, South Carolina, as the ''Carroll A. Campbell, Jr. Federal Courthouse''.

WELCOMING PASTOR KARL EASTLACK

(Mr. REYNOLDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize an inspiring and devoted leader from my district who just opened our House with a moving prayer.

Pastor Karl Eastlack heads up one of the largest congregations in the 26th Congressional District of New York. The thousands who are drawn to Eastern Hills Wesleyan Church in Williamsville, New York, are there because they see something special in Pastor Eastlack.

Pastor Eastlack's words provide guidance and comfort in an often rough and uncertain world. The words, he will tell you, are not his own but those of God who called him into service decades ago.

Pastor Eastlack arrived at Eastern Hills in 1987 to just 19 parishioners. The church has grown to 4,000 strong under the leadership of Pastor Eastlack, his family and staff, but Pastor Eastlack will tell you that more important than the number of bodies in the pews any given week are the number of lives being touched, changed and made better through the work of Eastern Hills Wesleyan Church. That is how he measures success.

Today, he is active in western New York's community, which he and his family call home, but he has been called to preach and teach throughout the world.

When Pastor Eastlack accepted his call to ministry, God had no boundaries for where he would serve. In the parable of the Good Shepherd, John 10:4 reads, ''I am the good Shepherd, and know my sheep, and am known of mine.''

A good shepherd, too, leads the flock of Eastern Hills Wesleyan Church, and Mr. Speaker, in honor of his spiritual leadership, I ask that this honorable body join me in honoring Pastor Karl Eastlack.

Printed on recycled paper.

EXPRESSING APPRECIATION TO HONDA FOR OPENING PLANT IN GREENSBURG, INDIANA

(Mr. PENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, within the hour, the people of Indiana will hear the news firsthand: 2,000 jobs and a $550 million Honda plant is coming to Greensburg, Indiana, in the heart of the Sixth Congressional District. Thanks to the leadership of Governor Mitch Daniels, Mayor Frank Manus and other State and local officials, Honda will soon break ground on a vehicle plant that will produce 200,000 automobiles in southern Indiana every year.

Through its decision today, Honda has chosen to partner with the people of my congressional district. While many deserve credit for seeing these 2,000 jobs come to this city of 10,200 citizens, Honda's decision today is mostly a reflection of its confidence in the hardworking people of Indiana. Honda said yes to Indiana and yes to the skill, integrity and ethic of working Hoosiers.

On behalf of the people of the Sixth Congressional District, I rise to express my profound gratitude and best wishes to Honda for providing this extraordinary economic boost for the citizens of Greensburg, Indiana, and the surrounding area.

WAG THE DOG

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, this administration is angry that the media leaked the story about its snooping into the bank records of millions of Americans. Its supporters in Congress want to formally condemn the New York Times. What a bunch of baloney.

It is about time the media did its job of protecting the public interest. If the media and this Congress had shown some independence from the party line of this administration, the claims of WMDs would have been dismissed, and the fact there was no connection between Iraq and 9/11 would have been well-established, and we would not have gone to war against Iraq.

A few years ago, a movie, ''Wag the Dog,'' told of how a fictional U.S. administration misused its communications power to create phony stories to put this Nation into an international conflict. This administration has not only wagged the dog in Iraq, but with the help of its fabricators at the Rendon and Lincoln groups, it has wagged a whole kennel.

In a free society, the media cannot be a lap dog of any administration. The first amendment says, Congress shall make no law abridging freedom of the press, except of course under this administration.

HAMAS

(Mr. McHENRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Speaker, Islamic extremists from the group Hamas attacked an Israeli army post on Sunday, killing two Israeli soldiers and holding hostage a 19-year-old corporal. Hamas militants called for the release of Palestinians from Israeli prisons in exchange for information on the soldier.

Mr. Speaker, Hamas's attempt at life-or-death blackmail once again shows its true colors. They are not a legitimate party promoting the democratic process. They are a terrorist organization, plain and simple.

The American taxpayers must never be asked to fund this terrorist organization that seeks to destroy the very existence of its democratic neighbor, Israel. We are in the business of eliminating terrorist funding, not authorizing it.

Our mission is to promote the spread of democracy in the Middle East. We must stand beside Israel, our most trusted ally in the Middle East, as they face down this terrorist organization in government clothing.

Mr. Speaker, democracy and terrorism cannot coexist, and I am putting my money on democracy.

MIXED SIGNALS ON IRAQ

(Mr. EMANUEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, we are getting mixed signals from the administration on the future of the Iraq war.

Last weekend, General Myers laid out a plan for withdrawal. Then, yesterday, General Peter Schoomaker, the Army Chief of Staff, said, ''It's my belief that we're going to be in Iraq for a long time. It's open-ended.''

An open-ended commitment with an open wallet? Really? After 3½ years, 2,500 lives, nearly a half a trillion dollars, 18,000 wounded, the American people deserve better than an open-ended commitment with an open wallet.

How about a strategy for success? The President has said, when the Iraqis stand up, we will stand down. How does that happen? The Iraqi people have a constitution. They have had an election. Now, they have 325,000 of the members of the Iraqi security force trained. What is the standard for success, let alone the strategy for success?

The American people desperately need a strategy, not slogans. We do not know because the administration does not know. They have no plan, and the American people are left with an endless occupation. What they are talking about is 5 more years and $500 billion more.

It is time for a new direction for Iraq. It is time for a new direction for America.

FREEDOM AND SECURITY, NOT POLITICS, WILL BRING OUR TROOPS HOME

(Mrs. MILLER of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend and just now on the floor, we have seen leading Democrats spin themselves into the ground when reports came out that the general in charge of operations was making plans to lower the number of American troops in Iraq.

Democrats seem more interested in who gets the political credit for the troops coming home than allowing themselves to achieve their mission. They see bogeymen around every corner.

In fact, the Senator from my home State of Michigan said that he knows the administration intends to withdraw troops in advance of the election simply for political gain.

Well, if they actually believe that the President is going to bring the troops home, why all these resolutions calling for a timetable for a withdrawal? Do they fear a withdrawal that happens due to the heroism of our troops and not Democratic political maneuvering?

The policy which has been backed by both Houses of Congress is that, as the Iraqis are increasingly able to stand up and provide for their own security, our forces will be able to stand down and return home with their mission accomplished.

Arbitrary timelines and calls for immediate withdrawal are nothing more than political posturing that will not change conditions on the ground.

God bless our troops.

MTM ENERGY WEEK

(Mr. MEEHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, high fuel costs are having a devastating effect on family budgets. Since President Bush took office, gas prices have risen 162 percent to almost $3 a gallon.

Today, I am releasing a report that shows that Massachusetts' families will pay nearly $400 more for gasoline this summer than they did last summer.

Congress must start to address this energy crisis. This week, I will introduce legislation to give tax credits to consumers that buy flex-fuel vehicles. Flex fuel costs 30 to 60 cents less per gallon than conventional gasoline, and it is better for the environment.

Flex-fuel vehicles emit 25 percent less greenhouse gases, 40 percent less carbon monoxide and 80 percent less cancer-causing sulfates.

Mr. Speaker, this is a no-brainer. Why would anyone oppose paying less and breathing cleaner air?

As we approach the Fourth of July, Congress should declare our independence from foreign oil by passing this

commonsense legislation to help lower fuel prices.

HOUSE REPUBLICANS IMPROVE AMERICA'S ENERGY EFFICIENCY

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are committed to strengthening America's energy policies and lowering gas prices for families throughout our country. From supporting legislation to build more refineries to approving environmentally safe energy production, we have proposed commonsense initiatives that will provide a long-term solution to our energy crisis.

While Democrats may demagogue about any positive proposals, House Republicans continue to act on real reforms that will increase America's energy independence. Tomorrow, the House will consider the Deep Ocean Energy Resources Act, introduced by Congressman BOBBY JINDAL, which empowers States to protect their coastlines by restricting energy production to the deep seas more than 100 miles away from our shore. Additionally, this bill allows more of America's massive energy resources to be produced on the Outer Continental Shelf.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September 11.

MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express support for an increase in the minimum wage.

We should show the Nation that we understand it has been too long since we increased the minimum wage. We should be ashamed it takes a full day's pay at minimum wage to fill up your car at the pump.

Congress has not raised the $5.15 minimum wage since 1997. We are approaching a decade since we have addressed perhaps the most important issue for hardworking, low-income Americans.

This Congress has given billions of dollars in tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans, and we should help people who are working to make ends meet.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I know it has gotten to be a habit. I would like to raise a point of order that a lot of Members from the Republican side seem to come up and stand at the podium when we are speaking, and I would hope we would not do that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct. Members should not traffic the well while another Member is under recognition.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has given billions of dollars in tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans. We should help people who are working to make ends meet.

Under this administration, costs for everything are up. Housing, health care and college tuition have all become more expensive and continue to rise. Yet a minimum wage earner can at best earn $10,700 a year.

I look forward to voting on a minimum wage increase in the near future, and I hope our leadership has the courage to bring this important issue to the floor. Let's increase the minimum wage now.

□ 1015

SUPPORT THE WARN ACT

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me apologize to my colleague. I have been doing this for 9 years, and I am just trying to be efficient. That is all.

Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, along with my colleagues, Representatives WYNN, BONO, ENGLISH, and MELANCON, I introduced the House version of the Warning, Alert and Response Network Act, also known as the WARN Act. The Emergency Alert System has not kept pace with our increasingly wireless and mobile society.

The WARN Act will help bring the Emergency Alert System into the 21st century by ensuring that, regardless of where an individual is or what kind of communication technologies they are using, they will receive a life-saving alert. Some examples of instances where they would receive an alert would be in response to all threats to public safety, including natural disasters, man-made accidents, and terrorist incidents.

The act also establishes a network for transmission of alerts across a broad variety of communication technologies, including wireless communication devices like cell phones and BlackBerrys; also things such as the Internet, digital, analog, cable, and satellite television, and satellite and terrestrial radio, as well as nontraditional media such as the public warning sirens.

This is in response to the recommendations of the White House on the Katrina report. I encourage all my colleagues to join me in supporting the WARN Act.

REPUBLICAN DO-NOTHING CONGRESS REFUSES TO ADDRESS OUR NATION'S ENERGY CRISIS

(Mr. STUPAK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, at the end of this week, the House Republican leadership will once again leave town for another recess without seriously addressing our Nation's energy crisis. House Republicans have trumpeted this week as Energy Week. You would think if they were really serious about tackling this crisis we would spend the entire week debating a comprehensive energy proposal that would end our reliance on foreign oil and foster new energy technologies.

Instead, we get more of the same from the Republican leadership. Energy Week has turned into Energy Day, a debate on one bill that would allow oil and gas companies to drill on the Outer Continental Shelf off both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. Drilling off our coasts is not only environmentally and economically risky, but it is not possible for another 7 years. How is that supposed to help consumers today? The answer is that it is not.

House Republicans are only interested in lining the pocketbooks of the oil and gas companies. If House Republicans were serious about addressing our energy crisis, the House would debate my legislation that would reduce the price of a barrel of oil by $20. Instead, we spend 1 day on a bill that does nothing to assist Americans with the high cost of energy.

CONGRATULATING ST. CLOUD, MINNESOTA ON ITS 150TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the City of St. Cloud, Minnesota, as it celebrates its sesquicentennial.

In 1856, three settlements along the Mississippi River formed the City of St. Cloud. Bolstered by the area's rich granite deposits, St. Cloud's local economy grew quickly, and it remains today the largest metropolitan area in central Minnesota.

Home of St. Cloud State University and nearby St. John's University and the College of Saint Benedict, as well as a multitude of parks, community organizations, and thriving businesses, St. Cloud has built a reputation as a positive place for families and a community that works together.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating this milestone for St. Cloud, a city that has brought 150 years of pride to the State of Minnesota.

REPUBLICAN RX DRUG PLAN IS ACTUALLY DRIVING UP PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

(Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this morning I would like to highlight two new reports out over the last week that once again demonstrates how the pharmaceutical industry is benefiting from the new prescription drug plan, while American seniors and the American taxpayers are paying even larger bills.

The first study, done by AARP, concluded that wholesale prices on the most popular drugs used by American seniors increased by 3.9 percent over the first 3 months of the year. Pharmaceutical companies promised drug prices would go down when the Republican plan took effect, but now it is clear they have actually increased at four times the rate of inflation.

The second study was conducted by Families USA, which found that American veterans are paying 43 percent less for their drugs than their counterparts under the Republican prescription drug plan. Our veterans get cheaper rates because the VA negotiates to get better deals from the pharmaceutical companies.

Contrast that with the Republican drug plan that restricts Medicare from negotiating on behalf of the American seniors.

NATIONAL SECURITY LEAKS

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, as we all know, last week newspapers disclosed the details of a secret program used to track terrorist financial activity. Some newspaper editors make vague references to the public interest as their justification for publishing national security secrets. The greater public interest is protecting our homeland from another savage terror attack.

Our terrorist enemies are crystal clear about their intention. They seek the death not of hundreds or thousands but tens of thousands of innocent Americans. The program revealed last week by the media had been successful in stopping the terrorists from achieving their murderous aims. But now, thanks to the media, one more tool used to protect each and every one of us has been compromised.

Should this disclosure contribute to another attack on America, I wonder how the media will explain itself to the husbands, wives, sons, and daughters of those killed.

Mr. Speaker, the media got it wrong in this case. Because of them, we are in greater danger today than we were yesterday. In a time of war, this is truly disgraceful.

DO WHAT YOU CAN WITH WHAT YOU GOT WHERE YOU ARE

(Mr. FARR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, FDR once said, ''Do what you can with what you got where you are.''

We have west coast salmon fishermen that can't fish because of the government's stupidity. The administration released water in the Upper Klamath Basin to water intensive crops that killed the downstream fish, the breeding stock of wild salmon. The result is that fishermen can't fish.

The governments of the States have asked the administration to call for an emergency declaration to aid these fishermen. They have refused.

Today, the House of Representatives will hear about the plight of the fishermen and the failure of the GOP leadership to help them. We will do what we can with what we got where we are.

TRIBUTE TO DR. JOHN BURSON

(Mr. GINGREY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend a brave and giving man from my district, Dr. John Burson.

Dr. Burson is the CEO of Chattahoochee Healthcare in Carrollton, Georgia; and he was recently honored with a Healthcare Hero award for his selfless efforts on behalf of injured civilians in Iraq.

As a physician myself, I know many doctors but few with the tenacity of Dr. Burson. At age 71, he packed his bag for Baghdad, where he worked all during the day at the United States Embassy clinic and by night at the Combat Support Hospital treating injured Iraqi citizens. He even treated ABC news anchor Bob Woodward after he was injured by a roadside bomb.

Dr. Burson is a retired Lieutenant Colonel from the United States Army Reserves, where he spent 30 years serving our country. Thankfully, his retirement from the Reserves has not ended his commitment to service. In fact, Dr. Burson traveled to Iraq last November so he could relieve younger military doctors who wanted to spend the Christmas holidays with their families.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Burson has used his skill and passion to improve the lives of patients from Georgia and Iraq; and I ask you to join me in saluting this brave American.

KEEP IMMIGRATION ISSUE ALIVE

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to keep the immigration issue alive today. In spite of extraordinary efforts by our President and the Senate, the House majority is stalling any real negotiations by insisting on time-consuming hearings aimed at taking the temperature of the American public.

We know a clear majority of Americans want action and reform. Should we attempt border security first, which I believe we should, we still need to face the fact that comprehensive reform is necessary. This must include a guest worker program and dealing with the 11 million people who are here today that are contributing to our economy.

Need I remind my colleagues of the difficulty we had in just moving a few hundred thousand people from the gulf coast during the Katrina hurricane? Let us convene now the conference committee on immigration and deal with the issue and develop a bipartisan solution.

Delaying the conference committee with this proposed dog and pony show does the Nation no good. Further discussions need to begin. Delaying the difficult decisions will not make it go away. The American public wants and deserves action, not the politics of division.

REPUBLICAN PRINCIPLES ON IMMIGRATION

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, last week, House Republicans outlined five principles that we want included in any immigration reform legislation before it is sent to the President. They are:

Republicans want to put a premium on border security and provide the resources necessary to strengthen our Border Patrol.

Republicans want to strengthen the enforcement of immigration laws and stiffen the penalties for those who break those laws.

Republicans want to hold employers who knowingly hire illegal aliens accountable and strengthen the penalties on them.

Republicans oppose any and all efforts to reward those who break our immigration laws.

And last, Republicans believe that immigrants must come here legally, obey our laws, and assimilate into American society by learning English.

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans passed a bill last December that incorporated these principles. Unfortunately, some of our colleagues in the Senate are pushing for legislation that would actually weaken our borders.

Mr. Speaker, this is neither what the American people need nor want.

RAISING THE MINIMUM WAGE

(Ms. LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, in one week House Republicans have shown where their priorities lie, who they are willing to help, and who really gets left behind.

I am sure the American people are not shocked to hear that Republicans once again sided with the wealthiest in our Nation when they repealed the estate tax last week. Meantime, Republicans refused to join Democrats in providing nearly 7 million Americans a pay raise.

It is truly mind-boggling that House Republicans continue to believe that minimum-wage workers can still get by on $5.15 an hour. Don't they know if you take inflation into account the minimum wage is at its lowest level in 50 years? Don't Republicans know this is the second-longest amount of time minimum-wage workers have gone without a pay raise? Don't they know that nearly three-fourths of minimum-wage workers are not just taking care of themselves but also a family?

Mr. Speaker, this is totally immoral. In this great Nation it is unbelievable that nearly 7 million people must struggle to this extent to make ends meet. It is only fair we give these workers a raise.

Democrats are not giving up, and we will continue to fight to give these workers their first pay raise in 9 years. It is only fair.

PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY AND ISRAEL

(Mrs. DRAKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, last night, we watched as Israel launched a targeted operation on the Gaza Strip to recover Israeli Corporal Gilad Shalit, who had been kidnapped during an attack by members of Hamas' military wing.

As an independent sovereign nation, Israel has every right to respond to acts of aggression against its homeland and the soldiers who defend it. In the name of peace, the Palestinian Authority must meet the calls from Israel and nations such as France and Egypt to produce the abducted soldier.

Our Nation must stand behind our allies in the global war on terror, support their right to protect their citizens, and call for Hamas to abandon aggression and violence and work for a peaceful solution recognizing Israel as part of a two-nation plan.

HELP SALMON FISHERMEN ON NORTHWEST COAST

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to support the fishers and the fishers' families on the west coast whose livelihood teeters on the brink of disaster as we stand here today.

It is outrageous that it has come to this. It is outrageous that the Bush administration's botched Klamath River policies will shut down 90 percent of the commercial salmon season and take huge bites out of the recreational and tribal catches.

It is outrageous that fisheries' managers were given the task of deciding between the survival of fishers and the survival of Klamath salmon, without the means to achieve either.

It is outrageous that the Bush administration continues to punish the fishing industry by challenging the court decision that would have returned needed flows to the Klamath River area.

It is outrageous that despite a 60 percent cutback in last year's fishing season, emergency economic assistance has been denied.

And, finally, it is outrageous that without economic assistance this year, many fishermen and their boats will be down and useless for the rest of eternity.

□ 1030

BAN DUMPING IN THE GREAT LAKES

(Mr. KIRK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, this week I am introducing bipartisan legislation to ban dumping in the Great Lakes. Along with my Democratic colleague DAN LIPINSKI, we are moving the Great Lakes Water Protection Act because the number of beach closings in Illinois rose from 213 in 2003 to over 600 in 2004.

There were over 140 beach closings in my district alone last year. Our bill, supported by the Alliance for the Great Lakes, the Sierra Club and the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of Chicago, sets a Federal date certain to ban dumping in the source of our drinking water. Fines under this bill would support building new sewage control projects to protect the lake.

I want to give a special thank you to a member of my staff, Ms. Kristy Cole, who drafted this legislation. As she leaves the Congress for a Northwestern JD/MBA program, we will now gather bipartisan support for this common-sense environmental reform.

DEMOCRATS OFFER A PRESCRIPTION FOR CHANGE TO FINALLY HELP SENIORS WITH RX DRUG COSTS

(Ms. WATSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, recent reports have shown why the Republican prescription drug plan is not working for seniors. Prices are still going up, and millions of seniors are about to fall into the doughnut hole, a period where they receive no coverage but continue to pay their premiums.

Democrats have long believed there is a better way, so we introduced a Democratic prescription for change. Our plan would give Medicare the bargaining power to negotiate lower prices with drug companies. The VA is doing that right now, and veterans are paying 43 percent less for their drugs than American seniors.

With all the money we save from negotiating lower prices, we have closed the doughnut hole to ensure that seniors are not losing coverage for a substantial portion of the year. Mr. Speaker, if Republicans are really interested in helping our seniors with their prescription drug bills, they would join us in supporting this prescription for change. It just doesn't make sense to continue with a plan that isn't lowering costs and creates a giant gap in coverage.

STOP INTELLIGENCE LEAKS

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. The New York Times, you know, the actions of that storied paper certainly are the subject of much discussion. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad discussion, because it is a discussion about those who chose to leak information and those who chose to print that leaked information that is harmful to this great Nation's security.

It is unfortunate, and it does add to the level of distrust of bureaucracy and of government. It is sad. It is disappointing.

The perpetrators of those actions, Mr. Speaker, can rationalize all they want. But the point is this: Those actions, leaking that information, printing that information, make our intelligence community's job a little harder.

They make defunding terrorists and their activities more difficult, and they make our American communities less safe and less secure. It is a sad action, and it is an action with unfortunate consequences.

WASHINGTON REPUBLICANS CAN'T IGNORE FACT THAT THEY CREATED RECORD-SETTING DEFICITS

(Mr. CLEAVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I am a Democrat, and I am glad about it. The reason for this joy is over the fact that the party to which I belong is pushing back against this Republican-led Congress and their out-of-control spending. Let us take a look at the facts. President Bush and congressional Republicans have turned a $5.6 trillion surplus into a $4 trillion deficit, a change of $9 trillion.

This is the most fiscally irresponsible American administration. We owe China almost $150 billion. My hope is that we never have to go to war with them because I don't believe they are going to finance it.

Secondly, it is absolutely unacceptable that the United States is borrowing almost all the money they are using to fight in Iraq and Afghanistan.

NATIONAL SECURITY LEAKS

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in frustration over the recent leak by the New York Times of a vital national security program. In a time of global war, this leak is a disgrace to all Americans and especially a disgrace to those risking their lives every day to keep us safe.

This disclosure raises grave concerns about why some in the media seem determined time and again to simply hand over our playbook to barbaric terrorists. Our ability to emerge victorious in this war on terror hinges on the success of these legal, appropriate and needed programs.

This is a war that more than any other in our history relies heavily on sophisticated data gathering. Giving away these details only empowers our enemy. Freedom of the press is an important right. However, the media must practice responsibility with classified intelligence.

Not just American prosperity is on the line, Mr. Speaker. These counterterrorism programs exist solely to protect the lives and the freedoms of American citizens. It is time that American lives are given greater priority than selling more newspapers.

STOP CURTAILING SALMON FISHING ON THE PACIFIC COAST

(Mr. WU asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, this administration has moved to massively curtail fishing for salmon on the Pacific Coast. This is not just an economic effect. Salmon fishing is part of our culture. It is a part of who we are. This closure is not based on sound science; it is based in raw politics. It is allegedly to benefit one spring salmon run on the Klamath River.

But closure of the ocean will not bring the spring chinook back. What will bring it back, according to NOAA's own scientists, is better water management and taking better care of the water base and ecosystem. Closure of the ocean salmon season will not do any of these things.

Yesterday, we met with NOAA officials, and they decided not to even declare an emergency so that relief can be given for the disaster which they created. We are going to take actions today to alleviate or terminate the disaster that NOAA has created on the northwest coast.

VOLUNTEER FIRST RESPONDERS

(Mr. HAYES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise this morning to salute the brave men and women in my district and around the Nation who graciously offer their time, compassion and lifesaving skills to fellow citizens in their time of greatest need.

Volunteer firefighters and rescue squad personnel provide essential services to our communities. A Scotland County volunteer, James Rupard, recently made me aware of a mileage reimbursement problem that was causing a financial burden on our local first responders.

The Volunteer Emergency Responder Fair Mileage Act seeks to give our volunteer emergency first responders a mileage reimbursement for use of their personal vehicles that reflects the critical service they provide.

Our volunteer first responders don't have a choice in their driving distance when an emergency occurs. They also don't have the luxury of choosing times or convenience when duty calls. I feel that raising this rate is a way to keep critical volunteers from having undue financial hardship, and it reflects the contribution they make to our communities.

I urge my colleagues to support volunteer first responders in their districts by cosponsoring the Volunteer Emergency Responder Fair Mileage Act.

OUR SALMON FISHING INDUSTRY IS HITTING THE ROCKS

(Mr. THOMPSON of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, The Oregonian today printed, the west coast salmon fishing industry is nearly dead in the water, and everybody can see it is going to hit the rocks. But so far, the Bush administration is unwilling to lift a finger.

Mr. Speaker, NOAA fisheries at the local level said it is a disaster. Governors in California and Oregon have said it is a disaster, but NOAA fisheries in Washington D.C. and the Bush administration have said to the west coast, drop dead, we are not even going to look at this issue until February.

By the time February rolls around, fishing families and fishing communities throughout the coast, in my district, in Eureka, Fort Bragg, Fortuna, Arcada, Crescent City, they are going to be out of business. They are going to lose their boats. They are going to lose their homes. They are not going to be able to pay for their kids to go to college or buy insurance.

This is a disaster. The administration is refusing to even look at it. The Republican Congress is ignoring this fact that working families are being displaced, put out of jobs and are going bankrupt.

STOP RESTRICTING SALMON FISHING

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. There is a lot of lip service paid in this Congress and downtown at the White House about family values and small business. Who better represents family values and small business than the fishermen and women on the Oregon and California coast.

This administration has told them we are going to restrict the fishing season to a point where you cannot afford to go out; you can only catch 75 fish in one trip. Nobody can afford to go far out to catch 75 fish, so no one is fishing.

But they won't declare a disaster because they said someone might fish. They admitted no one is fishing. No one can afford to fish. Well, maybe something will happen. The price of fish will go up, go up to what, $100 a pound? Then maybe they could afford to go out for 75 fish.

This administration is refusing to put its money where its mouth is and deliver and help keep families together, support communities and support small business with a modest amount of disaster assistance. We need a disaster declaration from the White House, and we need it now.

EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE FOR ECONOMIC DISASTER ON OREGON AND CALIFORNIA COAST

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, later today, Mr. THOMPSON and Mr. DEFAZIO will offer an amendment seeking emergency assistance for an economic disaster that the Bush administration is creating on the Oregon and California coast, and that disaster is about to strike hundreds of small independent businessmen who fish for a living. These individuals are going to lose the economic support for their families. They are going to probably lose the ability to keep their boats so they can fish if the recovery takes place, and they are going to end up deep in debt.

It is just unfair that this would happen, especially when this is a disaster that was created by the Bush administration. They ought to take responsibility. They ought to be held accountable for their actions, and they ought to provide relief to these hardworking families who are so much a part of our community and our culture and our economy. And they ought to do it now.

The Congress can correct this matter later today by passing the amendment. Unfortunately, we have been put on notice that that won't happen, so we are going to put you on notice. We are not going to relent on this effort until

some relief is forthcoming from the administration, as has been asked by the Governor of California, the Governor of Oregon, the delegations in the Senate, but nothing from the administration except obstruction and an economic disaster for these families from the coast.

NOAA FISHERIES RESPOND TOO SLOWLY TO DISASTER

(Ms. HOOLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HOOLEY. Last year, the fishing was reduced by about 60 percent. This year, the fishing along the Oregon and California coast has been reduced to almost nothing. In March, an administrator from NOAA told us they would be able to expedite a disaster by March of the 2006 season.

Well, it is way past March, folks. Yesterday we were told they will not be able to declare a disaster until February of 2007.

Let me tell you what happens: The people that cannot go out fishing cannot afford to make their payments on their boats. They cannot afford to feed their families. They cannot afford to put a roof over their heads. They can't afford school books for their children. This is a time when divorce rates go up; suicide rates go up.

These are not rich communities. These are poor communities. When disasters happen in other areas, we declare a disaster and help people out. That's what we do. This is unacceptable. We need everyone's help.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 27, nays 358, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 331]

YEAS—27

Ackerman
Berry
Capps
Clay
Conyers
DeFazio
Delahunt
Doggett
Emanuel
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Hastings (FL)
Kucinich
Lewis (GA)
McDermott
Miller, George
Pastor
Pelosi
Sánchez, Linda T.
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Towns
Waters
Waxman
Woolsey
Wu

NAYS—358

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Capito
Cardin
Carnahan
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeGette
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Etheridge
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Osborne
Otter
Pallone
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—47

Abercrombie
Boehlert
Bono
Cannon
Cantor
Capuano
Cardoza
Carson
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (FL)
Edwards
Engel
Evans
Fattah
Gingrey
Grijalva
Holden
Hyde
Istook
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Matsui
McCrery
McKinney
Melancon
Millender-McDonald
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Pascrell
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Poe
Pombo
Rangel
Sabo
Schakowsky
Sherwood
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Taylor (MS)
Watson
Young (AK)

□ 1108

Messrs. BUYER, MARCHANT, CLEAVER, COSTA, Mrs. MYRICK, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. EMANUEL, KUCINICH and Ms. ESHOO changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 331 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 890 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5672.

□ 1109

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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5672) making appropriations for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday,

June 27, 2006, the amendment by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 25, line 22.

Pursuant to the order of the House of that day, no further amendment to the bill may be offered except those specified in the previous order of the House of that day, which is at the desk.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REYES

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REYES:

Page 23, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 24, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 62, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(decreased by $10,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

The amendment before us would increase funding for the Southwest Border Prosecution Initiative, which is designed to reimburse prosecutors for the cost of prosecuting Federal drug crimes. As we all know, many federally initiated drug cases are referred to local courts for prosecution. These drug crimes are committed at U.S. ports of entry and communities along our U.S.-Mexico border.

This program has previously been funded at as much as $50 million to help alleviate the financial burden that the Federal Government was placing on local prosecutors in the 24 southwest border counties. The Department of Justice has expanded eligible jurisdictions to not only include 24 counties of the border but all 360 counties of all four border States: Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and California.

While the number of eligible jurisdictions has increased, annual appropriations have continued to decrease. The Fiscal Year 2006 Appropriations Act provided only $30 million for the program, which does not come close to meeting the existing needs. My amendment would add an additional $10 million, which would come closer to providing local governments with resources to carry out this Federal responsibility.

Last year, I received a letter from the District Attorney of El Paso, Texas, notifying me that he would cease to accept federally referred drug cases for State prosecution due to the excessive local financial burden that the lack of reimbursement was placing on the El Paso community. With help from the U.S. Attorney and our State senators, we were able to prevent this stoppage. If local prosecutors cease accepting these cases, many of these drug cases could not be adjudicated at all.

As we are all aware, the U.S.-Mexico border remains a main corridor for the entry of illegal drugs, and despite much success in interdiction and the prosecution efforts of many, harmful drugs continue to be a problem in our country. Our border counties and States are committed to providing assistance in prosecuting Federal drug cases, but Congress needs to be equally committed to funding this important program.

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

□ 1115

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman and ranking member for accepting this very vital and important amendment to our border communities, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES).

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

Mr. THOMPSON 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 Texas will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES

For activities authorized by the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–322), the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (''the 1968 Act''), the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–162), and the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act (Public Law 109–177) (including administrative costs), $570,545,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the funds under this heading, not to exceed $2,575,000 shall be available for the Office of Justice Programs for reimbursable services associated with programs administered by the Community Oriented Policing Services Office: *Provided further*, That any balances made available through prior year deobligations shall only be available in accordance with section 605 of this Act. Of the amount provided—

(1) $20,000,000 is for the matching grant program for armor vests for law enforcement officers, as authorized by section 2501 of part Y of the 1968 Act;

(2) $99,000,000 is for grants to address public safety and methamphetamine manufacturing, sale, and use in hot spots as authorized by section 754 of Public Law 109–177, including research on a methamphetamine vaccine;

(3) $100,000,000 is for law enforcement technologies and interoperable communications;

(4) $4,936,000 is for an offender re-entry program;

(5) $4,873,000 is for grants to upgrade criminal records, as authorized under the Crime Identification Technology Act of 1998 (42 U.S.C. 14601);

(6) $175,568,000 is for a DNA analysis and capacity enhancement program, and for other local, State, and Federal forensic activities, of which not less than $151,000,000 shall be for reducing and eliminating the backlog of DNA samples and for increasing State and local DNA laboratory capacity;

(7) $31,065,000 is for improving tribal law enforcement, including equipment and training;

(8) $54,808,000 is for Project Safe Neighborhoods, of which $40,000,000 is for a national program to reduce gang violence;

(9) $3,997,000 is for training and technical assistance;

(10) $49,348,000 is for the Office of Weed and Seed Strategies, as authorized by section 103 of the 1968 Act, as amended by section 1121 of Public Law 109–162; and

(11) not to exceed $26,950,000 is for program management and administration.

JUVENILE JUSTICE PROGRAMS

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (''the 1974 Act''), the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (''the 1968 Act''), the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–162), and other juvenile justice programs, including salaries and expenses in connection therewith to be transferred to and merged with the appropriations for Justice Assistance, $280,739,000, to remain available until expended as follows—

(1) $706,000 for concentration of Federal efforts, as authorized by section 204 of the 1974 Act;

(2) $75,000,000 for State and local programs authorized by section 221 of the 1974 Act, including training and technical assistance to assist small, non-profit organizations with the Federal grants process;

(3) $59,872,000 for demonstration projects, as authorized by sections 261 and 262 of the 1974 Act;

(4) $65,000,000 for delinquency prevention, as authorized by section 505 of the 1974 Act, of which—

(A) $10,000,000 shall be for the Tribal Youth Program;

(B) $20,000,000 shall be for a gang resistance education and training program; and

(C) $25,000,000 shall be for grants of $360,000 to each State and $6,640,000 shall be available for discretionary grants to States, for programs and activities to enforce State laws prohibiting the sale of alcoholic beverages to minors or the purchase or consumption of alcoholic beverages by minors, prevention and reduction of consumption of alcoholic beverages by minors, and for technical assistance and training;

(5) $992,000 for Project Childsafe;

(6) $14,808,000 for the Secure Our Schools Act, as authorized by part AA of the 1968 Act, as amended by section 1169 of Public Law 109–162;

(7) $15,000,000 for programs authorized by the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990; and

(8) $49,361,000 for the Juvenile Accountability Block Grants program as authorized by part R of the 1968 Act, as amended by section 1166 of Public Law 109–162 and Guam shall be considered a State:

Provided, That not more than 10 percent of each amount may be used for research, evaluation, and statistics activities designed to benefit the programs or activities authorized: *Provided further*, That not more than 2 percent of each amount may be used for training and technical assistance: *Provided further*, That the previous two provisos shall not apply to demonstration projects, as authorized by sections 261 and 262 of the 1974 Act: *Provided further*, That section 702(a) of Public Law 88–352 shall apply to any grants

for World Vision described in the report accompanying this Act and awarded by the Attorney General.

PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS BENEFITS

To remain available until expended, for payments authorized by part L of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796 et seq.) (''the 1968 Act''), such sums as are necessary, as authorized by section 6093 of Public Law 100–690 (102 Stat. 4339–4340); and $4,821,000, to remain available until expended for payments as authorized by section 1201(b) of the 1968 Act; and $4,007,000 for educational assistance, as authorized by subpart 2 of part L of title I of the 1968 Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent to return to that portion of the bill so he can offer his amendment?

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Yes.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

Page 23, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 23, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 67, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $2,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, before I begin, let me commend Chairman WOLF and the ranking member as well for all of the hard work and energy that goes into this and the battle as well to bring this bill to the floor and to conclusion.

I come to the floor this morning to offer an amendment that, in essence, is very similar to one that I offered last year; and at that time the chairman gracefully accepted the amendment. My amendment simply seeks to take a small portion of the U.S. assessed contributions to the United Nations and give those funds to local law enforcement agencies, and it does that through the Byrne Memorial State Law Enforcement Assistance Grants Program, a program that has been talked about on this floor just last night.

Mr. Chairman, this is a program that is basically a partnership between the Federal Government, the State government and local communities, working together to create stronger and safer communities. It awards grants to States and local government entities so they can work together to create a strong criminal justice system, with emphasis on violent crime and serious offenders.

Mr. Chairman, since September 11, this grant program has also been utilized by local officials to boost their preparedness in case of terrorist attack. Living as I do in the Fifth District overlooking Ground Zero, the people in our area know about terrorism and the need to fight violent crime.

The total sum of this transfer is very small, only $2 million, and the United Nations' annual budget is almost $2 billion. This amounts to a fraction of 1 percent of the overall U.N. budget. It is my hope that this money will come directly from the United States contributions to the U.N.'s Information Center, which is based right here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, I see no reason whatsoever that U.S. tax dollars should be going to the U.N. to have the U.N. lobby this Congress. They are a bloated and overfunded agency as it is, and they should not be using our dollars to come and lobby us.

The stated purpose of this Information Center is to ''raise awareness about the organization's work and foster relations with the American public, U.S. Government officials and NGOs.''

Really? To foster relations?

Recently, a very highly publicized speech regarding the relationship between the United States and the U.N. was made by Deputy Secretary-General Mark Malloch Brown. In that speech, he chastised the American public and government officials such as us, saying we ''lack judgment and are unwittingly subject to manipulation by U.N. detractors.'' Then this very same U.N. Information Center took that speech and spread it around in a wide array of congressional and executive offices.

Again, I personally do not feel that the American public needs to be lectured by someone from an institution with the high rate of corruption and failed promises as the U.N. We should not be having our tax dollars go to an organization to attack us maliciously with false attacks. If the U.N. wants to repair its relationship with the U.S. Congress, it should spend less of its efforts and money on lobbying these Halls and more on cleaning up its own halls and operations.

Mr. Chairman, I will conclude at this point by reiterating how badly our law enforcement agencies need these funds and how aware we are of all the inefficiencies at the U.N. It was just yesterday with the Oil-for-Food Program that they were going through with the first prosecution in that matter. We are all familiar with the reform efforts that this House has tried to pass for the U.N., and the U.N. has blocked them at every count. We are all aware also that U.N. cannot even give us a definition of what genocide is, and we all know what is going on in Darfur. That is a genocide. Finally, we are all too aware that the U.N. cannot even give us a definition of what terrorism is.

Let me say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the law enforcement community and the citizens of the Fifth Congressional District who live in the shadows of 9/11 and Ground Zero, we are all too aware of what terrorism is, and we do not want our money to go to an organization such as the U.N. We would rather it go to fight terrorism.

Again, I thank the chairman for working with us on this legislation.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. We accept the amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. GEORGE 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 New Jersey will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH

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

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent to return to that portion of the bill so he can offer his amendment?

Mr. LYNCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LYNCH:

Page 26, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $12,000,000)''.

Page 26, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $12,000,000)''.

Page 67, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $12,000,000)''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

First of all, I would like to thank Chairman WOLF and also Ranking Member MOLLOHAN for accepting this amendment.

This amendment is being offered by myself and the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA). It basically restores $12 million to the Bulletproof

Vest Partnership Program and also reduces contributions to the International Organization funds within this bill by a corresponding amount.

Since the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Program's inception, over 11,500 jurisdictions have participated in purchasing over 450,000 bulletproof vests nationwide. Almost every congressional district across this Nation has benefited from this program. I know in Massachusetts alone law enforcement agencies have purchased over 34,000 vests since its inception.

Mr. Chairman, there is some urgency here on this matter because, unfortunately, it is estimated now that over 200,000 vests may need to be replaced that were previously issued due to the results of tests showing that a substance called Zylon has been used in previous vests and those have been shown to fail. So there is the need to get out and replace those vests that are now in service.

Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is that, according to President Tom Nee of the National Association of Police Organizations, almost 3,000 law enforcement officers have survived shootings thanks to bulletproof vests. We know that body armor can save lives. The problem is that many towns and cities in our districts and across the Nation are struggling with the costs. With budgetary constraints at the State and local levels, many communities are simply unable to purchase this life-saving equipment on their own.

With this program, by sharing that cost with the Federal Government, communities do have the opportunity to buy bulletproof vests for their law enforcement officers and thereby provide some protection for those in dangerous professions.

Mr. Chairman, Members on both sides of the aisle understand that our State and local law enforcement professionals should be fully equipped, and that is why I ask my colleagues in the House to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA).

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) for this bipartisan effort to help law enforcement.

We know the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program provides the necessary funding to protect local law enforcement officials. In my hometown of New York City, we received 10 percent of the money they spent on bulletproof vests over the last 2 years from the program, especially in Staten Island and Brooklyn, which I am proud to call home. We have probably more active and retired police officers than any other county in the country.

Mr. Chairman, we know full well, whether it is in Staten Island, Massachusetts or anywhere else in the country, that the line between this great country and anarchy is our police department. Even more devastating is when we hear from time to time, and it happens, when a police officer is shot and killed because he did not have the protection necessary.

Recently, we had an officer in New York City, Officer Dillon Stewart, shot during a high-speed chase. The bullet hit him just under his arm, just a fraction of an inch above his bulletproof vest, which eventually killed him. That is the horror, not only for the people who really appreciate the sacrifice of law enforcement, but for the Stewart family and so many others, who probably question if he just had a little more protection.

That is what this bulletproof vest program does. It allows cities like New York, Boston and all cities across the country to step up and get the resources to provide our law enforcement men and women with the tools they need. When we hear of a high-speed chase or we hear of a shooting, we can rest a little better knowing that we have done in Congress a good thing for them by giving them the protection that they deserve, expect and, frankly, need.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you in advance for accepting this amendment and giving the $12 million. I know you have a lot of difficult choices to make in this appropriations process, but in this case I think you are doing what is right for the American people and law enforcement.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. My father was a policeman in the City of Philadelphia for 20-some years, and I know how important this is.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) and the gentleman from New York City (Mr. FOSSELLA). We accept the amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

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

Mr. THOMPSON 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 Massachusetts will be postponed.

MOTION TO RISE OFFERED BY MR. GEORGE MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion to rise.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 37, noes 352, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 332]

AYES—37

Capps
Capuano
Case
Clay
Conyers
Cummings
DeFazio
Doyle
Emanuel
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Hastings (FL)
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Markey
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
Miller, George
Napolitano
Owens
Pastor
Pelosi
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Solis
Stark
Strickland
Thompson (CA)
Towns
Velázquez
Waters
Watson
Waxman
Woolsey
Wu

NOES—352

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Capito
Cardin
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Etheridge
Everett
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney

Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Osborne
Otter
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Pearce
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—43

Abercrombie
Alexander
Calvert
Cannon
Cantor
Cardoza
Costa
Cubin
Davis (FL)
Edwards
Engel
Evans
Grijalva
Higgins
Holden
Hunter
Hyde
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kilpatrick (MI)
Marchant
Matsui
Miller (NC)
Murtha
Nussle
Ortiz
Oxley
Payne
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Poe
Sabo
Sanders
Schwartz (PA)
Sherwood
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Westmoreland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 1159

Messrs. OTTER, NADLER, BARRETT of South Carolina, BOSWELL, RANGEL and WALSH changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California changed her vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to rise was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 1200

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHIMKUS). The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

SEC. 101. In addition to amounts otherwise made available in this title for official reception and representation expenses, a total of not to exceed $60,000 from funds appropriated to the Department of Justice in this title shall be available to the Attorney General for official reception and representation expenses.

SEC. 102. None of the funds appropriated by this title shall be available to pay for an abortion, except where the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term, or in the case of rape: *Provided*, That should this prohibition be declared unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, this section shall be null and void.

SEC. 103. None of the funds appropriated under this title shall be used to require any person to perform, or facilitate in any way the performance of, any abortion.

SEC. 104. Nothing in the preceding section shall remove the obligation of the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to provide escort services necessary for a female inmate to receive such service outside the Federal facility: *Provided*, That nothing in this section in any way diminishes the effect of section 103 intended to address the philosophical beliefs of individual employees of the Bureau of Prisons.

SEC. 105. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Department of Justice in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise specifically provided, shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: *Provided*, That any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

SEC. 106. The Attorney General is authorized to extend through September 30, 2008, the Personnel Management Demonstration Project transferred to the Attorney General pursuant to section 1115 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, Public Law 107–296 (6 U.S.C. 533) without limitation on the number of employees or the positions covered.

SEC. 107. None of the funds made available to the Department of Justice in this Act may be used for the purpose of transporting an individual who is a prisoner pursuant to conviction for crime under State or Federal law and is classified as a maximum or high security prisoner, other than to a prison or other facility certified by the Federal Bureau of Prisons as appropriately secure for housing such a prisoner.

SEC. 108. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used by Federal prisons to purchase cable television services, to rent or purchase videocassettes, videocassette recorders, or other audiovisual or electronic equipment used primarily for recreational purposes.

(b) The preceding sentence does not preclude the renting, maintenance, or purchase of audiovisual or electronic equipment for inmate training, religious, or educational programs.

SEC. 109. Any funds provided in this Act under ''Department of Justice'' used to implement E-Government Initiatives shall be subject to the procedures set forth in section 605 of this Act.

SEC. 110. None of the funds made available under this title shall be obligated or expended for SENTINEL, or for any other major new or enhanced information technology program having total estimated development costs in excess of $100,000,000, unless the Deputy Attorney General and the investment review board certify to the Committees on Appropriations that the information technology program has appropriate program management and contractor oversight mechanisms in place, and that the program is compatible with the enterprise architecture of the Department of Justice.

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

TITLE II—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES

TRADE AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT

RELATED AGENCIES

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the United States Trade Representative, including the hire of passenger motor vehicles and the employment of experts and consultants as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $46,207,000, of which $1,000,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed $124,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That negotiations shall be conducted within the World Trade Organization consistent with the negotiating objectives contained in the Trade Act of 2002, Public Law 107–210: *Provided further*, That not less than $2,000,000 provided under this heading shall be for negotiating, implementing, monitoring, and enforcing trade agreements with China.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the International Trade Commission, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, and not to exceed $2,500 for official reception and representation expenses, $62,575,000, to remain available until expended.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

INTERNATIONAL TRADE ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses for international trade activities of the Department of Commerce provided for by law, and for engaging in trade promotional activities abroad, including expenses of grants and cooperative agreements for the purpose of promoting exports of United States firms, without regard to 44 U.S.C. 3702 and 3703; full medical coverage for dependent members of immediate families of employees stationed overseas and employees temporarily posted overseas; travel and transportation of employees of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service between two points abroad, without regard to 49 U.S.C. 40118; employment of Americans and aliens by contract for services; rental of space abroad for periods not exceeding 10 years, and expenses of alteration, repair, or improvement; purchase or construction of temporary demountable exhibition structures for use abroad; payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of 28 U.S.C. 2672 when such claims arise in foreign countries; not to exceed $327,000 for official representation expenses abroad; purchase of passenger motor vehicles for official use abroad, not to exceed $45,000 per vehicle; obtaining insurance on official motor vehicles; and rental of tie lines, $424,782,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008, of which $13,000,000 is to be derived from fees to be retained and used by the International Trade Administration, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302: *Provided*, That $47,328,000 shall be for Manufacturing and Services; $40,806,000 shall be for Market Access and Compliance; $61,367,000 shall be for the Import Administration of which not less than $3,000,000 is for the Office of China Compliance; $249,791,000 shall be for the United States and Foreign Commercial Service; and $25,490,000 shall be for Executive Direction and Administration: *Provided further*, That the provisions of the first sentence of section 105(f) and all of section 108(c) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2455(f) and 2458(c)) shall apply in carrying out these activities without regard to section 5412 of the Omnibus Trade

and Competitiveness Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 4912); and that for the purpose of this Act, contributions under the provisions of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 shall include payment for assessments for services provided as part of these activities.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WOLF

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLF:

Page 36, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

Page 62, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 62, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for yielding and also for your cooperation in allowing this amendment.

I have two other amendments with much larger amounts that I wanted to shift into our United States Foreign Commercial Service and Trade Development Agency, but I am not going to offer those amendments. I have agreed to a smaller amount, some $5 million, which would come from the State Department's public diplomacy programs over at the State Department, again to promote United States business interests in international trade and through that administration in the Department of Commerce.

Yesterday, I think from the other side of the aisle, we took some $25 million from State and moved it into Legal Services. I can stand before you today, my colleagues, and say that probably nothing we do in this bill, as far as the Department of Commerce and our efforts to promote international trade and U.S. business and selling U.S. products abroad and creating jobs in the United States, is more important than this small shift of funds.

Today, we have a $724 billion trade deficit, and adding some $5 million to bolster our efforts and give us the tools and the resources we need to compete in these international markets and sell U.S. products abroad is so important. So that is what this amendment does.

And let me just commend Mr. WOLF, his staff, and the minority staff for the difficult task they have in moving these funds around in these very important projects. But this is a priority for me, it is a priority, I believe, for our Nation, and it is a priority for creating jobs and selling our products abroad.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF OHIO

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

Page 36, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert the following ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, when I was first elected to Congress in 1992, the United States trade deficit with the People's Republic of China for the whole year was $18 billion. This year, our trade deficit with China approached $18 billion by the end of January. By April, our year-to-date trade deficit with China topped $64 billion. At that pace, our trade deficit with China is growing 10 percent faster this year than last year, and last year's China trade deficit shattered all kinds of records by exceeding $201 billion.

It is not because China's companies are better than ours. It is not because people of China are smarter or more dedicated or more hardworking than American workers. We all know how China is able to do so well in the game of international trade: they cheat.

China's track record includes oppressive labor policies, currency manipulation, wholesale disregard for and theft of intellectual property, and dumping and counterfeiting of manufactured goods. These and other unfair China trade practices are a real source of concern for Members of Congress on this side of the aisle and some on that side of the aisle, and these practices are a real economic threat to the U.S. economy.

Believe me, I see the consequences all over Ohio in signs from Marietta to Toledo, from Youngstown to Hamilton; signs that read ''going out of business,'' ''everything must go,'' or just simply ''closed.'' Manufacturers in Ohio and all over the United States have closed their doors, have shipped jobs overseas because China refuses to compete fairly and because we haven't done enough to force China to play by the rules.

Chairman WOLF and Ranking Member MOLLOHAN understand the problem. I commend them for their work on this critical issue. Because of their leadership, the bill before us today specifically sets aside $3 million in International Trade Administration funding for the ITA's Office of China Compliance, which is responsible for monitoring imports from China and, importantly, initiating enforcement when it detects illegal dumping of Chinese goods.

My amendment builds on the foundation the committee has laid by increasing the set-aside for the Office of China Compliance from $3 million to $6 million.

American workers, American companies, especially small manufacturers, a machine shop in Akron or a tool and die maker in Dayton, these companies deserve a level playing field with China. Only with vigorous and well-funded trade monitoring and enforcement can we begin to provide that level playing field and allow U.S. manufacturers to compete.

My amendment improves funding for this critical work, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, our subcommittee created this office in 2004 after having a hearing. We have $3 million currently in the bill for China compliance. It is a very, very important issue.

We have also required there be a position in Beijing, and so I thank the gentleman for the amendment. We accept it.

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

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

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise now because of the reference to China in the previous amendment. I had intended to give a 1-minute speech this morning on this issue, before I was cut off by a motion, but let me simply make an observation about China.

I am one of those Members of the House who wants the administration to track bank records and financial transactions of terrorist groups or individuals who are suspected of belonging to terrorist groups. That is why, while I had great misgivings about the original PATRIOT Act, I voted for it because I wanted to see a tightening up of our ability to go after those records. But I wanted it to be done in a legal fashion, in a way which guarantees the privacy and civil liberties of people who do not fall into that category.

I note the fact that there is a very strong similarity between the Communist Chinese Government and our own administration in one respect. I have two headlines in my hand here. One says, ''GOP Measure Slams New York Times for Bank Story.'' The other says, ''China May Fine News Media to Limit Coverage.''

I would simply note that the Chinese Government appears to have something more in common with our administration in addition to their desire to undercut American wages through trade agreements with slave and cheap labor coming out of China. I would note that both the Chinese Communist Government and our own administration appears to be interested in doing almost anything in order to prevent legitimate news organizations from reporting activities of the people who govern each country.

Now, I do not know the details of The New York Times revelations with respect to banking transactions, but I do know that the administration and some of their supporters in Congress have been extremely interested in embarrassing The New York Times since The New York Times uncovered a number of other activities that were being conducted by the administration which, in my judgment, are illegal, and those have nothing to do with the banking transactions that we saw referenced the other day.

□ 1215

So I just thought it might be of interest to note the similarity between these two headlines, one an administration from supposedly a democratic country and another a government from a communist country, both of whom seem to be eager to clamp down as much as possible on their journalistic critics. I would hope that those similarities would decline in the future.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF INDUSTRY AND SECURITY

OPERATIONS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses for export administration and national security activities of the Department of Commerce, including costs associated with the performance of export administration field activities both domestically and abroad; full medical coverage for dependent members of immediate families of employees stationed overseas; employment of Americans and aliens by contract for services abroad; payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of 28 U.S.C. 2672 when such claims arise in foreign countries; not to exceed $15,000 for official representation expenses abroad; awards of compensation to informers under the Export Administration Act of 1979, and as authorized by 22 U.S.C. 401(b); and purchase of passenger motor vehicles for official use and motor vehicles for law enforcement use with special requirement vehicles eligible for purchase without regard to any price limitation otherwise established by law, $76,806,000, to remain available until expended, of which $14,767,000 shall be for inspections and other activities related to national security: *Provided*, That the provisions of the first sentence of section 105(f) and all of section 108(c) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2455(f) and 2458(c)) shall apply in carrying out these activities: *Provided further*, That payments and contributions collected and accepted for materials or services provided as part of such activities may be retained for use in covering the cost of such activities, and for providing information to the public with respect to the export administration and national security activities of the Department of Commerce and other export control programs of the United States and other governments.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

For grants for economic development assistance as provided by the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, and for trade adjustment assistance, $230,741,000, to remain available until expended.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of administering the economic development assistance programs as provided for by law, $29,700,000: *Provided*, That these funds may be used to monitor projects approved pursuant to title I of the Public Works Employment Act of 1976, title II of the Trade Act of 1974, and the Community Emergency Drought Relief Act of 1977.

MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

MINORITY BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses of the Department of Commerce in fostering, promoting, and developing minority business enterprise, including expenses of grants, contracts, and other agreements with public or private organizations, $29,641,000.

ECONOMIC AND INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE

ECONOMIC AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as authorized by law, of economic and statistical analysis programs of the Department of Commerce, $79,880,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for collecting, compiling, analyzing, preparing, and publishing statistics, provided for by law, $190,067,000, of which $19,200,000 is for the Survey of Income and Program Participation.

PERIODIC CENSUSES AND PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses related to the 2010 decennial census, $511,767,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided*, That of the total amount available related to the 2010 decennial census, $258,328,000 is for the Re-engineered Design Process for the Short-Form Only Census, $179,765,000 is for the American Community Survey, and $73,674,000 is for the Master Address File/Topologically Integrated Geographic Encoding and Referencing (MAF/TIGER) system.

In addition, for expenses to collect and publish statistics for other periodic censuses and programs provided for by law, $182,325,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008, of which $90,193,000 is for economic statistics programs and $92,132,000 is for demographic statistics programs: *Provided*, That regarding construction of a facility at the Suitland Federal Center, quarterly reports regarding the expenditure of funds and project planning, design and cost decisions shall be provided by the Bureau, in cooperation with the General Services Administration, to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this or any other Act under the heading ''Bureau of the Census, Periodic Censuses and Programs'' shall be used to fund the construction and tenant build-out costs of a facility at the Suitland Federal Center: *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this or any other Act for any fiscal year may be used for the collection of Census data on race identification that does not include ''some other race'' as a category.

NATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, as provided for by law, of the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), $17,837,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 1535(d), the Secretary of Commerce shall charge Federal agencies for costs incurred in spectrum management, analysis, and operations, and related services and such fees shall be retained and used as offsetting collections for costs of such spectrum services, to remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to retain and use as offsetting collections all funds transferred, or previously transferred, from other Government agencies for all costs incurred in telecommunications research, engineering, and related activities by the Institute for Telecommunication Sciences of NTIA, in furtherance of its assigned functions under this paragraph, and such funds received from other Government agencies shall remain available until expended.

PUBLIC TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES, PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION

For the administration of prior year grants, recoveries and unobligated balances of funds previously appropriated may be available for the administration of open grants.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Patent and Trademark Office provided for by law, including defense of suits instituted against the Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, $1,771,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced as offsetting collections assessed and collected pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1113 and 35 U.S.C. 41 and 376 are received during fiscal year 2007, so as to result in a fiscal year 2007 appropriation from the general fund estimated at $0: *Provided further*, That during fiscal year 2007, should the total amount of offsetting fee collections be less than $1,771,000,000, this amount shall be reduced accordingly: *Provided further*, That not less than 716 full-time equivalents, 745 positions and $90,532,000 shall be for the examination of trademark applications; and not less than 6,564 full-time equivalents, 6,920 positions and $1,084,025,000 shall be for the examination and searching of patent applications: *Provided further*, That not more than 311 full-time equivalents, 333 positions and $49,797,000 shall be for the Office of the General Counsel: *Provided further*, That not more than 95 full-time equivalents, 98 positions and $30,500,000 shall be for the Office of the Administrator for External Affairs: *Provided further*, That any deviation from the full-time equivalent, position, and funding designations set forth in the preceding four provisos shall be subject to the procedures set

forth in section 605 of this Act: *Provided further*, That from amounts provided herein, not to exceed $1,000 shall be made available in fiscal year 2007 for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 1353 of title 31, United States Code, no employee of the United States Patent and Trademark Office may accept payment or reimbursement from a non-Federal entity for travel, subsistence, or related expenses for the purpose of enabling an employee to attend and participate in a convention, conference, or meeting when the entity offering payment or reimbursement is a person or corporation subject to regulation by the Office, or represents a person or corporation subject to regulation by the Office, unless the person or corporation is an organization exempt from taxation pursuant to section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986: *Provided further*, That in fiscal year 2007, from the amounts made available for ''Salaries and Expenses'' for the United States Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), the amounts necessary to pay: (1) the difference between the percentage of basic pay contributed by the PTO and employees under section 8334(a) of title 5, United States Code, and the normal cost percentage (as defined by section 8331(17) of that title) of basic pay, of employees subject to subchapter III of chapter 83 of that title; and (2) the present value of the otherwise unfunded accruing costs, as determined by the Office of Personnel Management, of post-retirement life insurance and post-retirement health benefits coverage for all PTO employees, shall be transferred to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund, the Employees Life Insurance Fund, and the Employees Health Benefits Fund, as appropriate, and shall be available for the authorized purposes of those accounts: *Provided further*, That sections 801, 802, and 803 of Division B, Public Law 108–447 shall remain in effect during fiscal year 2007.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

TECHNOLOGY ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Under Secretary for Technology, $2,000,000.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY

SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL RESEARCH AND SERVICES

For necessary expenses of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, $467,002,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $9,450,000 may be transferred to the ''Working Capital Fund''.

INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGY SERVICES

For necessary expenses of the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, $92,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CONSTRUCTION OF RESEARCH FACILITIES

For construction of new research facilities, including architectural and engineering design, and for renovation and maintenance of existing facilities, not otherwise provided for the National Institute of Standards and Technology, as authorized by 15 U.S.C. 278c–278e, $67,998,000, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION

OPERATIONS, RESEARCH AND FACILITIES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of activities authorized by law for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, including maintenance, operation, and hire of aircraft and vessels; grants, contracts, or other payments to nonprofit organizations for the purposes of conducting activities pursuant to cooperative agreements; and relocation of facilities, $2,375,464,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided*, That fees and donations received by the National Ocean Service for the management of national marine sanctuaries may be retained and used for the salaries and expenses associated with those activities, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302: *Provided further*, That in addition, $3,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the fund entitled ''Coastal Zone Management'' and in addition $77,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the fund entitled ''Promote and Develop Fishery Products and Research Pertaining to American Fisheries'': *Provided further*, That of the $2,466,464,000 provided for in direct obligations under this heading $2,375,464,000 is appropriated from the general fund, $80,000,000 is provided by transfer, and $11,000,000 is derived from recoveries of prior year obligations: *Provided further*, That no general administrative charge shall be applied against an assigned activity included in this Act or the report accompanying this Act: *Provided further*, That the total amount available for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration corporate services administrative support costs shall not exceed $183,775,000: *Provided further*, That payments of funds made available under this heading to the Department of Commerce Working Capital Fund including Department of Commerce General Counsel legal services shall not exceed $34,425,000: *Provided further*, That any deviation from the amounts designated for specific activities in the report accompanying this Act, or any use of deobligated balances of funds provided under this heading in previous years, shall be subject to the procedures set forth in section 605 of this Act: *Provided further*, That the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration may engage in formal and informal education activities, including primary and secondary education, related to the agency's mission goals.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

Page 46, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $2,700,000)''.

Page 50, line 21, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $2,700,000)''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would increase the appropriations for the National Weather Service by $2.7 million. The current appropriation for the weather service is at $882.3 million. My amendment would increase that amount to a total of $885 million, which I think was the original recommendation from the budget office. I want to thank my colleagues on the Science Committee for assisting me.

Mr. Chairman, in recent years, both in Texas and around the Nation, we have suffered catastrophic hurricanes. The Midwest is tormented by tornados, as well as Texas. The West lives with a threat of a doomsday scenario, earthquakes, tsunamis. So weather predictions are very, very important. We have determined that the weather predictions have saved lives. We have not been able to save materials, so much, but they have saved lives.

We all saw what happened with the hurricanes of Katrina and Rita. Although the National Weather Service did its job in accurately predicting the magnitude and the path of the storms, city, State and local Federal officials were slow to act. Traffic was snarled, and all of us know exactly what happened after that.

The good work of the National Weather Service is at the root of an effective natural disaster preparedness, and the .3 percent appropriations increase will strengthen support for the weather service to help it perform even better. We do not want to discourage them by cutting their budget when we need their services so accurately. The timely and accurate information provided by the National Weather Service is a testament to its effectiveness.

On the front page of the weather service's Web site is a map of America depicting current weather conditions, as well as storm watches and warnings. We can click on any region of the country and get instant access to weather and climate news for that area. The National Weather Service also pulls real-time information on flood warnings, and it collects hourly data on temperatures throughout the day.

There is a wonderful section on weather safety that provides sound guidance on issues such as heat, lightning, hurricanes, tornados, floods and even topics like FEMA and the Red Cross. In Dallas, we are sensitive to the issue of flooding. Downtown Dallas relies on an antiquated 30-mile levee system to keep it dry from the Trinity River and its floods.

It is getting worse because of extensive development in the counties west and north of the city. The 50-year-old levees may not be able to handle all the runoff that they were designed to contain. So this is extremely important for that area. The flooding that would take place as predicted in Dallas would flood all of downtown and all executive offices, hospitals, medical centers and what have you.

I feel this is a modest amount of money to place back with NOAA and the weather service, and it comes out of the general Department of Commerce administrative funds. I hope that I can get support.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. We accept the amendment.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GILCHREST

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GILCHREST:

Page 46, line 11, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $441,000,000)''.

Page 47, line 7, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $89,000,000)''.

Page 48, line 7, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $253,000,000)''.

Page 55, line 21, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $783,000,000)''.

Page 55, line 23, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $783,000,000)''

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GILCHREST. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to make a comment on the chairman and the ranking member of this committee, that they have done a stunning job given the allocation.

What I would like to do with this amendment is to explain why it is important to take $738 million out of the space exploration program in NASA, that is the program that will send the man to the Moon and a man to Mars, and put that money into the National Ocean Service, the National Marine Fisheries Service and the Ocean Atmospheric Research Service of NOAA.

The Ocean Commission, commissioned by Congress, the members were appointed by the present President, Mr. Bush, recommended 200 items to be done with the world's oceans as ocean policy for the United States. They recommended that we put in $3.9 billion to implement those recommendations.

Well, we know that the budget is tight. The problem, though, is this particular appropriations bill provides for $300 million below the President's request for 2007, $300 million below the President's request, not even coming anywhere near, not even approaching the $3.9 billion. If you look at the budget for NOAA in 2005, we are, with this bill, with this budget, putting in $800 million less than the 2005 budget.

With the 200 recommendations to be implemented with the $3.9 billion that this commission recommended, we are attempting to resolve the issue of most of the world's largest fish, like you see here, 90 percent of their population is gone, 90 percent.

By the year 2050, the coral reefs that are healthy in the upper picture will look like the below picture. By the year 2050, we could have 60 percent of the coral reefs completely diminished. That doesn't even come close to the severe problems along U.S. coastal areas, the Gulf of Mexico, around Florida, the south Atlantic.

In this picture you see the dead zone, which is about a third of the area of the Chesapeake Bay. Our coastal areas are being depleted. I urge an ''aye'' vote on this amendment to take $738 million out of the manned space program to Mars and the Moon and put that amount of money into the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend Mr. GILCHREST for making a very powerful point with regard to the oceans. I refer Members to the newest issue of the National Geographic, The Health of the Coast. It validates so much of what Mr. GILCHREST has said. That is not the place to take it from, so I strongly oppose the amendment.

But I want to acknowledge that Mr. GILCHREST is right with regard to the oceans, and this administration and this Congress should be doing more in this regard. I think the gentleman understands that we can't take funding from there. I want to commend him and urge Members to validate what Mr. GILCHREST said with regard to the National Geographic.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I, too, want to commend my good friend from Maryland for his standing up for this important issue. I represent a coastal area, and certainly I would be willing to work with him as we move forward through the conference process.

This is obviously a very devastating amendment to NASA. I think this amendment would seriously jeopardize the plan to complete the International Space Station and jeopardize our obligations to the international partners.

We have entered into agreements with the Japanese and the Europeans to pursue completion of the space station. Obviously, it would also seriously jeopardize our plan to phase out the space shuttle and replace it with a crew exploration vehicle.

We are going to be getting into a phase in the early part of the next decade where we will not have a man-rated vehicle, where the Chinese will, and they plan to put people on the Moon. NASA is clearly a priority for this administration. It has been a priority for this Congress for years.

This amendment would cause personnel reductions. It would cause slippages in schedule.

I would strongly encourage all of my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I don't know if the gentleman from West Virginia would still seek to be recognized on this issue, but I would be very happy to yield time to my good friend from West Virginia on this very important topic.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I appreciate the gentleman yielding time. I rise in opposition to the amendment as well. Obviously, cuts of this kind in the science accounts anywhere in order to transfer money over to other science accounts is just robbing Peter to pay Paul. I think that illustrates where we are with the allocation that we have in this bill.

One of the real purposes of consolidating the science accounts into this subcommittee was to be able to look at science across the board and be able to fund it adequately. Well, it hasn't turned out to be that way, and this amendment is a great example of why. Here we are trying to take money from one science account and move it over to another science account.

I support the funding of the gentleman's amendment. I have to oppose the offset of the gentleman's amendment. In all of NASA's accounts, it was science that was hurt most.

□ 1230

Program after program after program, I don't have it at the moment to recite it, but the President has either eliminated or cut seriously science programs, one right after the other in the NASA account.

Well, we are very proud of increases to the National Science Foundation. Although we haven't met the authorization targets, we are very proud about increasing funding to the National Institutes of Health, and that has been funded very robustly over the last number of years.

But there are those science accounts and, particularly, NASA, a great science agency, that is not getting adequate funding now. That is about $500 million, I believe, short of where it should be.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I just wanted to give you some specifics. This is a tight budget year, as we all know. And just to cite one of the accounts that this amendment would obviously devastate, we have already reduced the lunar precursor robotics program by $20 million. There is a $16 million reduction in the constellation systems, $115 million reduction in the exploration systems research technology.

Total reduction already in this bill, $151 million from the President's request; and, obviously, a huge cut like this would devastate it further. So I would recommend a ''no'' vote on the Gilchrest amendment. But I applaud the gentleman for his passion on this issue.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, as a co-chair of the House Oceans Caucus, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Mr. GILCHREST to increase the base funding for NOAA.

Both the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy and the independent Pew Commission have called on Congress to increase NOAA's budget to more than $6 billion. Yet this bill funds NOAA at roughly half that, $3.4 billion, a cut of more than $500 million below last year.

Relative to their size and economic value, funding for ocean research and management pales in comparison to other natural resource programs, like management of public lands and space exploration. When we derive so much from our oceans, how can we invest so little in the understanding of them?

This amendment will allow us to better manage our fisheries, institute an integrated ocean observation system based on what we already have in the Gulf of Maine, and protect our coast from erosion and pollution. I urge support of the Gilchrest amendment.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure if I have any other speakers on the floor. I would simply say that, out of about approximately $16 billion that is spent on NASA and less than $4 billion spent on ocean issues, that is a pretty big disparity.

We need to spend the $16 billion on NASA, and probably a lot more. But, in my judgment, the Moon will be there for a long time. Mars will be there for a long time. And I don't want to take the money out of needed science programs, but the world's oceans are being degraded. They are being degraded in a number of ways by human activity that is not compatible with nature's design and the bulging population and acidic problems in the ocean. Because of burning of fossil fuel, the coastal areas are being inundated with our populations and being polluted. It is time that this country looked at this world, this Nation, and came up with a comprehensive, well-funded ocean program.

I want to thank the gentleman from Maine for speaking on behalf of this amendment. I want to thank the chairman for the time and his comments.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment.

NOAA is our lead ocean agency, overseeing programs to promote healthy oceans, coastal areas and communities. The U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy highlighted the need for new and sustained investments in ocean and coastal programs to meet our current and future challenges. Failing to make these investments will jeopardize the economic and ecological benefits our Nation receives from its oceans and coasts.

Although I understand difficult decisions must be made in the limited budget available for fiscal year 2007, H.R. 5672 would decimate funding for our coastal programs including cooperative fisheries research; coastal and estuarine land conservation; ocean exploration and undersea research; oil spill response and restoration; and our National Estuarine Research Reserves. These programs provide important, on-the-ground benefits to our coastal communities at relatively little Federal expense.

Cuts to our Coastal Zone Management Program in New Jersey would result in the elimination of their coastal hazards training program to assist our communities prepare and respond to hurricanes. They would also be forced to eliminate their Clean Marina program. These are just a few examples of what would be lost if this level of funding remains.

Our Nation has put 16 men on the surface of the Moon and only sent two to the bottom of the ocean. It is time we put Earth first—we can go to other planets later.

I urge my colleagues to support the Gilchrest amendment and restore NOAA funding to the fiscal year 2005 level.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the amendment offered by Congressman GILCHREST. While I fully support funding for NOAA, I stand opposed to efforts to reduce funding for NASA.

It is important to note that the bill reported out of the Appropriations committee already reduces funding for NASA by $151 million. If this amendment is accepted, it would further reduce NASA beyond the administration's request.

NASA is at a critical crossroads. Over the next few years, the agency must complete the International Space Station, retire the Space Shuttle, develop a new space vehicle, and maintain needed science and aeronautics programs. Further cuts to NASA will only deepen the gap in human space flight capability and force our nation to rely more heavily on international partners. At a time when the United States is concerned about global competitiveness, cutting NASA funding would send our country in the wrong direction.

Mr. Chairman, NASA is a good investment. Over the last 10 years, NASA's budget has decreased or remained flat while overall domestic spending grew substantially. Fully funding the space exploration vision represents only .7 percent of the Federal budget and yet this small investment yields large returns in health care, public safety, and telecommunications. Space exploration technologies have produced advanced semiconductors that power our businesses, materials employed by our military to keep our men and women safe, and software that aids our law enforcement personnel in fighting crime and detecting illegal drugs.

The Appropriations Committee has done a commendable job balancing our national needs with our budget realities. They have preserved vital funding for critical areas, including science initiatives, and I would urge the House to support the underlying bill and vote against efforts to cut NASA funding. Vote ''no'' on the Gilchrest amendment.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I recognize Chairman WOLF's hard work on the SSJC bill, H.R. 5672. However, as one of six co-chairs of the House Oceans Caucus, I was deeply concerned when I saw the degree to which NOAA was grossly under-funded, especially its wet programs within the National Ocean Service (NOS), National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), and Oceanic and Atmospheric Research (OAR). The reductions proposed in the bill are about 31 percent compared to FY06 and 36 percent compared to FY05 enacted levels, totaling about $783 million over the last 2 funding cycles. The House mark represents a major setback in protecting our Nation's ocean and coastal resources. Given that NOAA is the lead Federal agency for ocean-related management and activities, this void will not be filled elsewhere.

The direct and indirect impacts the oceans and coasts have on our lives and livelihoods are paramount. They are, by far, our greatest natural resource and the life support of our only planet. Yet, we fail to see the ocean for the waves when we cut more than half a billion dollars from the NOAA budget. Over half of the U.S. population lives in coastal states. Coastal and marine waters support over 2.8 million jobs and produce one-third of the nation's GDP. The culture, economy, and security of our Nation depend on the health and sustainability of these assets, yet we are not sufficiently managing and protecting them. Though the budget this year is more constrained than ever, the decision not to make ocean funding a priority will cost the U.S. economy more than $1 billion in direct losses, and even more indirectly. Instead, an increased and sustained investment now would enhance the benefits we reap in the future, a need highlighted by the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy (USCOP) in their 2004 report and by the Joint Ocean Commission Initiative in their recent list of ocean policy priorities for Congress.

Along those lines, I want to emphasize the invaluable services and programs of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the lead federal agency for ocean-related management and activities. Among these are the National Marine Sanctuary Program, the Integrated Ocean Observing Program, the National Sea Grant College Program, and the Protected Species Research and Management Program, just to name a few. Combined, the many NOAA activities support necessary ocean protection, research, exploration, and education. Therefore, the significant cuts that are proposed in this bill are unacceptable and would seriously impair the efficiency and effectiveness of the agency. To allow cuts would be a step in the wrong direction and would sustain the ''failing grade'' received on this year's U.S. Ocean Policy Report Card released by the Joint Ocean Commission Initiative.

Furthermore, it is about time for the ''blue'' of our world's oceans to get at least as much attention as the ''blue'' above us. After all, our planet of more than 70 percent water is largely unexplored. The amendment being offered by Mr. GILCHREST on behalf of the House Ocean Caucus is one way to start showing recognition for our need to reprioritize. The amount requested here ($783 million) would come out of NASA's Exploration Systems which was marked to more than $3.8 billion—more than NOAA's entire budget for the year! The cost of just one NASA mission could restore 2 years worth of funding cuts to all of NOAA, without compromising basic science and research conducted by NASA.

I cannot emphasize enough the need to show our ocean stewardship now—and stewardship for our own planet—so we can turn the tide on the dire consequences facing our oceans. Therefore, I wholly support the amendment offered by Mr. GILCHREST. I would hope that the House of Representatives would take a position that makes oceans more of a priority by supporting funding for NOAA programs that are of critical importance to our nation and beyond. This step would give us a better platform as we move into Conference negotiations with the Senate. Let us start to make the necessary investments in the FY07 cycle or the losses will be greater and more irreparable the longer we wait.

Attached are (1) a summary of the NOAA Impact Statement and (2) a copy of the Joint Ocean Commission Initiative letter in regards to H.R. 5672.

NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION IMPACT OF HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE FY 2007 MARK

	FY 2006 Enacted w/o Supp.	FY 2007 President's Budget	FY 2007 House Mark	House Mark vs. FY 2006 PB	House Mark vs. FY 2006 Enacted
ORF	$2,813.5	$2,678.8	$2,466.5	($212.3)	($347.0)
PAC	1,119.5	1,026.5	998.7	(27.8)	(120.8)
Other	70.5	68.8	22.3	(46.5)	(48.2)
Finance	(92.0)	(90.0)	(90.0)	—	(2.0)
Total	3,911.5	3,684.1	3,397.5	(286.6)	(514.0)

Summary: The House Appropriations Committee Mark provides a total of $3.39B for NOAA, a reduction of about eight percent from the FY 2007 President's Budget. The Mark provides sufficient funds to operate the National Weather Service and maintain satellite continuity. However, the House Mark proposes major reductions in a number of critical fisheries, protected species, and ocean related activities. Overall, the House Mark represents a major setback in protecting our Nation's ocean and coastal resources.

The House Mark includes a reduction of over $150M from the request level for the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMIS), jeopardizing basic regulatory and management responsibilities needed to sustain marine fisheries. The House Mark would force NOAA to close critical fisheries, and terminate protected species programs and the seafood quality and safety program, costing billions in economic losses and increasing the cost of seafood to U.S. consumers. Of particular note, the House Mark reduces funding for Alaska fisheries by over 50 percent from the President's request, terminates funding for the 4th Fisheries Survey Vessel, and reduces the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund by over 70 percent.

The House Mark reduces funding for the National Ocean Service (NOS) by over $90M from the request level. The House Mark reduces funding for basic mapping and charting activities needed to ensure safe marine transportation within U.S. waters. The House Mark also proposes reductions to the disaster response and restoration program, coastal services and research programs, and the National Marine Sanctuary Program. In addition, the House Mark cuts funding for ocean exploration and research programs such as Sea Grant, National Undersea Research Program and Invasive Species. The House Mark does not provide the necessary funds to sustain NOAA's infrastructure or support the pay raise for NOAA employees.

Overall, NOAA estimates the House Mark could require a Reduction in Force (RIF) of over 300 current NOAA employees and the termination of 400 contract employees, and could cost the U.S. economy over $1B in unnecessary economic losses. NOAA has outlined four priority areas of concern within the House Mark, including Sustaining Our Nation's Fisheries, Critical Ocean & Coastal Activities, Weather Warnings and Forecasts, and Critical Mission Support.

JOINT OCEAN COMMISSION INITIATIVE

Hon. JERRY LEWIS,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. FRANK WOLF,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Science, State, Commerce, Justice, and Related Agencies, U.S. House of Representatives, Capital Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. DAVID OBEY,
Ranking Member, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. ALAN B. MOLLOHAN,
Ranking Member, Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Science, State, Commerce, Justice, and Related Agencies, House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SIRS: As co-chairs of the Joint Ocean Commission Initiative, representing the members of the congressionally-mandated U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy and the Pew Oceans Commission, we are writing to express our grave concern with the funding level for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) provided in the FY 2007 Science, State, Justice and Commerce appropriation bill (H.R. 5672).

We recognize the difficult budget environment facing the nation and the hard funding decisions Appropriations Committee members faced in developing HR 5672. While we applaud the support provided to ocean-related research and education programs within the National Science Foundation and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, we were very disturbed to see the significant funding cuts proposed for NOAA in FY 2007.

The Committee's mark provides $3.4 billion for NOAA, which is $289 million below the President's request and $508 million below the FY 2006 enacted level, compounding the funding reductions incurred by the agency in FY 2006. The proposed funding cuts are being imposed at a time when there is clear recognition of the growing number and severity of problems that are compromising the health and associated economic benefits generated by our oceans, coasts, and Great Lakes. Last year economic and human health impacts were associated with major harmful algal blooms that impacted the East Coast, West Coast, and Gulf of Mexico, as well as tens of thousands of beach closures and advisories due to water pollution. Poor coastal land use planning and the loss of habitat contributed significantly to the losses associated with Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. Inadequate research and monitoring are limiting our capacity to understand, predict, and mitigate these and many other problems plaguing our oceans.

The House cut to NOAA's funding comes at a time when there is growing awareness and support for ocean-related programs and activities. The President has taken the admirable step of establishing a Committee on Ocean Policy within the Executive Office and developed an Ocean Action Plan, following up these commitments by requesting additional funding for NOAA. A number of states and regions have established councils or regional bodies to coordinate ocean-related activities, and are increasing their collaboration with federal agencies. This is a very encouraging trend that is already generating benefits, but is threatened by proposed decreases in federal ocean-related funding.

We, along with many others in the ocean community, remain very concerned that base funding for NOAA's core ocean programs is eroding as the need for investment in marine science and operations grows. We are hopeful that the House will be able to restore funding for NOAA during floor deliberations on HR 5672, and that there will be a concerted effort to fully fund the agency when the House and Senate negotiate on the final spending bill.

We appreciate your support for ocean science, management, and education and are available to assist in efforts to implement the recommendations of the Joint Ocean Commission Initiative and our two Commissions. Please contact Laura Cantral at 202–354–6444 if you require additional information or assistance.

Sincerely,

JAMES D. WATKINS,
Admiral, U.S. Navy (Retired), Chairman, U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy.

THE HON. LEON E. PANETTA,
Chair, Pew Oceans Commission.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw this amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMPSON of California:

On page 46, line 11, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)'' after the dollar amount.

On page 50, line 21, insert ''(decreased by $2,000,000)'' after the dollar amount.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday,

June 27, 2006, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, takes $2 million out of the Secretary of Commerce's Department managerial budget, and it puts that same $2 million in NOAA Fisheries Operational Account. The reason that this is necessary is to create a placeholder so when this bill goes to conference we will be able to revisit and address the very real disaster that is happening on the coast of California and the coast of Oregon, a disaster that, unfortunately, has been completely ignored by this administration.

It came to a head last night when a number of the impacted districts' representatives met with NOAA fisheries and we were told, in no uncertain terms, that the administration and NOAA were not going to address the problems that working families were having because of the salmon fishing disaster on the west coast. They said that they weren't going to even look at this until February of next year.

By that time, these families are going to be out of business. They are going to lose their boats and, in some instances, lose their homes. They are not going to be able to pay their insurance payments, to send their kids to school, and the Federal Government is giving them the proverbial backhand. This is immoral behavior from this Department. We need to have it addressed, and this will provide the placeholder that we need to do that.

This morning, the Oregonian newspaper editorialized saying the west coast salmon fishing industry is nearly dead in the water, and everybody can see it is going to hit the rocks. But, so far, the Bush administration is unwilling to lift a finger to help. That is inexcusable. We need to step in. We need to help save these businesses. We need to help save these hardworking families, and that is what this amendment will do.

I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, it has been over 2 months since the regional office said, NOAA, you need to declare a national disaster with this. NOAA has said, we are not even going to look at it till February of 2007. We have had the State declare a disaster, the State of Oregon, State of California, the regional area. We have had disasters declared for droughts, for storms, for floods, for winds, and yet here is an industry that will not make it through this season unless a disaster is declared.

This is about families. It is about businesses. These coastal communities are not wealthy communities. The base industry is the fishing industry. It impacts every other business in the coastal communities. This impacts families. How are they going to pay for their boats? How are they going to pay for their homes? How are they going to pay for food for their children?

This is about families and small businesses. This disaster needs to be declared. They need help.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to Mr. WU from Oregon.

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the subcommittee, the chairman and the ranking member and Ranking Member OBEY for working with us to get this $2 million placeholder into this bill. This $2 million will be very, very important to working families in Oregon and those many people who fish and those who depend upon the fishing industry.

I wish that our actions today had not been necessary, but they were made necessary by an administrative agency which is absolutely not hearing our words, and it is only through the actions of this committee and this particular subcommittee that our voices are heard and our constituents heard through us.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to Mr. DEFAZIO from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the committee and my colleagues. We only found out last evening that, despite the facts that are before us, the administration says it will be at least next year before they can determine whether or not there is a disaster for salmon fishers on the Pacific coast.

Bottom line, nobody is fishing. They created a structure where people can only go out and catch 75 fish. It is not worth the fuel to go out. It is clearly a disaster. But the bureaucracy here is resistant to declaring the disaster and getting our folks the assistance they need.

So, with this, this is nowhere near the amount of funds that will be necessary, but to get to conference and within 1 day to have moved this amount of money in the bill, I believe, is a significant step for the House; and I appreciate my colleagues in recognizing the need of people in Oregon and California, those who fish for a living, small businesses and families. They vitally need some help.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I spoke earlier today about the devastation befalling the salmon fisher families along the north coast. Because of gross mismanagement on the part of this administration and because of their typical disregard for sound science, this year's season has been cut by 90 percent. Ninety percent.

Imagine how your life would change if your income was cut by 90 percent. Imagine how could you pay for you your food, not including how would you pay for a boat. And it is not only the families of salmon fishers out in Oregon and California who are generation fisher families who need their livelihood, who are now talking about selling their boats. It is the entire communities who will suffer because of this inaction who depend on this industry.

The Bush administration created this disaster, and it is well past time that they own up and take some responsibility before it is entirely too late. Hundreds of families are depending on it. Please support this amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon.

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, again, I want to reiterate what this is all about. Last year, they reduced salmon fishing by 60 percent. This year, it is almost nonexistent. They can catch 75 fish a week. The only way you can possibly pay for your boat at 75 fish a week is if you can get $100 a pound for it. Well, salmon is really good, but I don't know of a single person that will pay $100 a pound for salmon.

So they are not fishing. They can't do it. They can't afford to pay for their boats. They can't afford to go out fishing. They can't afford to pay for their homes. And it impacts the entire community. This is the base industry of these west coast communities. These are small communities. They rely on the fishermen to buy food in the grocery store, to buy appliances at the appliance store, to buy clothing, to buy bait. When they are not operating, other businesses also don't operate.

I am happy that we have this opportunity for the $2 million as a placeholder, but what these people need is they need disaster relief. They need this now, and they need money to help them, just like we do for all other disasters that we declare.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to thank the gentleman from Virginia for being willing to help draw attention to this serious problem.

I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to thank our colleague and my friend, Mr. WOLF, for helping in this regard; and I just want to emphasize that this is a very serious problem that is impacting the lives of very real people. Both Governors, the Governors from California and Oregon, have declared disasters. They are waiting for us to act.

And I have heard from countless people from not only my district, but throughout the impacted area. Barbara and Ron Kemp, who are commercial fishers from Fortuna, called me last night and said for the first time in 23 years of marriage they have missed their mortgage payment. They have exhausted all of their savings, down to the last 12 cents in their savings account. They imagine that they are going to have to sell their boat. He is 44 years old, and he has made a career of fishing. He wants to know what he is going to do.

Ms. HOOLEY mentioned that they opened periods of the season, but those periods don't allow enough time to fish, nor is the season open in the places where there are fish. They just have no fish to catch.

Barbara Stickel from Morro Bay says in May, when their portion of the season was open, they were able to fish for 5 days. They caught zero fish.

□ 1245

They are $48,000 in the hole just trying to fish those 5 days. They have no idea what they are going to do or how they are going to make ends meet.

And it is not just the fishers. It is the related businesses as well. Larry Reuter, a salmon buyer from San Jose, California, says in 2004 he bought 21,000 pounds of salmon from commercial fishermen. This year, he was only able to buy 4,000 pounds. He has already suffered an $80,000 loss to his business, and this year he is paying $27.99 a pound. Before, he had never paid more than $7.

Up at the Klamath Lodge in Del Norte County, Paula Zimmerman says that they were booked solid during the spring season, but they have had massive cancellations because of the closure. Already this year, they have lost $21,000. That may not seem like a lot to those of us inside the Beltway, but for someone who is barely making ends meet, it is everything. This is the money that they need to live on through the winter months. They cannot go on.

Mr. Chairman and Members, thank you for hearing us out on this issue. This is an extremely important issue. Our failure to act would be nothing less than immoral.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Committee also for working with my colleagues.

I ask unanimous consent to vacate the requests for recorded votes on the five amendments on which proceedings were postponed, to the end that each of them stand adopted by the voice vote thereon.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Accordingly, the amendments by Messrs. REYES, GARRETT of New Jersey, LYNCH, and BROWN of Ohio, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas stand adopted by voice vote.

The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WELDON of Florida) assumed the Chair.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mrs. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5603. An act to temporarily extend the programs under the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

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

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In addition, for necessary retired pay expenses under the Retired Serviceman's Family Protection and Survivor Benefits Plan, and for payments for the medical care of retired personnel and their dependents under the Dependents Medical Care Act (10 U.S.C. ch. 55), such sums as may be necessary.

PROCUREMENT, ACQUISITION AND CONSTRUCTION

For procurement, acquisition and construction of capital assets, including alteration and modification costs, of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, $996,703,000, to remain available until September 30, 2009: *Provided*, That of the amounts provided for the National Polar-orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System, funds shall only be made available on a dollar for dollar matching basis with funds provided for the same purpose by the Department of Defense: *Provided further*, That except to the extent expressly prohibited by any other law, the Department of Defense may delegate procurement functions related to the National Polar-orbiting Operational Environmental Satellite System to officials of the Department of Commerce pursuant to section 2311 of title 10, United States Code: *Provided further*, That any deviation from the amounts designated for specific activities in the report accompanying this Act, or any use of deobligated balances of funds provided under this heading in previous years, shall be subject to the procedures set forth in section 605 of this Act.

PACIFIC COASTAL SALMON RECOVERY

For necessary expenses associated with the restoration of Pacific salmon populations, $20,000,000: *Provided*, That this amount shall be available to fund grants to the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, California, and Alaska, and to the Columbia River and Pacific Coastal Tribes for projects necessary for restoration of salmon and steelhead populations that are listed as threatened or endangered, or identified by a State as at-risk to be so-listed, for maintaining populations necessary for exercise of tribal treaty fishing rights or native subsistence fishing, or for conservation of Pacific coastal salmon and steelhead habitat: *Provided further*, That funds disbursed to States shall be subject to a matching requirement of funds or documented in-kind contributions of at least thirty-three percent of the Federal funds: *Provided further*, That non-Federal funds provided pursuant to the second proviso be used in direct support of this program.

COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT FUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Of amounts collected pursuant to section 308 of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1456a), not to exceed $3,000,000 shall be transferred to the ''Operations, Research, and Facilities'' account to offset the costs of implementing such Act.

FISHERIES FINANCE PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the costs of direct loans, $287,000, as authorized by the Merchant Marine Act of 1936: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990: *Provided further*, That these funds are only available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans not to exceed $5,000,000 for Individual Fishing Quota loans, and not to exceed $59,000,000 for traditional direct loans, of which $19,000,000 may be used for direct loans to the United States menhaden fishery: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available under this heading may be used for direct loans for any new fishing vessel that will increase the harvesting capacity in any United States fishery.

OTHER

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

For expenses necessary for the departmental management of the Department of Commerce provided for by law, including not to exceed $5,000 for official entertainment, $52,760,000, of which $5,900,000 shall be for blast mitigation at the Herbert C. Hoover Building and $990,000 shall be for necessary expenses of the National Intellectual Property Law Enforcement Coordination Council.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 17 offered by Mr. PALLONE:

Page 50, line 21, insert ''(decreased by $1,000,000) (increased by $1,000,000)'' after ''$52,760,000''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would provide $1 million for the Secretary of Commerce to contract with the National Academy of Sciences for the purpose of preparing a study on which U.S. coastal population centers are most at risk from the impacts of sea level rise due to global warming. These impacts could include inundation, coastal flooding, more intense storms, such as hurricanes, saline intrusion and a host of other damaging effects.

Last November, scientists at Princeton University released a report that found that under a worst case global warming scenario, more than 3 percent of my home State of New Jersey could be underwater by the end of the century. A full 9 percent of the State would be subject to constant coastal flooding, and so-called 100-year storms would occur every 5 years.

But, of course, New Jersey is by no means the only area facing this threat. More than half of the U.S. population lives within 50 miles of an ocean, many in cities that are at or just above sea level. What seems like a small rise in sea level, just a foot or two, could have dramatic effects on the magnitude of storm surges or other flooding events,

causing catastrophic and costly damage in some of our largest cities, including New York, Los Angeles, Miami, Seattle and Boston.

I think a mere $1 million offset from the administrative expenses of the Department of Commerce is but a small price to pay for us to get a better idea of what coastal areas would be most affected by sea level rise due to global warming.

And I would point out, Mr. Chairman, just look at what happened last week in Washington, D.C. I heard on the radio this morning that we actually faced here what is called a 300-year storm. So, in fact, what needs to be done is that cities around the country need to be able to prepare for this.

We had a forum on global warming in my district a few weeks ago. A number of the mayors came there. They reacted to some of the information that is out there and are already preparing plans. So this is just really a preventative measure that I think would be really crucial for a lot of our coastal districts around the country, including the city of Washington, D.C.

I would ask my colleagues whose districts would be affected by sea level rise and others from around the country, who will also see impacts from global warming, to join me in voting to fund this small but critical study.

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's amendment increases and decreases the amount for the Department of Commerce's Departmental Management Account. There is no net effect on the funding level of the account.

I have no objection to the gentleman's amendment. The committee accepts the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments that were made by my colleague, but I have two speakers who would like to speak.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of Congressman PALLONE's amendment to provide funding to the National Academy of Sciences to study the impacts of global warming on our coastal areas.

Coastal communities are at serious risk from global warming. We must better understand the specific threats faced by each coastal community to give ourselves a chance to prepare.

As the Earth warms, the sea level is rising. Scientists tell us that global warming likely caused 4 to 8 inches of sea level rise in the last century. Over the next 100 years, we may see up to 3 additional feet of sea level rise.

Warmer water fuels more intense hurricanes and tropical storms. Coral reefs are being damaged by both warmer water and increased ocean acidity from carbon dioxide.

Coastal communities need to know what they are up against. The effects of sea level rise include coastal erosion, land loss, disappearing beaches, saltwater intrusion into underground drinking water supplies, higher storm surges, damages to houses and roads, and harm to fisheries. And we have already seen the devastation that hurricanes and tropical storms could wreak on our coastal communities.

Coastal communities, such as Los Angeles, will be affected by changes inland. One-third of our precious water supplies come from the Sierra snowpack.

Of course, we must do much more than just try to adapt to massive temperature rises. The costs of that are far too high. We must dramatically cut our greenhouse gas emissions over the next few decades to avoid highly dangerous and irreversible warming. That is why last week, together with Congressman PALLONE and other colleagues, I introduced the Safe Climate Act. The Safe Climate Act reflects what science says we need to do to protect our children and grandchildren from disastrous climate changes.

While prompt action is necessary to avert the worst effects of climate change, this administration and the Congress are refusing to act. In the meantime, our coastal communities are at risk.

The Pallone amendment is a simple, commonsense measure to assess some of these vulnerabilities. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Rhode Island, the Ocean State.

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding and for drawing attention to the important issue of climate change.

Last week, the National Academy of Sciences concluded that ''the last few decades of the 20th century were warmer than any comparable period in the last 400 years.''

We can no longer ignore the fact that human activities, particularly the burning of fossil fuels, have increased carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases and contributed to changes in the Earth's climate.

The Pallone amendment recognizes that climate change threatens our coastal communities. In States like Rhode Island, which has about 400 miles of coastline and a significant portion of the population lives along the coast, the impact of rising sea levels would be downright disastrous. Beach erosion would lead to greater flooding and endanger our tourism-based economy, while the destruction of wetlands would eradicate wildlife habitat and reduce the natural buffer against storm surges.

Mr. Chairman, global warming threatens to have a devastating impact on our Nation's environment and economy, and Congress must take swift action. We can start by funding important research into climate change impacts on our communities. And I urge my colleagues to support the Pallone amendment.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Pallone Amendment. This amendment directs the Department of Commerce to provide $1 million for the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study of U.S. coastal areas facing the greatest impacts from global warming. My district of Guam, as an island in the Western Pacific, is in its entirety a coastal community. Guam is one of the several American communities directly facing the challenges associated with global climate change.

The islands in Oceania, including Guam, are particularly vulnerable to climate change, climate variability and sea level rise. Increased scientific and public policy cooperation on this issue would stand to benefit our island and coastal communities. The off-shore territories should not be neglected in the national effort to identify and address the challenges associated with this phenomenon.

We can identify and mitigate the effects of climate change by studying its impacts on our islands and coastlines. This amendment proposes a quality initial investment towards achieving this end. Our country can save money in the future and work towards protecting our lands and natural resources with this $1 million investment.

I support the Pallone Amendment. Its provisions are critical to helping us understand what areas of our country are most at risk. The study that would be funded by this amendment would yield the information we need to make more informed public policy decisions for the preservation of our country's coastlines.

I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, and our colleague from Washington, Mr. INSLEE, for their leadership on this issue. I urge support for their amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), $22,531,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 201. During the current fiscal year, applicable appropriations and funds made available to the Department of Commerce by this Act shall be available for the activities specified in the Act of October 26, 1949 (15 U.S.C. 1514), to the extent and in the manner prescribed by the Act, and, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3324, may be used for advanced payments not otherwise authorized only upon the certification of officials designated by the Secretary of Commerce that such payments are in the public interest.

SEC. 202. During the current fiscal year, appropriations made available to the Department of Commerce by this Act for salaries and expenses shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31

U.S.C. 1343 and 1344; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902).

SEC. 203. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Department of Commerce in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: *Provided*, That any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 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 the Secretary of Commerce shall notify the Committees on Appropriations at least 15 days in advance of the acquisition or disposal of any capital asset (including land, structures, and equipment) not specifically provided for in this or any other Appropriations Act.

SEC. 204. Any costs incurred by a department or agency funded under this title resulting from personnel actions taken in response to funding reductions included in this title or from actions taken for the care and protection of loan collateral or grant property shall be absorbed within the total budgetary resources available to such department or agency: *Provided*, That the authority to transfer funds between appropriations accounts as may be necessary to carry out this section is provided in addition to authorities included elsewhere in this Act: *Provided further*, That use of funds to carry out this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

SEC. 205. Section 214 of division B of Public Law 108–447 (118 Stat. 2884–86) is amended by (1) inserting ''and subject to subsection (f),'' following ''program,'' in section (a); and (2) striking subsection (f) and inserting:

''(f) FUNDING.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this section, up to $4,000,000 annually.''.

SEC. 206. (a) Section 318 of the National Marine Sanctuaries Act (16 U.S.C. 1445c), is amended by (1) inserting ''and subject to subsection (e),'' following ''program,'' in subsection (a); and (2) striking subsection (e) and inserting:

''(e) FUNDING.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce up to $500,000 annually, to carry out the provisions of this section.''.

(b) Section 210 of the Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001 (Public Law 106–553) is repealed.

SEC. 207. Any funds provided in this Act under ''Department of Commerce'' used to implement E-Government Initiatives shall be subject to the procedures set forth in section 605 of this Act.

This title may be cited as the ''Department of Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2007''.

TITLE III—SCIENCE

OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY

For necessary expenses of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, in carrying out the purposes of the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6601–6671), hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, not to exceed $2,500 for official reception and representation expenses, and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, $5,369,000: *Provided*, That the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall establish an Ethics Advisory Group for the National Nanotechnology Initiative focused on questions of human dignity: *Provided further*, That the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall report to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives by March 31, 2007, on specific actions planned and taken in response to the work of the National Science and Technology Council and the Academic Competitiveness Council with regard to improving science and math education in the United States.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

SCIENCE, AERONAUTICS AND EXPLORATION

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of science, aeronautics and exploration research and development activities, including research, development, operations, support and services; maintenance; construction of facilities including repair, rehabilitation, revitalization, and modification of facilities, construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, facility planning and design, and restoration, and acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law; environmental compliance and restoration; space flight, spacecraft control and communications activities including operations, production, and services; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; travel expenses; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $35,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, $10,482,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008, of which $5,404,800,000 shall be for science, $3,827,600,000 shall be for exploration systems, $824,400,000 shall be for aeronautics research, and $425,200,000 shall be for cross-agency support programs: *Provided*, That any funds provided under this heading used to implement E-Government Initiatives shall be subject to the procedures set forth in section 605 of this Act.

EXPLORATION CAPABILITIES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, in the conduct and support of exploration capabilities research and development activities, including research, development, operations, support and services; maintenance; construction of facilities including repair, rehabilitation, revitalization and modification of facilities, construction of new facilities and additions to existing facilities, facility planning and design, and acquisition or condemnation of real property, as authorized by law; environmental compliance and restoration; space flight, spacecraft control and communications activities including operations, production, and services; program management; personnel and related costs, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; travel expenses; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $35,000 for official reception and representation expenses; and purchase, lease, charter, maintenance and operation of mission and administrative aircraft, $6,193,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008, of which $1,777,900,000 shall be for the International Space Station, $4,056,700,000 shall be for the Space Shuttle, and $358,900,000 shall be for space and flight suport: *Provided*, That any funds provided under this heading used to implement E-Government Initiatives shall be subject to the procedures set forth in section 605 of this Act.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $33,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Notwithstanding the limitation on the availability of funds appropriated for ''Science, Aeronautics and Exploration'', or ''Exploration Capabilities'' by this appropriations Act, when any activity has been initiated by the incurrence of obligations for construction of facilities or environmental compliance and restoration activities as authorized by law, such amount available for such activity shall remain available until expended. This provision does not apply to the amounts appropriated for institutional minor revitalization and construction of facilities, and institutional facility planning and design.

Notwithstanding the limitation on the availability of funds appropriated for ''Science, Aeronautics and Exploration'', or ''Exploration Capabilities'' by this appropriations Act, the amounts appropriated for construction of facilities shall remain available until September 30, 2009.

□ 1300

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California for a colloquy with the chairman.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have a colloquy with the chairman of the committee, Mr. WOLF.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to see language in the SSJC appropriations report giving directives to NOAA and the Secretary of Commerce regarding the salmon in the Klamath River.

Though the river does not flow directly through my district, my salmon fishermen and related industries are greatly impacted. The National Marine Fisheries Service severely restricted the 2006 salmon season, after significantly cutting the 2005 season. This has caused undue financial hardships for local fishing communities, causing the Governors of both California and Oregon to declare it a fishery disaster.

There is definitely an immediate need to provide emergency funding to those impacted. However, we need to start addressing long-term needs to restore the habitat and rebuild the salmon population so that we do not find ourselves with a crisis every year. It would take a relatively small amount to curb much greater economic losses in the future.

Would the chairman be willing to work toward increasing the amount of funding from the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund to be used for the Klamath River restoration projects and salmon recovery? This important granting fund has already been reduced by almost $47 million below what the President requested in the fiscal year '06 enacted levels, so I further ask the chairman to work to restore funding during the conference committee.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, I understand your concerns, Mr. FARR. I agree there is a need to seek a long-term solution to the problems in the Klamath Basin and

appreciate your leadership on this issue. I commit, as we have spoken, to improve the levels of the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund in conference for restoration and also for recovery.

Mr. FARR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank you for your cooperation and for all the hard work on this important bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Funds for announced prizes otherwise authorized shall remain available, without fiscal year limitation, until the prize is claimed or the offer is withdrawn.

Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise specifically provided, shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers. Any transfer pursuant to this provision shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses in carrying out the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875), and the Act to establish a National Medal of Science (42 U.S.C. 1880–1881); services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; maintenance and operation of aircraft and purchase of flight services for research support; acquisition of aircraft; and authorized travel; $4,665,950,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008, of which not to exceed $485,000,000 shall remain available until expended for Polar research and operations support, and for reimbursement to other Federal agencies for operational and science support and logistical and other related activities for the United States Antarctic program: *Provided*, That receipts for scientific support services and materials furnished by the National Research Centers and other National Science Foundation supported research facilities may be credited to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That funds under this heading may be available for innovation inducement prizes: *Provided further*, That section 11(f) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1870(f)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end ", except that funds may be donated for specific prize competitions.".

MAJOR RESEARCH EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses for the acquisition, construction, commissioning, and upgrading of major research equipment, facilities, and other such capital assets pursuant to the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, including authorized travel, $237,250,000, to remain available until expended.

EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES

For necessary expenses in carrying out science and engineering education and human resources programs and activities pursuant to the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, authorized travel, and rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, $832,432,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses necessary in carrying out the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861–1875); services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $9,000 for official reception and representation expenses; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; $268,610,000: *Provided*, That contracts may be entered into under "Salaries and Expenses" in fiscal year 2007 for maintenance and operation of facilities, and for other services, to be provided during the next fiscal year.

OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD

For necessary expenses (including payment of salaries, authorized travel, hire of passenger motor vehicles, the rental of conference rooms in the District of Columbia, and the employment of experts and consultants under section 3109 of title 5, United States Code) involved in carrying out section 4 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1863) and Public Law 86–209 (42 U.S.C. 1880 et seq.), $3,910,000: *Provided*, That not more than $9,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General as authorized by the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $11,860,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

This title may be cited as the "Science Appropriations Act, 2007".

TITLE IV—DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCY

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ADMINISTRATION OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses of the Department of State and the Foreign Service not otherwise provided for, including employment, without regard to civil service and classification laws, of persons on a temporary basis (not to exceed $700,000 of this appropriation), as authorized by section 801 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948; representation to certain international organizations in which the United States participates pursuant to treaties ratified pursuant to the advice and consent of the Senate or specific Acts of Congress; arms control, nonproliferation and disarmament activities as authorized; acquisition by exchange or purchase of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by law; and for expenses of general administration, $3,709,914,000: *Provided*, That of the amount made available under this heading, not to exceed $4,000,000 may be transferred to, and merged with, funds in the "Emergencies in the Diplomatic and Consular Service" appropriations account, to be available only for emergency evacuations and terrorism rewards: *Provided further*, That of the amount made available under this heading, not less than $351,000,000 shall be available only for public diplomacy international information programs: *Provided further*, That of the amount made available under this heading, $3,000,000 shall be available only for the operations of the Office on Right-Sizing the United States Government Overseas Presence: *Provided further*, That funds available under this heading may be available for a United States Government interagency task force to examine, coordinate and oversee United States participation in the United Nations headquarters renovation project: *Provided further*, That no funds may be obligated or expended for processing licenses for the export of satellites of United States origin (including commercial satellites and satellite components) to the People's Republic of China unless, at least 15 days in advance, the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate are notified of such proposed action: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading are available, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1108(g), for the field examination of programs and activities in the United States funded from any account contained in this title.

In addition, not to exceed $1,513,000 shall be derived from fees collected from other executive agencies for lease or use of facilities located at the International Center in accordance with section 4 of the International Center Act; in addition, as authorized by section 5 of such Act, $490,000, to be derived from the reserve authorized by that section, to be used for the purposes set out in that section; in addition, as authorized by section 810 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act, not to exceed $6,000,000, to remain available until expended, may be credited to this appropriation from fees or other payments received from English teaching, library, motion pictures, and publication programs and from fees from educational advising and counseling and exchange visitor programs; and, in addition, not to exceed $15,000, which shall be derived from reimbursements, surcharges, and fees for use of Blair House facilities.

In addition, for the costs of worldwide security upgrades, $795,170,000, to remain available until expended.

CAPITAL INVESTMENT FUND

For necessary expenses of the Capital Investment Fund, $58,143,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized: *Provided*, That section 135(e) of Public Law 103–236 shall not apply to funds available under this heading.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General, $32,508,000, notwithstanding section 209(a)(1) of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (Public Law 96–465), as it relates to post inspections.

EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

For expenses of educational and cultural exchange programs, as authorized, $436,275,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed $2,000,000, to remain available until expended, may be credited to this appropriation from fees or other payments received from or in connection with English teaching, educational advising and counseling programs, and exchange visitor programs as authorized.

REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES

For representation allowances as authorized, $8,175,000.

PROTECTION OF FOREIGN MISSIONS AND OFFICIALS

For expenses, not otherwise provided, to enable the Secretary of State to provide for extraordinary protective services, as authorized, $9,270,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

EMBASSY SECURITY, CONSTRUCTION, AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses for carrying out the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926 (22 U.S.C. 292–303), preserving, maintaining, repairing, and planning for buildings that are owned or directly leased by the Department of State, renovating, in addition to funds otherwise available, the Harry S Truman Building, and carrying out the Diplomatic Security Construction Program as authorized, $605,652,000, to remain available until expended as authorized, of which not to exceed $25,000 may be used for domestic and

overseas representation as authorized: *Provided,* That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for acquisition of furniture, furnishings, or generators for other departments and agencies.

In addition, for the costs of worldwide security upgrades, acquisition, and construction as authorized, $899,368,000, to remain available until expended.

EMERGENCIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR SERVICE

For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary of State to meet unforeseen emergencies arising in the Diplomatic and Consular Service, $4,940,000, to remain available until expended as authorized, of which not to exceed $1,000,000 may be transferred to and merged with the ''Repatriation Loans Program Account'', subject to the same terms and conditions.

REPATRIATION LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct loans, $695,000, as authorized: *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.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan program, $590,000, which may be transferred to and merged with funds in the ''Diplomatic and Consular Programs'' account.

PAYMENT TO THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE IN TAIWAN

For necessary expenses to carry out the Taiwan Relations Act (Public Law 96–8), $15,826,000.

PAYMENT TO THE FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

For payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund, as authorized by law, $125,000,000.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to meet annual obligations of membership in international multilateral organizations, pursuant to treaties ratified pursuant to the advice and consent of the Senate, conventions or specific Acts of Congress, $1,151,318,000: *Provided,* That the Secretary of State shall, at the time of the submission of the President's budget to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, transmit to the Committees on Appropriations the most recent biennial budget prepared by the United Nations for the operations of the United Nations: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of State shall notify the Committees on Appropriations at least 15 days in advance (or in an emergency, as far in advance as is practicable) of any United Nations action to increase funding for any United Nations program without identifying an offsetting decrease elsewhere in the United Nations budget and cause the United Nations budget for the biennium 2006–2007 to exceed $3,798,912,500: *Provided further,* That any payment of arrearages under this title shall be directed toward special activities that are mutually agreed upon by the United States and the respective international organization: *Provided further,* That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be available for a United States contribution to an international organization for the United States share of interest costs made known to the United States Government by such organization for loans incurred on or after October 1, 1984, through external borrowings.

CONTRIBUTIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES

For necessary expenses to pay assessed and other expenses of international peacekeeping activities directed to the maintenance or restoration of international peace and security, $1,135,327,000, of which 15 percent shall remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided,* That none of the funds made available under this Act shall be obligated or expended for any new or expanded United Nations peacekeeping mission unless, at least 15 days in advance of voting for the new or expanded mission in the United Nations Security Council (or in an emergency as far in advance as is practicable): (1) the Committees on Appropriations and other appropriate committees of the Congress are notified of the estimated cost and length of the mission, the national interest that will be served, and the planned exit strategy; (2) the Committees on Appropriations and other appropriate committees of the Congress are notified that the United Nations has taken appropriate measures to prevent United Nations employees, contractor personnel, and peacekeeping forces serving in any United Nations peacekeeping mission from trafficking in persons, exploiting victims of trafficking, or committing acts of illegal sexual exploitation, and to hold accountable individuals who engage in such acts while participating in the peacekeeping mission; and (3) a reprogramming of funds pursuant to section 605 of this Act is submitted, and the procedures therein followed, setting forth the source of funds that will be used to pay for the cost of the new or expanded mission: *Provided further,* That funds shall be available for peacekeeping expenses only upon a certification by the Secretary of State to the appropriate committees of the Congress that American manufacturers and suppliers are being given opportunities to provide equipment, services, and material for United Nations peacekeeping activities equal to those being given to foreign manufacturers and suppliers.

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to meet obligations of the United States arising under treaties, or specific Acts of Congress, as follows:

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY AND WATER COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

For necessary expenses for the United States Section of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, and to comply with laws applicable to the United States Section, including not to exceed $6,000 for representation; as follows:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For salaries and expenses, not otherwise provided for, $28,453,000.

CONSTRUCTION

For detailed plan preparation and construction of authorized projects, $9,237,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized.

AMERICAN SECTIONS, INTERNATIONAL COMMISSIONS

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided, for the International Joint Commission and the International Boundary Commission, United States and Canada, as authorized by treaties between the United States and Canada or Great Britain, and for the Border Environment Cooperation Commission as authorized by Public Law 103–182, $9,587,000, of which not to exceed $9,000 shall be available for representation expenses incurred by the International Joint Commission.

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSIONS

For necessary expenses for international fisheries commissions, not otherwise provided for, as authorized by law, $20,651,000: *Provided,* That the United States' share of such expenses may be advanced to the respective commissions pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3324.

OTHER

PAYMENT TO THE ASIA FOUNDATION

For a grant to the Asia Foundation, as authorized by the Asia Foundation Act (22 U.S.C. 4402), $13,821,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized.

CENTER FOR MIDDLE EASTERN-WESTERN DIALOGUE TRUST FUND

For necessary expenses of the Center for Middle Eastern-Western Dialogue Trust Fund, the total amount of the interest and earnings accruing to such Fund on or before September 30, 2007, to remain available until expended.

EISENHOWER EXCHANGE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

For necessary expenses of Eisenhower Exchange Fellowships, Incorporated, as authorized by sections 4 and 5 of the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Act of 1990 (20 U.S.C. 5204–5205), all interest and earnings accruing to the Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Program Trust Fund on or before September 30, 2007, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That none of the funds appropriated herein shall be used to pay any salary or other compensation, or to enter into any contract providing for the payment thereof, in excess of the rate authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5376; or for purposes which are not in accordance with OMB Circulars A–110 (Uniform Administrative Requirements) and A–122 (Cost Principles for Non-profit Organizations), including the restrictions on compensation for personal services.

ISRAELI ARAB SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

For necessary expenses of the Israeli Arab Scholarship Program as authorized by section 214 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (22 U.S.C. 2452), all interest and earnings accruing to the Israeli Arab Scholarship Fund on or before September 30, 2007, to remain available until expended.

EAST-WEST CENTER

To enable the Secretary of State to provide for carrying out the provisions of the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West Act of 1960, by grant to the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West in the State of Hawaii, $3,000,000: *Provided,* That none of the funds appropriated herein shall be used to pay any salary, or enter into any contract providing for the payment thereof, in excess of the rate authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5376.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR DEMOCRACY

For grants made by the Department of State to the National Endowment for Democracy as authorized by the National Endowment for Democracy Act, $50,000,000, to remain available until expended.

RELATED AGENCY

BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS

INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING OPERATIONS

For expenses necessary to enable the Broadcasting Board of Governors, as authorized, to carry out international communication activities, including the purchase, rent, construction, and improvement of facilities for radio and television transmission and reception and purchase, lease, and installation of necessary equipment, including aircraft, for radio and television transmission and reception to Cuba, and to make and supervise grants for radio and television broadcasting to the Middle East, $651,279,000, of which $5,000,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided,* That of the total amount in this heading, not to exceed $16,000 may be used for official receptions within the United States as authorized, not to exceed $35,000 may be used for representation

abroad as authorized, and not to exceed $39,000 may be used for official reception and representation expenses of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty; and in addition, notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed $2,000,000 in receipts from advertising and revenue from business ventures, not to exceed $500,000 in receipts from cooperating international organizations, and not to exceed $1,000,000 in receipts from privatization efforts of the Voice of America and the International Broadcasting Bureau, to remain available until expended for carrying out authorized purposes.

BROADCASTING CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

For the purchase, rent, construction, and improvement of facilities for radio and television transmission and reception, and purchase and installation of necessary equipment for radio and television transmission and reception as authorized, $7,624,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCY

SEC. 401. Funds appropriated under this title shall be available, except as otherwise provided, for allowances and differentials as authorized by subchapter 59 of title 5, United States Code; for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and for hire of passenger transportation pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1343(b).

SEC. 402. Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Department of State in this title may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise specifically provided, shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: *Provided*, That not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Broadcasting Board of Governors in this title may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation, except as otherwise specifically provided, shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: *Provided further*, That any transfer pursuant to this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

SEC. 403. None of the funds made available in this title may be used by the Department of State or the Broadcasting Board of Governors to provide equipment, technical support, consulting services, or any other form of assistance to the Palestinian Broadcasting Corporation.

SEC. 404. (a) The Senior Policy Operating Group on Trafficking in Persons, established under section 105(f) of the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7103(f)) to coordinate agency activities regarding policies (including grants and grant policies) involving the international trafficking in persons, shall coordinate all such policies related to the activities of traffickers and victims of severe forms of trafficking.

(b) None of the funds provided in this or any other Act shall be expended to perform functions that duplicate coordinating responsibilities of the Operating Group.

(c) The Operating Group shall continue to report only to the authorities that appointed them pursuant to section 105(f).

SEC. 405. None of the funds made available by this title may be used for any United Nations undertaking when it is made known to the Federal official having authority to obligate or expend such funds that: (1) the United Nations undertaking is a peacekeeping mission; (2) such undertaking will involve United States Armed Forces under the command or operational control of a foreign national; and (3) the President's military advisors have not submitted to the President a recommendation that such involvement is in the national security interests of the United States and the President has not submitted to the Congress such a recommendation.

SEC. 406. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this title shall be expended for any purpose for which appropriations are prohibited by section 609 of the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999.

(b) The requirements in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 609 of that Act shall continue to apply during fiscal year 2007.

SEC. 407. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this title shall be expended for any purpose for which appropriations are prohibited by section 616 of the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999.

(b) The requirements in subsections (b) and (c) of section 616 of that Act shall continue to apply during fiscal year 2007.

SEC. 408. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b), a project to construct a diplomatic facility of the United States may not include office space or other accommodations for an employee of a Federal agency or department if the Secretary of State determines that such department or agency has not provided to the Department of State the full amount of funding required by subsection (e) of section 604 of the Secure Embassy Construction and Counterterrorism Act of 1999 (as enacted into law by section 1000(a)(7) of Public Law 106–113 and contained in appendix G of that Act; 113 Stat. 1501A–453), as amended by section 629 of the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2005.

(b) Notwithstanding the prohibition in subsection (a), a project to construct a diplomatic facility of the United States may include office space or other accommodations for members of the Marine Corps.

SEC. 409. Ceilings and earmarks contained in this title shall not be applicable to funds or authorities appropriated or otherwise made available by any subsequent Act unless such Act specifically so directs. Earmarks or minimum funding requirements contained in any other Act shall not be applicable to funds appropriated by this title.

SEC. 410. Any funds provided in this Act under ''Department of State'' used to implement E-Government Initiatives shall be subject to the procedures set forth in section 605 of this Act.

SEC. 411. (a) Subsection (f) of section 36 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2708(f)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(f) INELIGIBILITY.—An officer'' and inserting the following:

''(f) INELIGIBILITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), an officer''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) EXCEPTION IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES.—The Secretary may pay a reward to an officer or employee of a foreign government (or any entity thereof) who, while in the performance of his or her official duties, furnishes information described in such subsection, if the Secretary determines that such payment satisfies the following conditions:

''(A) Such payment is appropriate in light of the exceptional or high-profile nature of the information furnished pursuant to such subsection.

''(B) Such payment may aid in furnishing further information described in such subsection.

''(C) Such payment is formally requested by such agency.''.

(b) Subsection (b) of such section (22 U.S.C. 2708(b)) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting ''or to an officer or employee of a foreign government in accordance with subsection (f)(2)'' after ''individual''.

This title may be cited as the ''Department of State and Related Agency Appropriations Act, 2007''.

TITLE V—RELATED AGENCIES

ANTITRUST MODERNIZATION COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Antitrust Modernization Commission, as authorized by Public Law 107–273, $462,000, to remain available until expended.

COMMISSION FOR THE PRESERVATION OF AMERICA'S HERITAGE ABROAD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses for the Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad, $493,000, as authorized by section 1303 of Public Law 99–83.

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Commission on Civil Rights, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, $8,933,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used to employ in excess of four full-time individuals under Schedule C of the Excepted Service exclusive of one special assistant for each Commissioner: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated in this paragraph shall be used to reimburse Commissioners for more than 75 billable days, with the exception of the chairperson, who is permitted 125 billable days.

COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, as authorized by title II of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–292), $3,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, as authorized by Public Law 94–304, $2,110,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China, as authorized, $2,000,000, including not more than $3,000 for the purpose of official representation, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission as authorized by title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (29 U.S.C. 206(d) and 621–634), the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and the Civil Rights Act of 1991, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343(b); non-monetary awards to private citizens; and not to exceed $28,000,000 for payments to State and local enforcement agencies for services to the Commission pursuant to title VII of the Civil Rights Act of

1964, sections 6 and 14 of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and the Civil Rights Act of 1991, $322,807,000: *Provided*, That the Commission is authorized to make available for official reception and representation expenses not to exceed $2,500 from available funds: *Provided further*, That the Commission may take no action to implement any workforce repositioning, restructuring, or reorganization until such time as the Committees on Appropriations have been notified of such proposals, in accordance with the reprogramming provisions of section 605 of this Act.

Mr. WOLF (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 83, line 7, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Federal Communications Commission, as authorized by law, including uniforms and allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; not to exceed $4,000 for official reception and representation expenses; purchase and hire of motor vehicles; special counsel fees; and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $294,261,000: *Provided*, That offsetting collections shall be assessed and collected pursuant to section 9 of title I of the Communications Act of 1934, of which $293,261,000 shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2007 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2007 appropriation estimated at $1,000,000: *Provided further*, That any offsetting collections received in excess of $293,261,000 in fiscal year 2007 shall remain available until expended, but shall not be available for obligation until October 1, 2007: *Provided further*, That remaining offsetting collections from prior years collected in excess of the amount specified for collection in each such year and otherwise becoming available on October 1, 2006, shall not be available for obligation: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding 47 U.S.C. 309(j)(8)(B), proceeds from the use of a competitive bidding system that may be retained and made available for obligation shall not exceed $85,000,000 for fiscal year 2007: *Provided further*, That, in addition, not to exceed $3,000,000 may be transferred from the Universal Service Fund in fiscal year 2007, to remain available until expended, to monitor the Universal Service Fund program to prevent and remedy waste, fraud and abuse, and to conduct audits and investigations by the Office of Inspector General.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MURPHY:

Page 83, line 17, insert ''(increased by $50,000) (decreased by $50,000)'' after the aggregate dollar amount.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Chairman, first, I thank the distinguished chairman, Chairman WOLF, for his work on this bill.

This amendment is intended to highlight the dangerous practice of caller ID fraud or ''call spoofing'' and hope the FCC moves quickly and takes immediate action to protect the public from this. It is a deceptive practice being used to defraud people of their money and deceive citizens into releasing private information.

There are now several Web sites where anyone can change their outgoing phone number to any number that they choose on a temporary basis. This practice is not just for harmless pranks but has tremendous identity theft and other security implications.

For example, the AARP bulletin recently reported that people received false calls claiming they missed jury duty and were asked for their Social Security numbers. The phone number of the local courthouse had shown up on their caller ID.

Criminals have engaged in caller ID fraud to gather private consumer information from businesses that rely on caller ID for authentication, such as financial companies that perform wire transfers. Cell phone voice mailboxes often only require verification that an incoming call is from the user's cell phone number.

Lastly, in 2005, SWAT teams surrounded an empty building in New Brunswick, New Jersey, after police received a call from a woman who said she was being held hostage in an apartment. She was not in the apartment, and the woman had intentionally used a false caller ID.

False caller ID information can be used to bypass safety systems made to prevent domestic violence and harassment. Imagine what can happen when predators use false caller ID numbers to prey upon children and senior citizens. I might add that these phone spoofing Web sites also offer to disguise the voice of the caller and to record the call.

The House has already expressed its will on this matter, unanimously passing H.R. 5126 earlier this month; and I am pleased to be a cosponsor of that bill. I have another bill, H.R. 5304, that would go a step further by amending criminal law to protect Americans from this practice.

We cannot keep waiting to deal with this insidious problem and must ask the FCC to move forward quickly.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I think it is a good amendment. Hopefully, the FCC will take note of what Mr. MURPHY is doing. I would urge a ''yes'' vote on the amendment.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my colleague, Mr. MURPHY, and his amendment. It is appropriate for our colleague from Pennsylvania to be offering this amendment because he is himself a victim of this insidiousness.

I also want to thank Chairman BARTON, who with me, introduced the Truth in Caller ID Act that passed the House not long ago. I also want to thank and recognize Mr. UPTON, Mr. DINGELL and Mr. MARKEY for their significant contributions to that bill.

I commend our colleague from Pennsylvania for offering this amendment. It will highlight to the FCC that the House of Representatives takes this problem very seriously. We have swiftly passed legislation that is now pending in the Senate. And so we expect the FCC to do whatever it can now—and to move expeditiously once the Truth in Caller ID Act is signed into law.

Not long ago, I was like most Americans—completely unaware that is was so easy for someone to alter their caller ID. Caller ID spoofing is not your grandfather's prank call.

This technology has limited uses that I find legitimate, such as for law enforcement and protecting battered women.

This technology has unlimited uses that I find completely unacceptable. This technology enables people to pretend to be a bank, a doctor's office, a court house, or even a member of Congress. Nefarious people are . . . I say are using this technology to get a hold of private information and engage in identity theft.

The Telecommunications and Internet Subcommittee of Energy and Commerce held a hearing on this matter. We heard stories of people receiving phone calls from their local court houses saying they had missed jury duty and that to confirm a make up the caller needed the person's social security number. Well who wouldn't be flustered when seeing a local court house phone number on the caller ID and being told you had missed jury duty. So these innocent people gave out their social security numbers.

We heard of people make fake calls to police departments claiming to be victims of home intrusion and being held at gun point. The Newark Star Ledger reported on July 12, 2005 that Mr. Wadu Jackson plead guilty to placing ''a fake 911 call that drew dozens of police sharpshooters to a New Brunswick home in March in a mistake belief that a teenage girl was being held hostage.

I know of three of our colleagues in the House who have been victims of caller ID spoofing. Not in the personal lives, but in their professional lives as Members of Congress. They have had people call and leave obnoxious messages that indicate the call is coming from the member's district office.

I can only believe that this was an early effort at testing this technology to interfere with the electoral process of our nation.

I think we do a service to our constituents today by highlighting and alerting them to this problem. I urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Murphy/Schmidt amendment to H.R. 5672, and I commend Mr. MURPHY for his good work on this important issue.

I introduced legislation on the issue of manipulation of caller identification information, and I know first-hand there is a need to end the practice of "call spoofing."

With the increasing frequency of identity theft, we must do all that we can to end opportunities for falsification of this data.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 89, line 9, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the bill through page 89, line 9, is as follows:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commission, including uniforms or allowances therefore, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and not to exceed $300,000 shall be available for use to contract with a person or persons for collection services in accordance with the terms of 31 U.S.C. 3718: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed $129,000,000 of offsetting collections derived from fees collected for premerger notification filings under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 (15 U.S.C. 18a), regardless of the year of collection, shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, $23,000,000 in offsetting collections derived from fees sufficient to implement and enforce the Telemarketing Sales Rule, promulgated under the Telephone Consumer Fraud and Abuse Prevention Act (15 U.S.C. 6101 et seq.), shall be credited to this account, and be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2007, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2007 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than $61,079,000: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the Federal Trade Commission may be used to enforce subsection (e) of section 43 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1831t) or section 151(b)(2) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991 (12 U.S.C. 1831t note).

HELP COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the HELP Commission, $1,250,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That section 637(f)(1) of the HELP Commission Act (Public Law 108–199, division B) is amended by inserting "and 3 months" after "2 years".

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

PAYMENT TO THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

For payment to the Legal Services Corporation to carry out the purposes of the Legal Services Corporation Act of 1974, $313,860,000, of which $296,990,000 is for basic field programs and required independent audits; $2,970,000 is for the Office of Inspector General, of which such amounts as may be necessary may be used to conduct additional audits of recipients; $12,661,000 is for management and administration; and $1,239,000 is for client self-help and information technology.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION—LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

None of the funds appropriated in this Act to the Legal Services Corporation shall be expended for any purpose prohibited or limited by, or contrary to any of the provisions of, sections 501, 502, 503, 504, 505, and 506 of Public Law 105–119, and all funds appropriated in this Act to the Legal Services Corporation shall be subject to the same terms and conditions set forth in such sections, except that all references in sections 502 and 503 to 1997 and 1998 shall be deemed to refer instead to 2006 and 2007, respectively.

MARINE MAMMAL COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Marine Mammal Commission as authorized by title II of Public Law 92–522, $2,000,000.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Securities and Exchange Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, the rental of space (to include multiple year leases) in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and not to exceed $3,000 for official reception and representation expenses, $900,517,000, to remain available until expended; of which not to exceed $10,000 may be used toward funding a permanent secretariat for the International Organization of Securities Commissions; and of which not to exceed $100,000 shall be available for expenses for consultations and meetings hosted by the Commission with foreign governmental and other regulatory officials, members of their delegations, appropriate representatives and staff to exchange views concerning developments relating to securities matters, development and implementation of cooperation agreements concerning securities matters and provision of technical assistance for the development of foreign securities markets, such expenses to include necessary logistic and administrative expenses and the expenses of Commission staff and foreign invitees in attendance at such consultations and meetings including: (1) such incidental expenses as meals taken in the course of such attendance; (2) any travel and transportation to or from such meetings; and (3) any other related lodging or subsistence: *Provided*, That fees and charges authorized by sections 6(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77f(b)), and 13(e), 14(g) and 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78m(e), 78n(g), and 78ee), shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $880,517,000 of such offsetting collections shall be available until expended for necessary expenses of this account: *Provided further*, That $20,000,000 shall be derived from available balances of funds previously appropriated to the Securities and Exchange Commission: *Provided further*, That the total amount appropriated under this heading from the general fund for fiscal year 2007 shall be reduced as such offsetting fees are received so as to result in a final total fiscal year 2007 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than $0.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the Small Business Administration as authorized by Public Law 108–447, including hire of passenger motor vehicles as authorized by 31 U.S.C. 1343 and 1344, and not to exceed $3,500 for official reception and representation expenses, $303,550,000, of which $10,000,000 shall be available for microloan technical assistance, and of which $1,000,000 shall be transferred to and merged with appropriations for "Business Loans Program Account" and shall remain available until expended for the cost of direct loans: *Provided*, That the Administrator is authorized to charge fees to cover the cost of publications developed by the Small Business Administration, and certain loan program activities, including fees authorized by section 5(b) of the Small Business Act: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, revenues received from all such activities shall be credited to this account, to remain available until expended, for carrying out these purposes without further appropriations: *Provided further*, That any funds provided under this heading used to implement E-Government Initiatives shall be subject to the procedures set forth in section 605 of this Act: *Provided further*, That, of the funds made available under this heading, $500,000 shall be for the National Veterans Business Development Corporation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. DAVIS of California:

Page 90, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(increased by $1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment today along with my colleagues, Mr. EVANS of Illinois and Ms. HERSETH of South Dakota, on behalf of our veterans seeking to start and operate their own businesses.

I have been interested in this issue for a number of years after visiting with our servicemembers in Afghanistan. I recall one brave servicemember who told me his dream was to learn about entrepreneurship and start his own business after his tour of duty. So it is up to us to make sure our veterans have access to the training, assistance and capital to start a business.

Mr. Chairman, Congress passed legislation in 1999 establishing the National Veterans Business Development Corporation to provide all of these crucial aspects of entrepreneurship to veterans. As a result, the Veterans Corporation has provided training to over 8,000 veterans and has helped over 550 veterans start businesses during 2006 alone.

Charmaine Burnett is one of those thousands of success stories. She is a service-disabled veteran of the Gulf War living in California, and her construction services company has been awarded several contracts in recent months. She attributes her success in part to the assistance she received from the Veterans Corporation.

Unfortunately, at $500,000, H.R. 5672 does not provide sufficient funding for the Veterans Corporation to train and continue its services to veterans when they need it the most.

Mr. Chairman, why would we cut this funding to veterans when they need it most? The corporation will have to cut back and reduce services for veterans entrepreneurship when many of our servicemembers are returning from Iraq and Afghanistan.

Our amendment increases funding for the Veterans Corporation by a mere $1 million to match its level for fiscal year 2006. Our veterans need this funding.

This amendment is completely budget neutral. It does not increase spending and does not take away from other important programs within the SBA.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and to support business ownership for America's veterans.

□ 1315

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I support the gentlewoman's amendment. I know the Veterans Corporation is working to get itself revitalized, and I hope we can have this thing authorized. I think the more effort that can be done would help us, particularly as we move into the outyears.

Mr. Chairman, I accept the gentlewoman's amendment.

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

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that acceptance, and I know that the veterans will as well.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from California has 3 minutes remaining.

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH).

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

In light of the chairman's support, I will submit my comments for the RECORD in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my support for this important amendment offered by the gentlelady Ms. DAVIS of CA to the Science, State, Justice, and Commerce Appropriations bill to increase by $1 million the amount of funding in this bill to the National Veterans Business Development Corporation—also known as The Veterans Corporation.

Our amendment increases funding for The Veterans Corporation from $500,000 to $1.5 million to match Fiscal Year 2006 levels. Without level funding, The Veterans Corporation will be forced to cut back and reduce entrepreneurship assistance to our veterans.

As the Ranking Member of the Veterans' Affairs Economic Opportunity Subcommittee, which maintains jurisdiction over veterans' employment and re-employment matters, I have been working to explore the perceptions, activities, employment practices, and entrepreneurship opportunities for former servicemembers.

In my view, which I know is shared by many of my colleagues, the men and women serving in the military today are very professional, highly trained, and extremely motivated. I am confident that many of these men and women would add value to our economy if given the opportunity to start their own businesses. In my district—the State of South Dakota—more than 17,000 veteran owned small businesses are operating—generating a combined income of more than $816 million.

Mr. Chairman, as the Administration has repeatedly stated, this is a key transitional year for members of our Armed Forces serving overseas. Increasing numbers of servicemen and women are expected to return home from Iraq and Afghanistan—including thousands of National Guard and Reservists. The men and women in uniform who defend this country and make our economic and political systems possible, indeed, have earned our best efforts and a fair opportunity to successfully transition from military service to civilian life and employment.

The Veterans Corporation is working to help these veterans, who would like to enter the world of entrepreneurship, have the opportunity to successfully do so. I ask my colleagues to support these veterans by supporting this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, $13,722,000.

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

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman. I likewise thank you for your leadership and the chairman's leadership, and I would like to enter into a colloquy. It is, I think, appropriate to do so as there is a pending launch going forward in the Nation's space program, space shuttle program, to talk about the next generation of scientists and astronauts.

Mr. Chairman, in 1992, Dr. Mae C. Jemison became the first woman of color to travel into space. After retiring from NASA, she worked as an active advocate of science education, especially for minorities and economically disadvantaged students.

Dr. Jemison is a doctor by training, and she is a pioneer in aeronautics. And through the creation of the Dr. Mae C. Jemison Grant Program, we hope to provide other minorities and women in America with the opportunity to succeed in science and engineering.

Frankly, what we want to do is to create the next generation of our scientists and our astronauts. I would say to you that, unfortunately, we are woefully noncompetitive. The Dr. Mae C. Jemison Grant Program is intended to ensure equal access for minority and economically disadvantaged students to NASA's education programs.

The program facilitates NASA's ability to work with institutions serving minorities to bring more women of color into the field of space and aeronautics. We must pursue this program to safeguard equal opportunities in fields of study and professions that have far too low of a minority ratio.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that as this particular program is authorized in the NASA authorization bill, we will find it in our good graces to be able to fund it. My question, as I yield to the gentleman, is, would the gentleman agree with me to work with me to find a way to recognize and to fund this particular program?

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman. She certainly has raised a very important issue. I pledge to explore this issue further.

It is my understanding that NASA anticipates, because they have a strong education program, building this program using the funding appropriated to the agency for education programs. I do recognize that the Dr. Mae C. Jemison Grant Program is a program charged to NASA, and we look forward to the launch of the program and the benefits that will result.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time. Let me say that it is my hope, Mr. Chairman, that we do recognize this as a grant program and that as you have indicated, that this program be funded under the education programs in NASA, and to be specifically funded, and as indicated in the RECORD, I had an amendment to offer.

At this time, I will not be offering the amendment. And therefore, I hope to accept the assurances and be able to move forward on this program so that it can be funded

Mr. WOLF. Thank you.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy with Chairman WOLF, of the Science, State, Justice, Commerce Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I had offered to introduce an amendment today to make a

modest increase of $2.2 million for the Space Environment Center, returning its funding to the President's requested level of $7.2 million.

However, Mr. Chairman, after discussing this with your staff, I have decided not to offer the amendment but would like to engage you in a colloquy.

Mr. WOLF. Sure.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, the Space Environment Center is a part of NOAA's National Weather Service, and it is the only civil provider of space weather warnings. These warnings enable government and private sector operators to take actions to minimize disruptions in service and damage to critical infrastructure.

Last year, the Space Environment Center received a $4 million cut, a cut of about 44 percent from its $7 million budget. NOAA, in order to prevent degradation of services reprogrammed funds from other programs to continue the operations of the Space Environment Center.

But in this cycle, if the Center receives $5 million as proposed in the bill, it will be forced to make substantial cuts in its staffing.

As a national critical system, should the capabilities of the center go down, the Air Force currently provides data as a back-up. However, with this proposed budget, the center will not be able to maintain a liaison position with the Air Force, potentially harming its operations and the continuity of its services.

So, in that spirit, with that background, Mr. Chairman, I have two questions. Would you agree that the space weather warnings are a vital service to many of our space-based assets and that more funding is needed for the Space Environment Center? And if so, would you be willing to work in conference to increase funding for the center?

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

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. I agree with the gentleman that the warnings provided by the Space Environment Center are important to protect their satellites and other space-based industries. And I will be happy to work with the gentleman as the bill moves forward through conference to try to find increased funding for the Space Environment Center.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman's response and willingness to work on this issue. I thank my colleague, Mr. MOLLOHAN, from the great State of West Virginia for yielding time to me.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SURETY BOND GUARANTEES REVOLVING FUND

For additional capital for the Surety Bond Guarantees Revolving Fund, authorized by the Small Business Investment Act, as amended, $2,824,000, to remain available until expended.

BUSINESS LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Subject to section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, during fiscal year 2007 commitments to guarantee loans under section 503 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, shall not exceed $7,500,000,000: *Provided*, That during fiscal year 2007 commitments for general business loans authorized under section 7(a) of the Small Business Act, shall not exceed $17,500,000,000: *Provided further*, That during fiscal year 2007 commitments to guarantee loans for debentures under section 303(b) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, shall not exceed $3,000,000,000: *Provided further*, That during fiscal year 2007 guarantees of trust certificates authorized by section 5(g) of the Small Business Act shall not exceed a principal amount of $12,000,000,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $123,706,000, which may be transferred to and merged with the appropriations for Salaries and Expenses.

DISASTER LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct loans authorized by section 7(b) of the Small Business Act, $85,140,000, to remain available until expended: *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.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct loan program authorized by section 7(b) of the Small Business Act, $113,850,000, of which $495,000 is for the Office of Inspector General of the Small Business Administration for audits and reviews of disaster loans and the disaster loan program and shall be transferred to and merged with appropriations for the Office of Inspector General; of which $104,445,000 is for direct administrative expenses of loan making and servicing to carry out the direct loan program, to remain available until expended, and which may be transferred to and merged with appropriations for Salaries and Expenses; and of which $8,910,000 is for indirect administrative expenses, which may be transferred to and merged with appropriations for Salaries and Expenses: *Provided*, That any amount in excess of $8,910,000 to be transferred to and merged with appropriations for Salaries and Expenses for indirect administrative expenses shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION—SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Not to exceed 5 percent of any appropriation made available for the current fiscal year for the Small Business Administration in this Act may be transferred between such appropriations, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 10 percent by any such transfers: *Provided*, That any transfer pursuant to this paragraph shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the State Justice Institute, as authorized by the State Justice Institute Authorization Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–572), $2,000,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $2,500 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses.

UNITED STATES-CHINA ECONOMIC AND SECURITY REVIEW COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission, $4,000,000, including not more than $5,000 for the purpose of official representation, to remain available until September 30, 2008: *Provided*, That for purposes of costs relating to printing and binding, the Commission shall be deemed, effective on the date of its establishment, to be a committee of Congress: *Provided further*, That compensation for the executive director of the Commission may not exceed the rate payable for level II of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5, United States Code: *Provided further*, That section 1238(c)(1) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001, is amended by striking ''June'' and inserting ''November'': *Provided further*, That travel by members of the Commission and its staff shall be arranged and conducted under the rules and procedures applying to travel by members of the House of Representatives and its staff: *Provided further*, That section 635(b) of Public Law 109–108 is repealed.

UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Institute of Peace as authorized in the United States Institute of Peace Act, $26,979,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008.

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 601. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress.

SEC. 602. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 603. The expenditure of any appropriation under this Act for any consulting service through procurement contract, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3109, shall be limited to those contracts where such expenditures are a matter of public record and available for public inspection, except where otherwise provided under existing law, or under existing Executive order issued pursuant to existing law.

SEC. 604. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of each provision to persons or circumstances other than those as to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 605. (a) None of the funds provided under this Act, or provided under previous appropriations Acts to the agencies funded by this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2007, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming of funds that: (1) creates new programs; (2) eliminates a program, project, or activity; (3) increases funds or personnel by any means for any project or activity for which funds have been denied or restricted; (4) relocates an office or employees; (5) reorganizes or renames offices; (6) reorganizes programs or activities; or (7) contracts out or privatizes any functions or activities presently performed by Federal employees; unless the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress are notified 15 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

(b) None of the funds provided under this Act, or provided under previous appropriations Acts to the agencies funded by this Act that remain available for obligation or expenditure in fiscal year 2007, or provided from any accounts in the Treasury of the

United States derived by the collection of fees available to the agencies funded by this Act, shall be available for obligation or expenditure for activities, programs, or projects through a reprogramming of funds in excess of $750,000 or 10 percent, whichever is less, that: (1) augments existing programs, projects, or activities; (2) reduces by 10 percent funding for any existing program, project, or activity, or numbers of personnel by 10 percent as approved by Congress; or (3) results from any general savings, including savings from a reduction in personnel, which would result in a change in existing programs, activities, or projects as approved by Congress; unless the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress are notified 15 days in advance of such reprogramming of funds.

SEC. 606. Hereafter, none of the funds made available in this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce any guidelines of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission covering harassment based on religion, when it is made known to the Federal entity or official to which such funds are made available that such guidelines do not differ in any respect from the proposed guidelines published by the Commission on October 1, 1993 (58 Fed. Reg. 51266).

SEC. 607. If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a ''Made in America'' inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, the person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds made available in this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in sections 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against section 607. This provision violates clause 2(b) of House rule XXI. It proposes to change existing law and therefore constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill in violation of House rules.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say, Mr. DAVIS has convinced me of the merit of his argument. I would never object to him. Since it makes a lot of sense, I concede.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 608. The Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Broadcasting Board of Governors, the National Science Foundation, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Federal Communications Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Small Business Administration shall provide to the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and of the House of Representatives a quarterly accounting of the cumulative balances of any unobligated funds that were received by such agency during any previous fiscal year.

SEC. 609. Any costs incurred by a department or agency funded under this Act resulting from personnel actions taken in response to funding reductions included in this Act shall be absorbed within the total budgetary resources available to such department or agency: *Provided*, That the authority to transfer funds between appropriations accounts as may be necessary to carry out this section is provided in addition to authorities included elsewhere in this Act: *Provided further*, That use of funds to carry out this section shall be treated as a reprogramming of funds under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

SEC. 610. None of the funds provided by this Act shall be available to promote the sale or export of tobacco or tobacco products, or to seek the reduction or removal by any foreign country of restrictions on the marketing of tobacco or tobacco products, except for restrictions which are not applied equally to all tobacco or tobacco products of the same type.

SEC. 611. None of the funds appropriated pursuant to this Act or any other provision of law may be used for—

(1) the implementation of any tax or fee in connection with the implementation of subsection 922(t) of title 18, United States Code; and

(2) any system to implement subsection 922(t) of title 18, United States Code, that does not require and result in the destruction of any identifying information submitted by or on behalf of any person who has been determined not to be prohibited from possessing or receiving a firearm no more than 24 hours after the system advises a Federal firearms licensee that possession or receipt of a firearm by the prospective transferee would not violate subsection (g) or (n) of section 922 of title 18, United States Code, or State law.

SEC. 612. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel of the Department of Justice to obligate more than $625,000,000 during fiscal year 2007 from the fund established by section 1402 of chapter XIV of title II of Public Law 98–473 (42 U.S.C. 10601).

SEC. 613. None of the funds made available to the Department of Justice in this Act may be used to discriminate against or denigrate the religious or moral beliefs of students who participate in programs for which financial assistance is provided from those funds, or of the parents or legal guardians of such students.

SEC. 614. None of the funds made available in this Act may be transferred to any department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government, except pursuant to a transfer made by, or transfer authority provided in, this Act or any other appropriations Act.

SEC. 615. The Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Small Business Administration shall, not later than two months after the date of the enactment of this Act, certify that telecommuting opportunities have increased over levels certified to the Committees on Appropriations for fiscal year 2006: *Provided*, That, of the total amounts appropriated to the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Science Foundation, the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Small Business Administration, $5,000,000 shall be available to each only upon such certification: *Provided further*, That each Department or agency shall provide quarterly reports to the Committees on Appropriations on the status of telecommuting programs, including the number and percentage of Federal employees eligible for, and participating in, such programs: *Provided further*, That each Department or agency shall maintain a ''Telework Coordinator'' to be responsible for overseeing the implementation and operations of telecommuting programs, and serve as a point of contact on such programs for the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 616. Any funds provided in this Act under ''National Science Foundation'' used to implement E-Government Initiatives shall be subject to the procedures set forth in section 605 of this Act.

SEC. 617. (a) Tracing studies conducted by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives are released without adequate disclaimers regarding the limitations of the data.

(b) The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives shall include in all such data releases, language similar to the following that would make clear that trace data cannot be used to draw broad conclusions about firearms-related crime:

(1) Firearm traces are designed to assist law enforcement authorities in conducting investigations by tracking the sale and possession of specific firearms. Law enforcement agencies may request firearms traces for any reason, and those reasons are not necessarily reported to the Federal Government. Not all firearms used in crime are traced and not all firearms traced are used in crime.

(2) Firearms selected for tracing are not chosen for purposes of determining which types, makes or models of firearms are used for illicit purposes. The firearms selected do not constitute a random sample and should not be considered representative of the larger universe of all firearms used by criminals, or any subset of that universe. Firearms are normally traced to the first retail seller, and sources reported for firearms traced do not necessarily represent the sources or methods by which firearms in general are acquired for use in crime.

SEC. 618. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act may be used to issue patents on claims directed to or encompassing a human organism.

SEC. 619. None of the funds made available in this Act shall be used in any way whatsoever to support or justify the use of torture by any official or contract employee of the United States Government.

SEC. 620. For an additional amount under the heading ''Small Business Administration, Salaries and Expenses'', $20,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2008, shall be for initiatives related to small business development and entrepreneurship, including programmatic and construction activities: *Provided*, That amounts made available under this section shall be provided in accordance with the terms and conditions specified in the statement of managers accompanying this Act.

SEC. 621. Of the amounts made available in this Act, $674,155,851 from ''Department of State''; $45,635,505 from ''Department of Justice''; $20,678,269 from ''Department of Commerce''; $771,279 from ''United States Trade Representative''; $1,238,808 from ''Broadcasting Board of Governors''; $377,722 from ''National Aeronautics and Space Administration''; and $120,173 from ''National Science Foundation'' shall be available for the purposes of implementing the Capital Security Cost Sharing program.

SEC. 622. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law or treaty, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under this Act or any other Act may be expended or obligated by a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States to pay administrative expenses or to compensate an officer or employee of the United States in connection with requiring an export license for the export to Canada of components, parts, accessories or attachments for firearms listed in Category I, section 121.1 of title 22, Code of Federal Regulations

(International Trafficking in Arms Regulations (ITAR), part 121, as it existed on April 1, 2005) with a total value not exceeding $500 wholesale in any transaction, provided that the conditions of subsection (b) of this section are met by the exporting party for such articles.

(b) The foregoing exemption from obtaining an export license—

(1) does not exempt an exporter from filing any Shipper's Export Declaration or notification letter required by law, or from being otherwise eligible under the laws of the United States to possess, ship, transport, or export the articles enumerated in subsection (a); and

(2) does not permit the export without a license of—

(A) fully automatic firearms and components and parts for such firearms, other than for end use by the Federal Government, or a Provincial or Municipal Government of Canada;

(B) barrels, cylinders, receivers (frames) or complete breech mechanisms for any firearm listed in Category I, other than for end use by the Federal Government, or a Provincial or Municipal Government of Canada; or

(C) articles for export from Canada to another foreign destination.

(c) In accordance with this section, the District Directors of Customs and postmasters shall permit the permanent or temporary export without a license of any unclassified articles specified in subsection (a) to Canada for end use in Canada or return to the United States, or temporary import of Canadian-origin items from Canada for end use in the United States or return to Canada for a Canadian citizen.

(d) The President may require export licenses under this section on a temporary basis if the President determines, upon publication first in the Federal Register, that the Government of Canada has implemented or maintained inadequate import controls for the articles specified in subsection (a), such that a significant diversion of such articles has and continues to take place for use in international terrorism or in the escalation of a conflict in another nation. The President shall terminate the requirements of a license when reasons for the temporary requirements have ceased.

SEC. 623. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States receiving appropriated funds under this Act or any other Act shall obligate or expend in any way such funds to pay administrative expenses or the compensation of any officer or employee of the United States to deny any application submitted pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2778(b)(1)(B) and qualified pursuant to 27 CFR Sec. 478.112 or .113, for a permit to import United States origin ''curios or relics'' firearms, parts, or ammunition.

SEC. 624. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to include in any new bilateral or multilateral trade agreement the text of—

(1) paragraph 2 of article 16.7 of the United States-Singapore Free Trade Agreement;

(2) paragraph 4 of article 17.9 of the United States-Australia Free Trade Agreement; or

(3) paragraph 4 of article 15.9 of the United States-Morocco Free Trade Agreement.

SEC. 625. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay expenses for any United States delegation to any specialized agency, body, or commission of the United Nations if such commission is chaired or presided over by a country, the government of which the Secretary of State has determined, for purposes of section 6(j)(1) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2405(j)(1)), has provided support for acts of international terrorism.

SEC. 626. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to carry out any diplomatic operations in Libya or accept the credentials of any representative of the Government of Libya until such time as the President certifies to Congress that Libya has taken irrevocable steps to pay, in its entirety, the total amount of the settlement commitment of $10,000,000 to the surviving families of each decedent of Pan Am Flight 103 and certifies to Congress that Libya will continue to work in good faith to resolve the outstanding cases of United States victims of terrorism sponsored or supported by Libya, including the settlement of the La Belle Discotheque bombing.

SEC. 627. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used in contravention of the Federal buildings performance and reporting requirements of Executive Order 13123, part 3 of title V of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 8251 et seq.), or subtitle A of title I of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (including the amendments made thereby).

SEC. 628. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Government of the United States to enter into a basing rights agreement between the United States and Iraq.

□ 1330

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY:

At the end of title VI, insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) MINIMUM WAGE.—Section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''and not less than $5.15 an hour'' and inserting ''not less than $5.15 an hour''; and

(2) by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: '', not less than $5.85 an hour beginning on January 1, 2007, not less than $6.55 an hour beginning on January 1, 2008, and not less than $7.25 an hour beginning on January 1, 2009''.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF MINIMUM WAGE TO THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS.—(1) Section 6 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206) shall apply to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the minimum wage applicable to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands under section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(a)(1))—

(A) shall be $3.55 an hour, beginning on the 60th day after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) shall be increased by $0.50 an hour (or such lesser amount as may be necessary to equal the minimum wage under section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938), beginning 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act and every 6 months thereafter until the minimum wage applicable to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands under this subsection is equal to the minimum wage set forth in such section.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

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

Mr. Chairman, it has been 9 years since this country has adjusted the minimum wage. During that time, the food prices have gone up almost 25 percent. Health care costs overall have gone up over 40 percent. Insurance has almost doubled. Gasoline prices have doubled. Energy prices have gone out of sight, and yet people are still struggling along on the same minimum wage that they were paid 9 years ago.

To try to do something about that, we offered an amendment to the Labor-Health-Education-Social Services bill in the full committee. Every Democrat voted for that amendment, and so did seven Republicans. But after that happened and the amendment had passed, the Labor-Health-Education appropriations bill was blocked from consideration by the leadership of this House and by the Rules Committee.

Therefore, when this bill came before the full committee, we attempted once again to adjust the minimum wage in three increments of 70 cents each, because we believe that no one who works 40 hours a week ought to go home in poverty. We, this time, did not receive the support of those same seven Republicans. Five of them voted against us. The other two missed the vote, and so that amendment was lost.

We, therefore, asked the Rules Committee to make in order an amendment on this bill which would adjust that minimum wage, and that is what I am trying to do today.

I recognize that if the point of order is lodged against this amendment, that we will once again be blocked from our effort to provide an increase in the minimum wage, but I just want to say to those who say this is not the proper vehicle and we should try to do it on some other bill, that for 9 years we have been waiting for the majority party to find the right vehicle to accomplish this. And for 9 years, nothing has happened.

The issue comes down to this: Whose side are you on? Are you willing to help adjust that minimum wage upward or are you not? This is one effort to find out.

For those who think this is just a political or an academic exercise, I told the House on the debate on the rule that I recall, after my parents were divorced and my mother was trying to get along on the minimum wage, and I remember how it was to run out of money before you ran out of days on the calendar each month. So she would find some household item that she could take down to Etzkin's Pawn Shop and pawn to get the family through the week.

The outrage is that today that minimum wage has far less purchasing power than it did when she was earning

it years ago. I think that is an absolute disgrace.

The wealthiest 1 percent of people in this country have 33 percent of the Nation's wealth. The poorest 40 percent of the people in this country are struggling to hang on to 3 percent of the Nation's wealth. That kind of gap is wrong.

This is one of the few things the Congress can do to directly impact the size of that gap. I think we have an economic obligation. I think we have a moral obligation to make this happen, and I am not interested in playing jurisdictional dunghill niceties about which committee is supposed to handle this bill. This bill ought to be out on the floor. This amendment ought to pass.

I would ask that the majority party not offer a point of order against the amendment so that we can finally bring some justice to people who are struggling in the shadows of life, who are struggling on life's underside. We can make their lives just a little bit more pleasant by passing this amendment, and I would think that, given the fact that the Congress has just in this House determined to accept a COLA for itself, I would think that we would have significantly less embarrassment if we would recognize that it takes 4 months for someone working at the minimum wage to make the same amount of money that Congress will gain by way of a COLA. It is outrageous to adjust congressional COLAs and not adjust the minimum wage. So I would urge that no one lodge a point of order against this amendment.

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

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

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

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

I believe it is an appropriate issue to debate, but the appropriate forum for debate is with the authorizing committees and with an opportunity for both sides on the issue to present their cases.

Today's pending legislation is not a place for the debate, and I would hope that the authorizing committee would schedule hearings and bring forward a bill and let the House work its will. That is the way we do it. Authorizers hold hearings, look at the impact, come back, report out a bill, and let the committee and the House work its will.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I do make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill. Therefore, it violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part, an amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if it changes existing law. The amendment directly amends the existing law, and I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the rules of the House normally indicate that this legislation would be handled by the authorizing committee, but I would note that on the appropriation conference report just several months ago, the majority leader in the Senate added 40 pages of authorizing language to the Defense bill, language which protected the pharmaceutical industry in this country from suit.

And it would seem to me that if it is legitimate for the majority leader of the Senate to do that, in order to protect a privileged industry in this country, that we could find a way in the House rules to protect the interests of the lowest-income wage earners in the country, but I must reluctantly concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded and sustained. The amendment is out of order.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for a colloquy with the chairman.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise today to engage in a colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. WOLF. I understand and know quite frankly that the chairman has been a long-time advocate of public diplomacy and democracy through educational and cultural exchanges, and I would like to express my very strong support of his work. I truly appreciate his willingness to highlight these issues today of mutual concern.

So, Mr. Chairman, I come to the floor today to raise an issue that is important for our hemispheric foreign policy. For quite a few years, many in this body have stressed the importance of improving relations with Latin America and the Caribbean by strengthening educational exchange initiatives.

Many American students who spend time studying abroad are among our Nation's greatest assets, and this is especially true with regards to our hemispheric neighbors.

Many elected leaders in Latin America and the Caribbean spent some time studying here in the United States. They applied the skills and the values that they learned in the United States upon returning to their home countries.

For instance, in the wake of recent natural disasters, many Caribbean leaders who studied here were able to draw on their experience and networks of contacts when facing challenges.

The need for strengthening the human capital and democratic values is ever pressing as natural disasters, perhaps among the most severe destabilizing force, constantly wreak havoc on the region.

Hurricanes, floods, landslides, earthquakes are becoming more frequent. It takes years and sometimes decades to recover, and I know that we can all personally attest to how a natural disaster shakes a nation's foundation to its very core.

Educational exchange opportunities are an investment with the greatest return. By developing human capital, we are securing our hemisphere by planting the seeds of democracy and success.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I want to assure the gentlewoman from California that I agree that educational exchange initiatives are an important component of our hemispheric foreign policy.

The fact is, as you were speaking, I thought of my daughter Rebecca who was in an exchange program and actually taught down in Honduras, Tegucigalpa, for 2 years. The relationships, the friendships, and the opportunities she made were life changing. I think you make a very powerful point.

I appreciate the gentlewoman's intention in raising this issue, and I want to assure her that I will be mindful of this issue as this bill moves forward.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will further yield, I want to thank the gentleman for his attention to this issue and so many issues that are important to our country. I look forward to working together in standing up for democracy and improving relations with our hemispheric neighbors.

I want to thank you again, and I want to thank you for yielding me the time.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from California.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) and the other Members for a colloquy.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I do rise for purposes of engaging in a colloquy with you.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, I want to thank you and the ranking member, Mr. MOLLOHAN, for restoring funding for several critical Voice of America language services that were slated for reductions, including the Greek and Turkish services.

As cochair of the Hellenic Caucus and a strong supporter of resolving the Cyprus issue, I believe finding innovative ways to bring the two sides closer are necessary. The Greek and Turkish VOA services have proposed a new joint program initiative promoting the end of the division in Cyprus by engaging both Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot communities in a revised process using radio and television. This program would entail reporting on bicommunal developments, conducting

interviews with prominent figures and airing them as part of radio and TV dialogues, or bridges, if you will, between the two communities. As H.R. 5672 moves through the appropriations process, I hope, Mr. Chairman, you will work with members of the Hellenic and Turkish Caucuses to find the funding needed to initiate this new joint program.

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

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. WEXLER. Mr. Chairman, I, too, want to join my colleagues in expressing gratitude to Chairman WOLF for agreeing to enter into the colloquy.

I also want to thank the chairman and the ranking member, Mr. MOLLOHAN, for restoring full funding for Voice of America services, including funding for Turkey and Greece. I strongly believe this programming, which reaches millions, remains critical to peace, stability and democracy in the Middle East, Eastern Mediterranean and Balkans regions.

Mr. Chairman, for the first time, the Turkey Caucus and the Hellenic Caucus have joined forces to foster reconciliation on the island of Cyprus. Creating a distinct and separate VOA program for Cyprus provides advocates for reunification a unique opportunity to bring both sides back to the negotiating table.

We believe that the United States must play an active role in resolving differences between Greek and Turkish Cypriots, and the Voice of America Cyprus would be a positive step forward.

Thank you very much.

□ 1345

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mrs. MALONEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would like to add my support to what has already been said about the importance of developing a joint program initiative by the Greek and Turkish language services at the Voice of America to promote an end to the division of Cyprus and to help engage the Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot communities in a revived process aimed at their reunification.

Cyprus has been divided since 1974, way too long, and we all want this division to come to an end. I believe that this type of initiative would go a long way in making that happen by keeping the lines of communication between the two communities open.

I am especially pleased to join my fellow cochair and cofounder of the Hellenic Caucus, Representative BILIRAKIS, as well as the cochairs of the Turkish Caucus, Representatives WEXLER and WHITFIELD, in showing our collective support for this effort.

I would also like to thank Chairman WOLF and Ranking Member MOLLOHAN for restoring the cuts to valuable programs at the Voice of America, including the Greek and Turkey services, and I look forward to working with them on this new and exciting project for Cyprus.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield once again?

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Thank you again, Mr. Chairman.

This is really a pretty special thing when you come to think about it. This is the first time that we are working together with the Turkish Caucus on an issue which we all agree has enormous potential to benefit the relations and close the gap between the two communities; and I hope, sir, that you will work with us to find, along with Mr. MOLLOHAN, to find funding for this critical Cyprus reconciliation joint initiative.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank both you, Mr. BILIRAKIS, as well as Mr. WEXLER and Mrs. MALONEY of New York. It really does offer an opportunity. It is kind of an historic moment, in some respects, for this reconciliation opportunity.

So I support the efforts aimed at bringing a solution to the Cyprus issue and agree that new avenues should be explored. I really commend you for doing this. I share your concerns and really will be pleased to work with my colleagues to explore what might be done to gain support for this new joint initiative to someday bring peace and reconciliation to the area.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman WOLF and Mr. MOLLOHAN for their consideration and for yielding us the time, and I look forward to working with both of you in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VII—RESCISSIONS

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

VIOLENT CRIME REDUCTION TRUST FUND

(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances available under this heading, $8,000,000 are rescinded.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

TELECOMMUNICATIONS CARRIER COMPLIANCE FUND

(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances available under this heading, $39,000,000 are rescinded.

LEGAL ACTIVITIES

ASSETS FORFEITURE FUND

(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances available under this heading, $152,787,000 are rescinded.

OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS

STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances available under this heading from prior year appropriations, $127,500,000 are rescinded.

COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES

(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances available under this heading from prior year appropriations, $127,500,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

EMERGENCY STEEL GUARANTEED LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances available under this heading from prior year appropriations, $38,607,000 are rescinded.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

CENTER FOR MIDDLE EASTERN-WESTERN DIALOGUE TRUST FUND

(RESCISSION)

Of the funds available under this heading, $10,000,000 are rescinded.

RELATED AGENCIES

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances available under this heading, $6,100,000 are rescinded.

BUSINESS LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances available under this heading, $5,000,000 are rescinded.

DISASTER LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(RESCISSION)

Of the unobligated balances available under this heading, $3,700,000 are rescinded.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. TANCREDO

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 25 offered by Mr. TANCREDO:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enforce any of the provisions in the Memorandum to all Department and Agency Executive Secretaries dated, February 2, 2001, and entitled ''Guidelines on Relations With Taiwan''.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

This bipartisan amendment would prevent the State Department from expending any funds to enforce several arbitrary and archaic ''guidelines'' that inhibit or altogether prevent United States officials from communicating with their counterparts in Taiwan.

These restrictions range from just silly to downright absurd.

These so-called guidelines, among other things, do not permit meetings with Taiwanese diplomats or elected officials in Department of State buildings, the White House, or the Old Executive Office Building.

They prevent executive branch personnel from the foreign affairs agencies and those above the rank of GS–14 from attending Taiwan's annual holiday reception in Washington.

They prevent executive branch personnel from attending meetings at Twin Oaks, which is the former residence of Taiwan's ambassador here in Washington.

They prevent travel to Taiwan by any officials above a certain rank from the Defense Department and the State Department.

They explicitly prohibit executive branch personnel from corresponding directly with Taiwanese officials. Instead, the guidelines mandate that communications be sent through a third party.

The guidelines even stipulate that ''indirect'' communications not be printed on official letterhead, and they prohibit U.S. personnel from using the official title of the Taiwanese official to whom the letter is being sent.

Executive branch officials are even directed ''not to refer to Taiwan's democratically elected government as a 'government.''' Instead, they are directed to use the strange term ''Taiwan authorities.''

Mr. Chairman, these guidelines needlessly complicate our ability to effectively communicate with our friends in Taiwan. As a result, Taipei and Washington often find themselves talking past each other through the international media instead of communicating face-to-face. It makes absolutely no sense and helps no one.

Mr. Chairman, these self-imposed guidelines raise serious questions about who is really in charge and calling the shots when it comes to the U.S. policy in Taiwan. Is it the Congress or is it the Communist governments in Beijing?

I ask for an ''aye'' vote on the amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I will accept the amendment, but I just wanted to highlight how ludicrous it is, and I think the gentleman has pointed it out, but to have those requirements on Taiwan when China is spying against us. In this bill is funding for the FBI to keep the Chinese from spying against us.

There is no persecution in Taiwan. On Monday, we had a meeting with the Cardinal Kung Foundation, and they pointed out that there are now 40, 40 Catholic bishops and priests in jail in China. There are zero in jail in Taiwan. This is serious, and I am glad the gentleman offered this.

There are 4,000 to 6,000 evangelicals, house church leaders, men and women, in prison in China today. The latest figure as of Monday. There are zero in Taiwan. There are Buddhist monks and nuns in Tibet being persecuted, and President Hu was the one who put the policy together. It is against the law to have a picture of the Dalai Lama. But there are no Tibetan monks or nuns being persecuted in Taiwan.

Maybe we should have the Taiwan regulations apply to the embassy in Beijing and reverse it.

Lastly, just so people know this, there is great persecution against the Uighers, the Muslims in China. And to show you how close this comes to home, Mr. LANTOS and my office worked to have Reba Kadeer released, she was in prison for 5 years, by agreeing to meet with a congressional delegation. She went through a difficult time. Five years in solitary confinement. She got out. Now there was a staff codel to meet with her kids 3 weeks ago, and they have now arrested her three children and they are in jail. One was beaten and pummeled.

The Chinese security police sent out agents to northern Virginia to spy on her, and they took the license plates down of their cars and their public security police.

So I think the only difference I have with the gentleman's amendment is that these restrictions that are on Taiwan should have been on the American embassy in Beijing. It is just the opposite. It is like that Simon and Garfunkel song, The Boxer: Man hears what he wants to hear and disregards the rest.

There is tremendous growing persecution in China of the Catholic church. Some of these bishops are in their 80s. One, Bishop Su, has not been seen since 8 years ago. He gave Holy Communion to Congressman CHRIS SMITH. I repeat: 4,000 to 6,000 evangelicals, Buddhist monks and nuns, and now the Uighers.

So I am glad the gentleman offered this amendment, and I urge it to be strongly passed.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I do not see Mr. ANDREWS, who was coauthor. Therefore, I will simply say that I would hope that we invalidate these nonsensical guidelines, allow our government to communicate directly with Taiwan's democratically elected government the same way we communicate with other friendly governments.

I ask for an ''aye'' vote.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Tancredo-Andrews-Chabot-Brown amendment.

As my colleagues know, Taiwan is one of our strongest and most loyal allies. It is also a democracy that has a multi-party political system that recognizes individual liberty and respects human rights.

Just across the Taiwan Strait is the People's Republic of China. It is not a democracy. It has an abysmal human rights record. It does not recognize the rule of law. It practices religious persecution. It warehouses political prisoners. It carries out a coercive abortion policy. And it has more than 800 missiles pointed at Taiwan.

Our government treats the PRC and Taiwan differently. Now, in a logical world, we would work closely with our democratic ally. We would treat our friend with the respect it deserves. We would welcome the leaders of Taiwan with open arms and conduct frequent high-level exchanges. But we don't do that.

What we do, under the umbrella of our so-called One China policy, is just the opposite. We invite high level military officials from the People's Liberation Army to visit the Pentagon. We welcome the communist dictator to the White House with a twenty-one gun salute.

We treat our democratic friends from Taiwan quite a bit differently. In fact, the democratically elected President of Taiwan is not permitted to come to Washington, D.C. Nor is the Vice-President, the Defense Minister, or the Foreign Minister.

Just a few weeks ago, only two weeks after Communist China's dictator, Hu Jintao, was welcomed to the White House, Taiwan's democratically-elected leader, President Chen Shui-bian was told he could not make transit stops in the United States on his way to Paraguay and Costa Rica. Instead, he was told that he could refuel his aircraft in Alaska and be on his way. Some way to treat a friend.

What kind of message are we sending here?

The Tancredo-Andrews-Chabot-Brown amendment would not change our ''One China'' policy . . . although I would not be averse to that. It simply lifts a number of tired, old guidelines that deter or prevent high level U.S. officials from communicating with their counterparts from Taiwan. We should treat Taiwan like we treat our other allies. It is dangerous to do otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, let's do the right thing. Let's scrap these counterproductive guidelines. Adopt the Tancredo-Andrews-Chabot-Brown amendment.

Mr. TANCREDO. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. BEAN) for a colloquy with the chairman.

Ms. BEAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for agreeing to engage in a colloquy on Internet safety.

Mr. Chairman, many of our constituents enjoy access to the valuable resources available on the Internet, and yet many are growingly feeling under siege from the increasing dangers lurking on the Internet. Cyber criminals use spyware, phishing schemes, sales schemes, and on-line identity theft, wreaking havoc on American lives each year. These threats include a growing number of predators exploiting popular networking Web sites in search of young victims. Unfortunately, despite intense media attention, many parents and children are unaware of these risks or how best to protect themselves.

The FTC estimates that its Bureau of Consumer Protection devotes at least 10 percent and likely more of its resources to these Internet safety and security initiatives. As the role of the Internet continues to grow even more in the daily lives of Americans, more crimes are moving to the net. The FTC expects that, as these trends continue,

it will need to devote a growing share of its resources to preventing and pursuing cyber crimes under its jurisdiction.

I respectfully request of the chairman that the committee continue to work with the FTC to ensure that these efforts receive the resources they need to vigorously promote Internet safety public awareness and make prevention of cyber crimes a national priority.

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

Ms. MOLLOHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Illinois for her hard work to promote Internet safety.

Just recently, Congressman KIRK, who has been a leader on this, has raised this in our hearings a number of times.

Congressman KIRK and I urged the FTC to issue a national consumer alert to parents and children about the risk of sites like MySpace. I would say if any mother or father is listening, to have your children involved in MySpace is a mistake. So what I think you are trying to do and what Mr. KIRK is doing is very good.

I share the gentlewoman's concerns and commit to continue looking into the matter to ensure the FTC is devoting sufficient resources to fight Internet predators and protect children.

Ms. BEAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from West Virginia will continue to yield, I want to offer my sincere thanks to the chairman for his leadership on the issue of Internet safety and look forward to working with him in the future in our efforts to protect American families.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be read.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to fund the Tooling and Machining Association in Rochester, New York.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

□ 1400

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, yesterday we had quite a discussion on this bill. There were efforts to move money from paying for the census, for example, to other areas of the bill or other priorities. There was a lot of talk about limited resources and the limited amount of money in this bill and the need to take money from one area to put into another.

I would submit that one area that we can take some money from that is overfunded, grossly overfunded, in this bill is in some of these earmarks. Now, I will maybe highlight 10 of them today, but there are literally hundreds in the bill that we could take the money from to fund our constitutional obligation, for example, to conduct the census every 10 years.

But I will start today with 250,000 for the Rochester, New York, Tooling and Machining Association for a workforce development program; that is an earmark. This amendment would strip that funding. The Rochester Tool and Machining Association is one chapter of a larger international tooling and machining association, which is the national representative of the custom precision manufacturing industry in the United States.

They maintain a legislative alert center on their Web site so their members can lobby Congress on issues that matter to them. They also retain a lobbying firm to advance their interests with the Federal Government. It would seem that they are doing yeoman's work for their members, as is their Rochester chapter. Their Rochester chapter offers technical training and education to its members.

They assert on their Web site that manufacturing job opportunities are not declining and that manufacturing accounts for 24 percent of the private sector jobs in New York State. They go on to claim that the size of the workforce is declining and that there are insufficient skilled workers to fill these available jobs, which I can only assume is what this earmark is for.

What we have here is simple supply and demand, not enough skilled workers for too many jobs, an equation that is normally balanced by the free market, until this earmark. For those who buy into the idea that it is the Federal Government's responsibility to plan and shape the supply and demands of our workforce, my objection to this earmark will not resonate with you.

But for those who have witnessed the profound failures of central planning in countries around the world during the 1970s and the 1980s, I hope that you will understand that this earmark is a mini-economic boost by a Federal, centralized government, to increase the supply of one industry's workers over another industry.

I would submit that if there is such a demand for skilled manufacturers, as the association claims, then wages will increase, and the workforce will adapt, and they will learn ways and skills necessary to earn those wages. Let the market decide which industries succeed or fail, not politicians in Washington.

I would like to hear the justification for the Federal function in this case, but then I ask, why are we picking winners and losers through the earmarking process? Why is this industry, this sector, these workers, more deserving than others? I don't think Congress should be picking favorites like this.

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

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

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

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS).

Mr. REYNOLDS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Virginia for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona. It is the responsibility of all Members of this distinguished body to faithfully represent the interests and well being of their constituents.

I come to this Chamber again today to once again support the needs of my home district, where job creation continues to be the number one priority of western New York. The Federal investment included by the Appropriations Committee for the Rochester Tooling and Machining Association is welcome news for western New York.

I appreciate that the chairman of the committee recognizes, as I do, that this project is worthy of Federal involvement through the Small Business Administration and will be used to meet the ultimate objective of creating and retaining good high-paying jobs for the hardworking Americans I represent.

The Rochester Tooling and Machining Association is a nonprofit organization whose mission is to promote the development and improvement of tooling, machining and contract manufacturing industries in Monroe County and western New York. They have been the region's leading association for the tooling and machining cluster for over 60 years.

With more than 500 tooling and machine companies in Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse communities, employing approximately 16,000 people, these companies clearly have a significant economic impact in my region. The goal in this project is to assist these firms with necessary training in advanced manufacturing methods which will enhance their competitive position by reducing costs and maximizing efficiencies.

The association plans to implement programs in lean manufacturing and Six Sigma training, which will streamline business manufacturing and business practices and cut down on unnecessary expenses. By implementing proven business training techniques, we can ensure our manufacturers increase their competitiveness in today's global marketplace.

This project will be a big boost to the marketability of our manufacturing sector and help with new business activity for the region, which will lead to

job retention and, hopefully, job creation. The stated goal of the Small Business Administration is to ''maintain and strengthen the Nation's economy by aiding, counseling and assisting and protecting the interests of small businesses.'' This funding is completely in line with those principles.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I would simply say, again, we all say it is our job to represent our constituents, and it certainly is. But we are in a deficit situation. We have a massive deficit and a massive Federal debt.

What if every Member of Congress said, I am going to represent my constituents by getting every Federal dollar that I can back into my district, regardless of the deficit, regardless of the debt.

That is pretty much where we are at right now. When you had, I think last year was $27 billion in earmarks, where does it end? When do we say enough is enough? When do we say, I am not going to pick this industry over that one?

That workforce may be worthy of this kind of help, but what makes it more worthy than another one? Why do we just continue with the spoils system where if you happen to get with this group and they happen to be lucky enough to get your earmark, they get funded, but nobody else does? We simply can't continue this.

I urge support of the amendment.

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

Mr. WOLF. I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona.

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to fund the Arthur Avenue Retail Market.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I am a big fan of Italian food. My district is home to a great Italian restaurant, Anzio's Landing. You can order many of your favorite dishes, good Italian bread, and there are many former New Yorkers in my district, and they know it well. But if the owner of this restaurant, whom I know well, if he approached me to get a Federal earmark to modernize his restaurant, I would have to tell him ''fuhgetaboudit.''

Today I am bringing this amendment to learn whether the rest of the House will agree with me on that premise. The bill before us today asks us to spend $150,000 in Federal taxpayer dollars to the Arthur Avenue Retail Market, an Italian grocery market in a neighborhood labeled Bronx's Little Italy. Over a dozen merchants currently reside in the market, including Joe Liberatore's Garden of Plenty, Peter's Meat Market and Mike's Deli, a two-generation family-owned business that sells antipasti, breads, meats, pasta, and imported cheeses. The market is also home to the La Casa Grande Tobacco Company, which offers hand-rolled cigars.

In 2004, the market received $300,000 in earmarked Federal dollars for renovations. The market received another $400,000 in Federal transportation appropriation dollars for a new parking facility in 2005. We are back.

In 1940, Mayor LaGuardia built an indoor Arthur Avenue Market to take street vendors out of the cold. This is where this originated.

In the 1980s, the merchants of the market formed a co-op and paid for renovations to that market. Now, there are long lines at the market on weekends to get great Italian bread, cheese and salami.

I would ask the sponsor of this amendment why close to $700,000 has been spent on this Italian grocery market and why another $150,000 in taxpayer funds is needed.

There is a lot of Federal prosciutto to bring back to the District, or that is, a lot of Federal prosciutto to bring back to the District for a private Italian grocery market. I think we need to slice off some of this appropriations bill. If there is a place to slice, this is certainly it.

What possible Federal purpose does this earmark serve? Does the taxpayer even get a free Italian cookie assortment? If we allow our tax money to go to this grocery market, what benefit is there for the Federal taxpayer? There are certainly plenty of private benefits, but what Federal benefit? How do we justify this?

I would argue that this is one cannoli the taxpayer doesn't want to take a bite out of.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Arizona's use of certain ethnic words like ''cannoli'' and ''prosciutto'' indicate that he takes this more lightly than he should. This is a serious thing that he is trying to do here. I know he is on this mission to destroy every bit of dollar that is sent by Members of Congress.

Let me start off by saying that I am a firm believer that Members know the needs of their districts best, and I am proud to be on the floor today to talk about this project so important to the Bronx.

The Arthur Avenue Retail Market is one of the most prominent, well frequented and historic business locations in my district. It represents a little bit of Italy in the midst of the Bronx. This space serves as an incubator for food-related businesses.

It is, however, not a grocery store, but, instead, a building owned by the City of New York. I think that is important to note. These dollars don't go into these businessmen's pockets or businesses for that matter; it goes into a building owned by the City of New York.

In 1940, during the time of Mayor LaGuardia, Arthur Avenue Market, the first enclosed retail market in the Bronx, was built to house street vendors who were crowding the sidewalks of the borough's Belmont community. Today, it is a local landmark.

So let me be perfectly clear. This is not a privately owned real estate venture but a public market which gives many new merchants a starting point as they work towards full economic participation in the country. This is a place where merchants running their own small businesses sell specialty products to people from the surrounding areas to visitors from throughout the tristate area and to local restaurants. As you know, I represent the poorest congressional district in our country, which is located in the middle of the richest city on Earth.

However, this market is a bright spot, and it is vital to the economic success of the Bronx. It is a place where vendors and other small business owners can fully participate in our economy. This small amount of funding that is being highlighted today is for continued facility improvements and maintenance to keep this historic market running.

Specifically, this funding, which will be used for refurbishments of the market, will include electrical and plumbing upgrades. The Arthur Avenue Retail Market owned by the City of New York is responsible for the maintenance.

The purpose of the Small Business Administration is to assist our small businesses. This is exactly what this market does, help small businesses in the Bronx to flourish and grow.

So I would ask my colleague, Mr. FLAKE, where his outrage was when lending institutions and insurance companies were taking billions of dollars from the borough of the Bronx in the 1970s and early 1980s through redlining and other forms of disinvestment. Where was he when one of the few commercial locations remained viable in spite of that?

I would also like to take the occasion to personally invite the gentleman

from Arizona to come to the 16th District. You said you had one Italian restaurant in your district. I feel sorry for you. You should have more than one. I can take you all over the Bronx where you could see people hard at work.

Lastly, on a more serious note, I wish you would be as outraged about other things as you are about this one. You voted to rebuild areas of Iraq with markets, schools and everything else you can think of, and yet you would pick on something like this, which helps a small group of businessmen stay vital in the Bronx.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for the invitation. I likely will take him up on it. Maybe I will learn to say ''prosciutto'' properly.

But we simply get back to the point, where does it end? Where do we stop favoring one group, one industry over another? It is mentioned that this is a city-owned facility. Those who are residing there, who have their markets there, already received that kind of subsidy apparently from the city.

□ 1415

Now we are going in addition and giving them further subsidy. $400,000 last year for a parking garage, $300,000 in 2004 for similar upgrades, $150,000 more today. My guess is that there are Italian eateries or restaurants or markets elsewhere in the city that are getting no subsidy at all. How is it fair to them? How is it fair to them to favor one?

And I would say the same if it were in my district. It is not fair to subsidize one and not the other, and that is where we are with this earmarking process.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

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

Mr. FLAKE. 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 Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to fund the Oil Region Alliance of Business, Industry, and Tourism.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this earmark limitation amendment would prohibit $200,000 in Federal funds from being provided to the Oil Region Alliance of Business, Industry and Tourism.

Now, the mission of the Oil Region Alliance of Business, Industry and Tourism is to ''increase the prosperity and population of the Oil Region'' of Pennsylvania. The point of the alliance is to ''entice people to live, work, learn and play in the valley that changed the world.''

I am certain this is an important organization to the oil region. These folks are working to ensure that the region's future is important as was its past. I have no problem with that. I don't think anyone does. Being the site of the world's first successful oil well in 1859, this area has played a crucial role in the country's history.

My only question is, why should the Federal Government pay to develop this area's business and tourism? Why this area and not other areas?

In April of this year, Governor Rendell congratulated the Pennsylvania tourism industry for having a record-breaking year last year.

The $25 billion tourism industry sold more hotel rooms than ever before and attracted more than 130 million visitors in 2005, making Pennsylvania the fifth most visited State in the Nation. Statewide, tourism accounts for more than 400,000 jobs and is the Commonwealth's second largest industry.

I have said it before, and I will continue to say it: when the Federal Government hands out earmarks like this, we are picking winners and losers. We are encouraging people to visit and to provide tourism to this area. They have to come from somewhere else. Why aren't we subsidizing those whom they choose not to go to? Where does it end? Where do we stop? Why do we simply have a spoils system where one Member of Congress can say, I am going to benefit them but not others?

In this case, the oil region of Pennsylvania receives funding to attract businesses to locate in the region, to try to get families to move there and to stay, and to try to attract tourist dollars.

As I mentioned, there are businesses and families and tourist dollars that won't be heading to other areas of Pennsylvania or surrounding States or anywhere else in the country. Many other localities throughout the country would like to receive as many tourism dollars as possible, but we are favoring one with this earmark.

Simply put, we shouldn't be doing this. The Federal Government shouldn't be picking winners and losers like this.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I will reserve the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I would begin by stating that if the gentleman from Arizona represented the Fifth District in Pennsylvania and the oil region alliance area, he wouldn't be offering this amendment. He represents an area where the average income is 40-some-thousand a year, where the region I represent that we are talking about today is 20-some-thousand, half, an area that used to be the home of Quaker State, just a decade ago, the home of Pennzoil, the home of Wolf's Head, Universal Cyclops. One of the finest steel mills in this country was in that region. I could list you the ex-corporations that used to employ my citizens.

He represents a district that has grown 40 percent in population in the last decade, where I have lost close to 20 percent in this region of population because of the loss of these industries.

Now, you can ignore them. You can let those areas, like he said, let the market work. When you lose the number of jobs that this region has lost, that is not a normal marketplace. And when you reach out and invest a few Federal or State dollars to help communities pull their way back up and build an economic base that will pay taxes into the State treasury, taxes in the Federal Treasury, now, if you let the marketplace work, you will fund unemployment benefits, you will fund welfare benefits and all the social programs, LIHEAP and all of those things to help people who don't have a decent job.

Folks, when we don't invest in areas that have lost major employers to restabilize their base, we are making a mistake as a country. We are making a mistake.

This marketplace is not exactly as he describes it. Let's see what his district is asking for. The Mesa area, on their Web page, they want $42 million for bus fleets this year, $54 million for light rail, $10 million for an airport, $18.6 for another airport, and $1 million for a community college, which we don't have, $30 million for a river restoration project, and $3.5 million for planning new projects.

A measly $200,000 investment in the area that had the greatest economic decline in Pennsylvania in the last decade and is struggling from the loss of not only oil but steel and glass and all other types of manufacturing. This little grant helps an organization not only in one county but four counties, helps local government leaders deal with these losses, help them better manage, train people to write for Federal and State grants, because little governments don't have grant writers.

I want to tell you, folks. This hard, calloused approach of not helping those who have been destroyed by corporate mergers and companies moving away is a mistake when we don't invest. This is

not pork. This is food for survival so people can regrow their economies and pay taxes back into this Treasury. It is about reinvesting in America and a part of America that was the stalwart of this country.

That area furnished us with the transportation system that we have today. When they discovered every oil company in the world has roots in the Oil City, Titusville, Franklin region, that is where they all started.

Folks, to abandon that area is not what America should be about. This is not pork. This is food to help an area survive and fend for themselves and grow and pay taxes into the Treasury.

It is easy for those who represent affluence, growing areas with great prosperity, who really don't need us. But those who are struggling need us, and we should be there to help them.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I would simply submit that every Member of Congress in 435 districts around the country can point to at least pockets in his or her district that need help, where there is high jobless rates or where there is high crime.

But where does it end? Where do we say, all right, we simply can't pass out earmarks like this and circumvent the normal authorization, appropriation, and oversight process? When does it become our job to say, all right, we are not going to go through that process and authorize these programs, appropriate and then have oversight. Instead, we are just going to slip an earmark in that we don't even know who sponsored until we offer it on the floor today. And if nobody was standing up here, we still wouldn't know.

There are hundreds and hundreds of earmarks in this bill that we wouldn't even know who is offering them or what they are for because the descriptions are often so vague as to what the earmark is supposed to fund.

So where does it end? Why can't every Member stand up and say, I have pockets in my district, if not my entire district, that need workforce development, that need facilities?

He mentioned my district has grown 40 percent in the past couple of years. It has. It has tremendous infrastructure needs. But if I were to come and say we need all the lists that he rattled off there, then the Treasury simply couldn't handle it.

We are put in this position to make decisions and to have priorities; and I would submit that when you have an earmarking process like that, we aren't going through it properly.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to fund the Fairplex Trade and Conference Center.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prevent any funding from going to the Fairplex Trade and Conference Center.

Fairplex is home to the Los Angeles County Fair, the largest county fair in the world. The fair is a great asset to California, contributing a major portion of the $11.6 million in State sales tax revenue generated by Fairplex and $176 million in spending.

The L.A. County Fair Association describes itself as self-supporting and boasts that it does not fall under the auspices of any county or State governmental body.

Surplus revenues that are generated by the fair and other activities are reinvested into the maintenance and development of the facility.

The association also states that Fairplex receives no government funding for the operation or maintenance of its facilities. However, Fairplex received $1 million in Federal funding for fiscal year 2006. If the money is not used for the operation or maintenance of this thriving independent facility, what is it used for?

Maybe the funding is intended for some other activities at the Fairplex, such as the Wally Parks NHRA Motor Sports Museum or the Frank Hawley Drag Racing School. Maybe these funds are for Fairplex Park, a major horse racing facility with a grandstand and air-conditioned clubhouse for satellite gambling.

There is no question that Fairplex delivers major economic benefits for L.A. County and the rest of California. But I do question, however, why the Federal Government is throwing money at an independent facility that generates over $334 million in economic activity nationwide. Fairplex does so well, in fact, that it donates more than $400,000 in cash and in kind to local organizations each year.

So why are we giving this earmark? That is the question.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to my friend from Arizona for raising one of the issues that he and I have worked closely on over the years.

As the Reading Clerk stated and as my friend from Arizona stated, this is the Fairplex Trade and Conference Center.

Mr. Chairman, 43 percent of the goods coming to and from the consumers and workers of the United States of America come through the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. One of the most important centers for trade, planning and strategic meetings has been held at the Fairplex.

It doesn't fall in my district. It is not in my district. It is in the district of my very distinguished colleague, Mrs. NAPOLITANO. But I will tell you, as we look at our quest of trying to open up new markets for U.S. goods and services all around the world and as we look at ensuring that American consumers can have access to the best quality product at the lowest possible price, the utilization of this trade and convention center is critically important.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have got to tell you that, as important as the issue of global trade is, I was really struck when last December I had the opportunity to listen to a friend of mine who happened to be at the Fairplex Trade and Convention Center, where it had taken place 2 weeks before that, unfortunately, of the eight planned voting sites for the Iraqi people who are here in the United States of America, looking forward, on December 15, to having the access to a voting station, one of those had, unfortunately, closed down.

□ 1430

And what happened? The people at the Fairplex Trade and Convention Center came forward, and literally at the drop of a hat, they were able to provide the chance for Iraqis who were in this country on December 15 of last year to exercise that right to vote. Their ability to be on the frontline to participate in the global war on terror is something that I think is vitally important.

I was listening on the phone as applause went up every single time that a ballot was placed into that voting box, and it was a great moment for us. And as, in the last 2 weeks, we have gotten word of the establishment of the completion of that cabinet with the defense and interior ministers there, it reminded me again of those votes that were cast at the Fairplex Trade and Convention Center that falls not in my district but in the district of Mrs. NAPOLITANO. This particular earmark is there helping us in the global war on terror and helping us remain competitive globally.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The gentleman from Arizona and I have had some conversation over this particular issue earlier today, and I did try to impress upon him that this is not just an earmark. This isn't pork.

This is, in fact, funding that would come from the Small Business Administration account for construction of the $25 million trade center that is going to be located at the Pomona State Fairgrounds, which, by the way, is also a proposed staging area for the Los Angeles County emergency staging for terrorism. And this is vital to the city of Pomona and the whole surrounding community not only east of the Los Angeles area but the Inland Empire, as was mentioned by my colleague, Congressman DREIER.

This would create jobs and assist businesses in an economically depressed as well as disadvantaged community and, of course, as many of us already know, the number one crime city in the State of California. The unemployment rates are exceedingly high.

Now, this new addition to the fairgrounds, the Trade and Conference Center, will generate 1,700 full-time jobs, provide a large economic stimulus in the community where now a lot of people are out of work; businesses are moving partly because of NAFTA and others, let me tell you. But 90 small businesses are already signed and registered to work at this new facility or to be able to be exposed there. The Fairplex is a very well respected, nonprofit event center hosting yearly over 300 activities, including the Los Angeles County Fair, and attracts hundreds of thousands of people. It is used for Federal events and, as you just recently heard, for the Iraqi elections. And last but not least, it is also used for naturalization ceremonies.

I wish to thank my colleague, Chairman DREIER, for his support of the project that affects the many surrounding communities of southern Los Angeles. And as the Representative for Pomona, I am proud to support this bid of $750,000, which will benefit jobs and the economy in this area. And in helping this project move forward, I certainly thank you and look forward to the support for defeating the amendment.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the gentlewoman and for the gentleman who spoke, and I appreciate their efforts on behalf of this initiative. But, again, I have to say, where does it end? Where does it end when we say, this group, this organization, this facility is worthy of Federal dollars, and another is not? It simply isn't fair to continue to give earmarks like this in this manner.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to fund the Bronx Council on the Arts.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

I would ask Members of this body, how would you define irony?

I define it as providing a Federal earmark money to the Bronx Council on the Arts, which is an entity that is advertising an event on its Web site called, Pay to Play.

Pay to Play, according to the Bronx Council's Web site is ''a multimedia exhibition ala Abramoff, Scanlon, Cunningham, Halliburton and on and on and on.'' The Web site states that ''artists are asked to offer a bribe to participate in the show that will be on display alongside selected work. Please note that special consideration will be given to work that addresses corruption, greed, scandal, cover-ups, failures of democracy, the transparent veneer of public interest that masks rampant self-interest, and such other things.''

I am not saying the earmark for Bronx Council of the Arts fits any of these categories, but I am saying that it is sadly ironic that we are funding artistic parodies of congressional earmarking with earmarks.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would strike funding for the Bronx Council for marketing local arts initiatives. My staff and I were befuddled as to what the Bronx Council originally was. It appears that a Bronx Council got money last year in the same section of the bill, but the earmark was called, ''$150,000 for the Bronx Council for the Arts for its Arts Cultural Corridor Project to promote local arts initiatives.''

So we went from Bronx Council on the Arts to just the Bronx Council. We dropped the ''Arts Cultural Corridor Project,'' and we are no longer promoting local arts, but we are marketing them. I call this the Earmark Protection Program, changing the names of earmarks to make them so vague that no one can recognize them and no amendment can be drafted to strike them.

We often have trouble when we are offering these earmarks. We are told by the Parliamentarian that it has to refer to a specific facility or a specific initiative, and these earmarks this year, many of the names have been changed to be more vague, and it is difficult to know what they actually fund. As mentioned a few weeks ago, we had earmarks to simply fund a facility without reference to what that facility was. It is difficult to have amendments that are actually ruled in order to challenge them because, as the Parliamentarians will tell you, to successfully challenge an earmark, it requires an assumption that the agency that funds the earmark is familiar with the project. Otherwise, we might be legislating on an appropriation bill, which is a violation of our rules. The incentive, therefore, for Members looking to protect earmarks is to become more vague or silent about the project's goals and the project's oversight.

I would submit that we should get used to more earmarks entering this protection program in the near future to prevent them from being stripped from appropriation bills. I would welcome an explanation as to what this earmark actually does.

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York to speak on this issue.

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry Dr. Weldon is reluctantly rising.

But, first of all, I notice that three of the gentleman's 10 amendments are directed at New York. I do not know what you are angry about; the Diamondbacks beat the Yankees in the World Series, so you shouldn't be that upset. But the fact of life is that the more you get up on these, sir, the more I realize that you do not know what you are talking about because you seem to spend so much time on either the wording or how it appears when, in fact, you do very little to understand what it is.

The Bronx Council on the Arts is a private, nonprofit membership organization that has been in existence for over 40 years and is the official cultural agency of Bronx County. It is recognized nationally as a leading art services organization, serving a multicultural constituency of more than 1.2 million residents.

Now, I know that the big problem the gentleman from Arizona has is the word ''arts'' because there seems to be some belief by a lot of Members of Congress, or some, that we should not in any way be involved in promoting the arts, and if the arts express themselves in a way that we do not like, then we shouldn't even go close to them. So I wish that I could just always not call it something like the arts, but I do because that is what it is.

In this case the word ''arts'' is used in conjunction with the words ''small business.'' This funding belongs in the small business account because it will be used to grow our small businesses that have arts-related portfolios. It will specifically promote an Artisans Initiative which will facilitate business

development among local Bronx artisans, especially newly arrived immigrants, and help them establish their own small business. It will help with their skills development and assist their product marketing. It will also be used to train Bronx artists to market their skills and to develop business plans.

Small businesses devoted to the arts have an important role to play. For example, the Bronx Council on the Arts has had success in training the unemployed and underemployed residents of New York City as professional art handlers. Some have gone on to start their own small business as independent contractors.

Let me conclude by saying that I represent, as you know, the poorest congressional district in the Nation. I make no excuses about getting the Federal Government to earmark dollars into that district. Let me repeat that again: I make no excuses about the fact that I earmark dollars to go into the poorest congressional district in the Nation, which is situated in the richest city on Earth.

If the gentleman from Arizona wants to have an impact on our deficit, an impact on how we spend dollars, then let him stand up there the next time we are paying for the war in Iraq, a waste of money that is going to build all kinds of facilities in Iraq, a war based on lies told to this Congress. Then you stand up there and you cut at least 1 billion from the over $400 billion that we are spending in Iraq already. But I never saw you get up and complain about the fact that we are building arts facilities in Iraq, that we are building supermarkets in Iraq, that we are promoting basketball in Iraq, that we are promoting baseball in Iraq. You haven't said a word. But a couple hundred thousand dollars to one group of American citizens, that is a problem for you.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume for a question, and I would like to yield to the gentleman to answer.

Is this the same council that received the earmark last year, just for my clarification?

Mr. SERRANO. Yes. And I told you it was and I used the name that is appropriate for it. Call it a typographical error.

Mr. FLAKE. I will do that. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

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

Mr. FLAKE. 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 Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to fund the Johnstown Area Regional Industries organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

In last year's conference report on the SSJC appropriations bill, there was a $250,000 earmark for the JARI, which stands for Johnstown Area Regional Industries, Workforce Development Program. There was a separate $250,000 earmark for the JARI Small Business Technology Center. This year, there is a $500,000 earmark for the JARI Workforce Development Program and the Small Business Technology Center. We also found a separate $800,000 earmark for JARI for a Regional Business Incubator.

Aside from all other arguments that can be made against this kind of earmarking, I want to point out what appears to be a trend toward obfuscation in the language of earmarks. In drafting a limitation amendment to prevent funding to the JARI Regional Business Incubator, we used the earmark language exactly as it appears in the bill.

□ 1445

We then asked the Parliamentarians to review it to make sure it would be in order. We were informed that the ''region business incubator'' verbiage was too vague to be considered in order. So in drafting this amendment, we had no choice but to limit funding to JARI, period. The effect of this amendment would be to prohibit any funding from the bill going to the organization, whereas our initial intention was to limit the funding to the business incubator.

That is part of the problem we have here. All we have is the language in a report that is so vague or confusing that it is even difficult to draft an amendment to cover it.

Now I have no problem limiting any funding to the organization, let me tell you, but I also want to be clear that I have nothing against JARI. I wish the organization well in its efforts. I do, however, have a problem with the increasingly opaque process by which Congress hands out earmarks.

For the first half of this year, we debated ways to bring transparency to what we do here. When it comes to the earmarking process, Members have proposed a longer notice period before consideration of bills, making bills and reports more accessible, attaching Members' names to earmarks, compiling earmarks in tables, including earmarks in the text of legislation, and on and on and on. I think all these ideas are fine, and I have introduced my own proposal.

After a good deal of compromise, this House approved the Lobbying Accountability and Transparency Act last month. Yet here we are, just a few weeks later, and there has been no apparent effort to comply with the proposals that we made in the House and the entire House approved.

How can we explain this to our constituents? Was the lobbying and transparency legislation just for show? I certainly don't think it was, but it is starting to look that way to most Americans.

We need to demonstrate how serious we are about establishing transparency in Congress. We have made a strong effort, and there is nothing preventing us from making good on what we said. Waiting until this bill becomes law before we act would appear as though we are under compulsion to comply with the public demand for transparency. I think we need transparency now.

A small handful of our colleagues contend that we should not change the process until the other Chamber changes its process, that if we enact unilateral reforms in the House, we would shortchange ourselves.

Who is this about? Are we here to serve our country, the best interests of our country, or simply to look out for the interests of the House?

What are we waiting for? We are almost done with the appropriation process for the year, yet nothing has changed. Where are the names next to earmarks? Where is the transparency that we say that we want?

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I would be very happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I would simply point out that this organization operates in a part of the country that has suffered probably the most from government policies, particularly our trade policies, but also our environmental laws; and whatever arguments you could make for our, our free trade policies, they are in large part insensitive to the disproportionate negative impact they have on certain segments of our economy and certain geographical areas of our country.

The basic industry areas of the country where this organization operates

have suffered. It is one of those areas that has suffered disproportionately. The steel industry was a thriving industry there 20, 30 years ago. The Mon Valley, which is close to our area, is devastated and was practically the first steel industry to suffer. There is no steel industry in that area now.

In addition, environmental laws had negative impacts on the burning of fossil fuels. This general region was very prosperous producing the Nation's energy and has suffered greatly because of the impacts of environmental laws. I am not arguing the environmental law issue at all but just simply talking about the economic impact.

Well, these earmarks are contained in the Small Business Administration account, and that is the purpose of the Small Business Administration account, is to help small business. So the purpose of this funding is to look at workforce development, where there is tremendous unemployment as a result of trade laws, environmental laws, and government policy that have had a negative impact

This is self-help. This organization looks at workforce development, assisting in training needs for displaced workers, pursuing funding for mechanisms for training, assisting displaced workers, and working with the training facilities and the colleges and the universities to address those very difficult, midlife retraining challenges that the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program speaks to and that an organization like this can be very helpful in implementing.

The Incubator Project, is the other side of the coin. That is the development and diversification of small business. It is really pay me now or pay me later. As the previous gentleman from Pennsylvania said, you are either going to address the unemployment condition and try to retrain and try to get people back into the community, into the workforce through retraining, and at the same time promoting new industries, new small businesses for those people to work in, or you are going to be paying unemployment and you are going to be dealing with the issues of a deteriorating community.

This funding, which goes to all of those purposes, certainly is in keeping of the mission of the Small Business Administration.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I simply would like to point out that unless the gentleman who defended the earmark is the author of the earmark, and I don't believe that he is, this is an earmark in Pennsylvania. We still don't know who authored the earmark. There is nothing in the conference report that tells us, and we still don't know. Here we are about to vote on it, and we still don't know and we haven't had a defense of that earmark from the author of it, from the Member who authored it. There is something wrong with the process when this is what we are reduced to.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

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

Mr. FLAKE. 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 Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to fund the Wisconsin Procurement Initiative.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

Mr. Chairman, the committee report for this bill contains an earmark for the Wisconsin Procurement Initiative, and my amendment would limit funding for this item.

The committee report for last year's SSJC appropriations bill did not contain a similar earmark, but the conference report on this bill did include an earmark for the Wisconsin Procurement Institute for the same amount.

Though it is impossible to know by reading the report, it appears that this earmark is destined for the same institution. Again, we simply don't know. We have insufficient information, yet we are going to provide the funding without even knowing, without anybody even asking the question, is it the same thing to give money to the initiative or the institute?

It appears that this is one of several earmarks that have been funded in multiple years with similar but increasingly vague verbiage in the committee report.

The Wisconsin Procurement Institute was founded in 1987 by Les Aspin, a former Congressman and Secretary of Defense. The institute says its purpose is to "bridge the gap for Wisconsin companies interested in supplying their products and services to Federal, State and local agencies and prime contractors." The institute "guides, trains and provides hands-on assistance to firms in developing government business and improving process and technical capabilities to access and compete in the government workplace."

When I saw this earmark, it reminded me of the late-night commercials that you see from a fellow by the name of Matthew Lesko. He will stand up and run to the camera, and he has a suit with question marks all over it, and he has a car decorated the same way, and he will wave a book and say, "There is millions and millions of government dollars just for you, and if you pay me $19.95, I will tell you how can get these contracts, how you can get this money, how you can get these scholarships, how you can get these grants, how you can get these loans."

This seems to be a process similar to Matthew Lesko. You have an organization here whose job it is to secure projects from the Federal Government, and we are paying money to that organization to help them procure contracts from us. It just seems like a little double-dipping in that way. We are funding an organization whose purpose it is to help other organizations obtain Federal assistance, grants, contracts, et cetera.

According to the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, the 2003 budget for the Wisconsin Procurement Institute was $340,000. This year's and last year's earmarks were for $400,000 each. It seems that we have doubled their budget, or their entire budget comes from the Federal Government. I am not sure which.

I am sure the Wisconsin Procurement Institute's budget is higher now than it was 3 years ago, but a significant portion must be funded by this earmark.

I certainly support the outsourcing of Federal functions that can be better performed by private companies, but there is something inherently wrong with funding an organization whose purpose it is to help others secure government funding. Just thinking about it makes your head spin.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, we have done it again. We have come here to talk about an earmark that I am sure will be approved by voice vote and then probably by roll call, and we still don't even know who sponsored it. We don't know if the institute is the same as the initiative. We don't know why the organization claims on its own Web site to have a budget of $340,000, yet has received earmarks in each of the past 2 years for $400,000 each.

It simply doesn't make sense. Are we exercising the proper oversight that we ought to? We said before, both sides

have said, the gentleman and ranking minority member have said we simply don't have the staff to police the kind of earmarking we are doing here. I readily agree. Yet we are continuing to do this. I don't know where we stop. I simply don't.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, let me be very clear. The Wisconsin Procurement Institute was indeed organized originally by Les Aspin when he was chairman of the Armed Services Committee in this House. It is an organization that helps many new companies who are new to the procurement process figure out how the Federal procurement process works.

Instead of providing money to individual companies, this money is used to create an institute to educate all kinds of companies so that they can compete for Federal business, especially in the procurement area and most especially in the defense area.

I would make one simple point: Right now, large corporations have the resources and they have the experience to seek Federal business, but many quality companies do not because they are unfamiliar with how the Federal procurement process works.

There are a number of organizations who rank States in terms of how much Federal money they get each year. Wisconsin, Minnesota and Michigan always rank near the bottom. Ninety percent of the difference between them and the number one State in the Union in terms of Federal money occurs because of a difference in the number of Federal employees and because of differences in defense contracts.

The gentleman comes from the State which is the number six State in the Union in terms of getting money out of procurement. You have large companies, such as Raytheon, which produce huge numbers of missiles, so that gives you a lot of Federal procurement dollars.

□ 1500

You also have many talented electronic companies like General Dynamics, a huge company that also gets a large amount of Federal dollars. You have large military installations such as Fort Hauchuca, which contains the Army intelligence operation.

In Federal procurement, unfortunately, the way it usually works is ''Them what has gets more!'' This initiative, the Wisconsin Procurement Institute, which I fully confess that I and the other Members of the Wisconsin Delegation support, this initiative is to help other corporations who are not experienced in the ins and outs of Federal procurement policy, so that we can end the insider advantage that the gentleman's constituents have.

What we are trying to do is to open up the process so that you can enable a large number of companies to come in and compete. I make no apology whatsoever for that. Wisconsin has a right to expect that its corporations should be able to compete, and so does every other State in the Union.

I would simply ask the gentleman, do not begrudge the efforts of Wisconsin to close the gap between our State and yours. Your State gets $7 billion more in Federal procurement than mine does.

This operation is a small operation to try to enhance the ability of companies in our State to close that gap somewhat. We have chosen not to provide money directly to companies but instead to provide an ability for companies to learn how the procurement process works.

We also, under this process, have created a Web site which will enable Federal agencies to review the talents and the qualities of many of the companies in Wisconsin so that if they are looking for particular projects or products they know where to go to find them.

I think that what that will do in the end is help enhance competition, and it will help save taxpayers money by cutting some new companies in on the deal that so many large companies in the gentleman's State enjoy.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to fund Fairmont State University.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit $900,000 in Federal funds from being used by Fairmont State University in West Virginia for a small business initiative.

Fairmont State University is located in Fairmont, the county seat of Marion County, which has a population of 20,000 and is located in north central West Virginia. Similar to other earmarks I have challenged in this appropriations season, this earmark is vague in its description, offering no more than a general sketch of the purpose of the funding and making true oversight nearly impossible.

In addition, this is not the first earmark to benefit the school. In recent years, Fairmont State University and its partners have regularly benefited from earmarks in this appropriation bill.

For example, the 2005 Justice Department budget included a grant for nearly half a million dollars for the Fairmont State partner program looking at decoding criminal digital documents. Similarly, the 2006 SSJC appropriation bill included over $2 million in earmarks assisting the school's aviation program and aerospace curriculum.

And I guess the third time is the charm. We are likely to continue this trend in 2007 with an earmark for $900,000 for a small business development initiative.

In fact, according to some estimates, northern West Virginia has received more than $480 million in earmarks in various appropriation bills over the last 10 years.

This earmark illustrates the problem with earmarks. Year after year, we approve these vaguely described projects by the thousands. Not only do taxpayers not know how the money is being spent, the current earmark process makes those types of patterns, the same area benefiting time and time again at the taxpayers' expense, difficult if not impossible to detect.

My question is, where does it end? Where does Congress start to say enough is enough and add accountability and transparency to this runaway train that earmarks have become? If not with earmarks like this, then I do not know when.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time. I appreciate the opportunity to speak in opposition to this amendment.

You know, it should be understood that a lot of those earmarks go to help those who are in the greatest need of help.

I am struck by the good fortune of the gentleman and his congressional district and his State, as recounted by the ranking member just a few moments ago. You are indeed very fortunate to have these large defense contractors, Raytheon and General Dynamics, and these large Federal installations like Fort Wachuka in your State. That is a real blessing.

It is particularly a blessing in an economy that marginalizes and that is not nurturing to certain sectors. But certainly I think the gentleman can understand that in the last 20, 25, 30 years, our economy, because of the increased internationalization of it, has been extremely harsh on certain segments and certain geographical areas, as I mentioned earlier.

Those areas that were steel manufacturing areas, those areas that were coal producing areas, those areas that were basically manufacturing, microcosms if you will, for rust belt America were particularly hard hit during this period; and the need in these areas is for economic diversification. And the gentleman may not have been engaged in that much, but this is a very difficult, hard thing to do.

Federal Government assistance, this appropriation, these earmarks, if you will, in the Small Business Administration go directly to help rejuvenate economies, creating a broader, a more flexible, a more dynamic economy through diversification.

It is not an easy process; and if you have not been involved with it, the gentleman probably is not sensitive to that as he might be. But current economic trends in these areas, in these kinds of areas indicate that the sectors that do have potential growth are the heritage, tourism, regional travel; and this program works with the West Virginia Department of Education Travel and Tourism to promote what is the fastest-growing segment of the economic base.

So that is the purpose of the earmark, and I strenuously oppose the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, all of the descriptions of Arizona make it sound like Shangri-La, that everything is going so well in Arizona that we have no need for any help with the economy or any sector of the economy. That is simply not the case. We are experiencing rapid growth. There are a lot of infrastructure needs that come with that. We are experiencing transition.

I grew up in northeastern Arizona. There are tremendous problems there with drought and other issues.

But I would defy any Member of Congress to say that his district is not in need of something. But if we all said, all right, we are just going to get it all, get it all for our districts, circumvent the authorization appropriation oversight function that Congress has always had and simply say we are going to earmark it and use kind of a spoil system as to who gets the earmarks, then it is simply going to drain the Treasury, and it is not fair to anyone.

I have universities in my district. Many of them compete for educational grants, for research grants, for other grants that are typically available in this appropriation bill and others that are being depleted. Those accounts for research funds are being depleted by earmarks.

Later today I believe we will be voting on an amendment or some clarification of the TEA–LU bill to replenish a research account or some kind of research account on roads whose account was depleted because of earmarks. So people in Arizona or elsewhere are not going to receive the funding that would come by formula back to them, because of the gas taxes they paid in, because of all of the earmarking that is going on.

So this is a problem. It is not a fair system. It is not a transparent system. If it were a transparent system, we would have names next to the earmarks when they come to the floor. We would have the ability to challenge it at any step. You would have language that is such that a limitation amendment could not be ruled out of order.

This is not a fair process. We need to change it.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

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

Mr. FLAKE. 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 Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to fund the Southern and Eastern Kentucky Tourism Development Association.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit funds in the bill from being used for the Southern and Eastern Kentucky Tourism Development Association, which receives a $1 million earmark in this bill.

The Southern and Eastern Kentucky Tourism Development Association was created in 1987 to promote, expand, develop and market the existing and potential tourism industry in southern and eastern Kentucky.

According to our research, since 1987, the Southern and Eastern Kentucky Tourism Development Association has received more than $18 million in Federal grants, loans, and earmarks. In fact, last year, in the fiscal year 2006 Science, State, Justice and Commerce appropriation bill, the Southern and Eastern Kentucky Development Association received a $3 million earmark.

Now I love traveling, as everyone here does; and I am all for seeing Kentucky tourism continue to grow. But again, here, how do we justify favoring this tourism association and not others?

We have one in Arizona. Virtually every State has one. Many regions in our State have their own tourism associations. How do we decide that one is worthy of earmarks and another one is not?

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

This association, as the gentleman said, was formed in 1987, this association of 42 of Kentucky's counties covering five out of the six congressional districts.

What sets these counties apart, however, is their extreme poverty. These are rural counties in an impoverished coal mining region of the State who have seen the jobs in the mines disappear through mechanization and otherwise; and these counties are searching for a way to live, to survive. They are too poor to do it on their own, to form an association to try to create tourism, train people, create the small jobs that it takes to run tourism entrepreneurships. So they banded together, 42 of them, into an association where they pool their resources.

The State of Kentucky helps fund this association, as well as the Federal Government and locals. But for this association, these counties would not be able to advertise and attract to the very, very beautiful part of the country, the mountains, the streams and the hills, the history. It is the home of country music. US 23 that runs north and south through eastern Kentucky is known as Country Music Highway, a National Scenic Byway now, thanks to this association.

They are the ones that promoted that National Scenic Byway. There are two others, the Red River Gorge Scenic Byway, National Scenic Byway, and the Daniel Boone Trail. The Cumberland Gap is a part of this area.

□ 1515

So this association works to promote the region. It is providing jobs to those who otherwise would be drawing Federal handouts, Federal welfare. We are trying to work to get people a job rather than take a check from the Federal Government. I look upon this as not a handout but a hand up, and these communities are now beginning to realize income that provides real jobs for people that would otherwise be drawing welfare.

Now, is it unique that we would look to the Federal Government to help a region help itself grow into something better and provide the jobs? No, it is not unique. I would support today the earmarks over the years for the central

Arizona water project that enabled Arizona to grow and prosper and boom as it is now and providing jobs for people. That is what the Federal Government should be doing, and I do not begrudge a minute the gentleman from Arizona and the boom that is occurring in Arizona, but it was caused because the Federal Government over the years earmarked hundreds of millions of dollars to provide water out of the Colorado River so that Arizona in the desert would bloom.

It is a good thing. I would support that and continue to do so, but I would hope the gentleman would realize there are other parts of the country with much much smaller needs but equally as important to the people that live there.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope we will turn down the amendment.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER).

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona.

I was sitting in my office watching all these wonderful and heartrending speeches from folks about their economies and iron mills shutting down, steel mills shutting down, industries being totally lost, and now it is up to this Congress to pass through earmark appropriations in some legislative vehicles that are not the appropriate vehicle for it, which is why it is so hard for my friend from Arizona to find out where this money is going and why it is going and who asked for it.

But I am reminded from time to time that this was the same Congress that has passed regulation that has prohibited us in the west, in Idaho, from harvesting trees, from mining minerals, from, in fact, earning a living or even building, as my good friend from Kentucky just said, in talking about building a whole new industry.

Well, we would like that opportunity, too. In fact, we would like this Congress just to keep their promises to us when they shut down our forests and shut down the mining and halted much of the grazing on that land in Idaho and said, we will do this, we will make you PILT payments, payment in lieu of taxes. Because you have so much Federal ground in Idaho, a lot of that property does not render any taxes, and so we will make that payment for you. Well, you are about $148 million short this year alone.

So I would say to these Members of Congress that have such huge hearts for their own particular little locales and their own particular little projects, that if you are going to do this, for gosh sakes, let those of us that would like to do it without all your help help ourselves.

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

Let me simply make the point, I was not around when the central Arizona project or other water projects in Arizona were approved, but I do know this: Nobody slipped funding for the central Arizona project in an appropriations bill at the last minute in a conference report. These programs were authorized. There were appropriations. There has been oversight. It is the antithesis of what we are doing here in this bill and in this process this year.

We need to get back to the process of authorization and appropriation and oversight. We seem to have abandoned the outer two bookends, and all we are doing is appropriating, as I would submit, when you have descriptions this vague and you have situations where Members do not even come to the floor to defend it, and we still do not know on one of these that I offered today who the author is. On what I offered last week on two of the earmarks, we still do not know who offered them, but yet we pretend we are offering good oversight? We are really not. We can do a lot better than this.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

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

Mr. FLAKE. 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 Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CARDOZA

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARDOZA:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. For ''OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS—JUSTICE ASSISTANCE'' for the Drug Endangered Children grant program, as authorized by section 755 of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–177), and the amounts otherwise provided by this Act for ''OTHER—SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEPARTMENTAL MANGAGEMENT'' (reduced by $5,000,000) are hereby reduced by $5,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from California (Mr. CARDOZA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

I would like to start and begin by thanking Chairman WOLF and the ranking member, Mr. MOLLOHAN, for working with me on this amendment. I also want to thank Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Ms. HOOLEY for offering this amendment with me today and for all of their hard work addressing the methamphetamine problem and its effect on children.

I rise today to introduce this amendment to provide $5 million in authorized funding for the Drug Endangered Children Program. This program would provide grants to States for initiatives that help children move from homes in which drug abuse or production takes place and, instead, into safe, permanent homes.

Funding the Drug Endangered Children Program would represent an important step towards helping develop new protocols for law enforcement and child welfare workers to address the special needs of these children displaced by family methamphetamine use, which is a growing problem.

Mr. Chairman, I want to quickly tell you a story about a 12-year-old boy that recently came to see me here in the Capitol. He is from Stockton, California, in my district. His father was arrested for running a meth lab in their home garage, and his mom, a meth addict, abandoned him and his two brothers. In fact, she left them at a phone booth in the community of Stockton, told them that she would be back, and 2 days later, this young, 12-year-old boy took his two brothers to a local police station and turned themselves in to the police so that they could get food and get out of the cold climate that they were in for 2 days.

The system was unable to handle this situation. As a result, he was separated from his two brothers, his only remaining links to his family that he once loved.

He came to see me last year, and he sat in the cafeteria below this Chamber, and he leaned over to me, and he whispered, Congressman, I have had so much pain in my life.

We can do better and we must do better to help these young children. By working with the chairman and his staff, we have reduced the dollar amount in the bill so that this amendment no longer affects the Census Bureau.

Mr. Chairman, this program will make a real difference in the lives of children affected by meth and other drugs. I urge a ''yes'' vote on the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY).

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from California for offering this important amendment.

The most tragic victims of the meth epidemic are the drug-endangered children. A recent study in Oregon revealed that police find children living on the premises of one out of every four meth laboratories that they break up. These children are exposed to toxic chemicals on a daily basis and face the constant threat of physical, mental and emotional abuse from the nonstop flow of addicts through their home.

The Drug Endangered Children Program provides vital services for these children, ensuring that law enforcement, child protective services, prosecutors and health professionals all work together to get them the help that they need.

From removing and supporting these children as they transition out of these dangerous environments to ensuring that they get medical evaluations, mental health screenings, drug and chemical exposure screenings and addiction treatment, the Drug Endangered Children Program gives children a safe and drug-free environment to live in.

That is why we introduced this legislation. I hope that my colleagues will see fit to appropriate the $5 million for this appropriate initiative.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman for accepting the amendment. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN).

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to provide $5 million for the Drug Endangered Children Program.

I want to thank Chairman WOLF and Ranking Member MOLLOHAN for their work to increase funding for many law enforcement programs and the fight against methamphetamine. I am particularly encouraged by the $99 million allocated for the Meth Hot Spots Account in this appropriations bill.

I respect the tough job our appropriators have in writing these spending bills. They have admirably allocated dollars to programs that help our law enforcement do their job. However, one authorized program that was not fortunate to receive dollars in this bill is the Drug Endangered Children Program.

Children are too often the silent victims of drug abuse. As a cochair of the House Meth Caucus, I have talked to many social service workers and treatment providers about the risks that drug-endangered children face. I have heard repeated stories of meth users leaving their children unattended for days as they cook and use methamphetamine and sleep off its intense effects.

We have often talked about the need for more money to help local law enforcement to bust the bad guys, but we rarely talk about the impact those busts have on the kids who may be living in drug-infested homes.

So I want to thank the gentleman from California for his work on this amendment, and I urge a ''yes'' vote, and I want to thank the chairman for accepting this amendment as well.

Mr. CARDOZA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to once again thank the chairman for working with me on this and appreciate his accepting the amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CHOCOLA

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. CHOCOLA:

Page 110, after line 8, insert the following new title:

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for travel policies and practices in contravention of Office of Management and Budget Circular No. A–126.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think one of the greatest luxuries in life would be to own your own airplane. In fact, I think maybe one of the greater luxuries would be to have somebody else own the airplane and let you fly on it whenever you want and they pay the bill.

Well, Mr. Chairman, that is pretty much the arrangement that the senior management at the National Aeronautics Space Administration, better known as NASA, has. A recent GAO reports that, over a 2-year period, NASA employees took 1,188 flights on private jets at a cost of $25 million or five times the cost of commercial tickets.

I understand that at times NASA has appropriate uses for private jets, like when they do aeronautical research, but I do not think it is appropriate for routine visits, meetings, conferences and speeches. The GAO found that 86 percent of the trips taken on these private jets specifically are prohibited by Federal policy regarding aircraft ownership.

Mr. Chairman, that is 1,022 trips on private jets by NASA employees that are specifically prohibited and paid for by the American taxpayers.

Because NASA has been largely unresponsive to previous GAO recommendations to remedy this situation, the GAO has actually asked for congressional consideration of legislation to restrict NASA's ownership of passenger aircraft and funding for passenger aircraft services to those needed solely to meet valid mission requirements.

Mr. Chairman, this position is clearly indefensible. It is time to put an end to unresponsive management violating established policies, flying on private jets at the taxpayers' expense simply for personal convenience.

So I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment to achieve that result, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in strong support of the amendment. I understand the gentleman's amendment is related to the findings of the Government Accountability Office audit in August of 2005 concerning NASA mission management aircraft.

I also understand that NASA has concurred with the administrative recommendations, meaning they agree with the GAO and the gentleman trying to implement the recommendations made by GAO. NASA is now using a new methodology to justify any passenger travel on its aircraft to match OMB Circular A–126.

Further, OMB has reviewed NASA's revised policy and has no objections with respect to it.

It is a good amendment, and I think it is doubly good because for the first time we have brought a bill to the floor with absolutely no NASA earmarks. The administrator has said this is very good because when you have earmarks, it takes away.

So I strongly support the gentleman's amendment and urge that it be adopted.

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman WOLF for his support and for his hard work on this appropriations bill, and in an effort to not talk myself out of a sale, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1530

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANK OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

Page 110, after line 8, insert the following new title:

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for a manned space mission to Mars.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3½ minutes.

This amendment simply says that none of the funds being appropriated to NASA shall be used for a manned space shot to Mars.

We have heard throughout the appropriations debate legitimate complaints from the appropriators that they have too little money to meet various important needs. We are constantly faced with difficult choices on this floor between good programs. NASA itself has objected that it does not have enough money to do all that it is supposed to now do. I think that is right. I think it is terribly unfair and damaging to the

country to give to this important agency more than it can handle with the money it gets.

I would like to be able to appropriate more money, but the budget says we can't do that. So what we can do is, as a Congress, set some priorities. Sending human beings to Mars, in my judgment, is at best a luxury that this country cannot now afford.

We are talking about deficits that we have to deal with. We are talking about Social Security funding that will be needed. We are talking about a shortage within NASA to do everything it wants to do. To go forward with a commitment to send people to Mars, which is not in the arguments of any scientist I have ever heard as the best use of our funding, is a great mistake.

This amendment does not cut a penny out of NASA. Instead, it allows the money to be spent by NASA more wisely. It does not stop them from spending money on their priorities. We have things like aeronautics that have not got enough money, we have other space travel, we have space exploration by instrumentation. Committing and allowing funds to be spent now as a downpayment on sending human beings to Mars is, as I said, at best a luxury that the country ought not to be indulging in.

The justification for sending people to Mars is political, it is psychological, it is cultural, but it is not scientific. And we should also note that if we continue on this path now, so that money is spent to go to Mars, we will be confronted with an additional request at some point in the near future for $100 billion or more to do this.

We talk rhetorically often about the need to make tough decisions, the need to set priorities. As I listen to the inability to fund important program after important program, the notion that NASA, which as I said tells us they do not have enough money to do everything they would like to do, that some of that should be spent on sending human beings to Mars is the gravest example I can think of of money unwisely spent.

We talk about trying to save money. I don't want to save money on old people who need medical care. I don't want to save money on children who need help with drug abuse. I don't want to save money on protecting the border. I don't want to save money by cutting low-income housing for the elderly or the disabled.

There aren't many areas where we can say, you know what, let us just not spend that money at all. Sending human beings to Mars ought to be of a very low priority compared to everything else we do.

This amendment does not touch the funding of NASA. It does say that, of all of the needs that NASA now has, sending human beings to Mars is sufficiently low that we ought to put it aside, at least for now.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding, and I actually want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for offering this amendment, because I think it is a good amendment for us to discuss.

There is actually very little in this bill that is devoted to the subject he is talking about. The vast majority of the funds go to the continued operation of the space station, the shuttle, and the development of a replacement vehicle, a safer, more reliable, less expensive vehicle for the shuttle.

There is some early money for exploration devoted to returning to the Moon sometime in the next 10 to 15 years, and there is a very small amount of money devoted to the subject of can we put men and women on Mars someday and hopefully do that in a fashion with other countries to help reduce the cost.

I think we should overwhelmingly vote ''no'' on this, and I will tell you why. This is the United States of America. We are a Nation of pioneers and explorers. When we left the Moon the last time for Apollo 17, I thought we would be on Mars in 10 years. I never would have imagined that 30 or 40 years later we are still debating the subject.

I believe we are destined to explore not just Mars but go on to other stars. It is in our nature as human beings. And for us to say, no, we don't want to do that; we can't afford it; we have too many other problems, I think would be a very unfortunate thing. It would be unfortunate for our kids, who we want to study math and science. And the teachers all tell me the same thing, there is nothing you can do to motivate them more to study math and science than to talk to them about manned space and exploring other planets.

So I have a tremendous amount of respect for the gentleman, but I think he is wrong on this one. I recognize there are costs associated with it, and we are fighting a war, and we have a deficit, but this is a small amount of money, and I think we do need to proceed.

So I would encourage a ''no'' vote on the Frank amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in support of the amendment.

This is a Congress and this is a President which has decided we are going to blow $400 billion on the dumbest war since the War of 1812 in Iraq. This is the Congress that has decided that every other priority has to be scuttled so that we can provide $50 billion in tax cuts for millionaires this year. And yet there is no room in the Budget Inn for improving the health care of our people.

We are actually going to be funding fewer grants next year at the National Institutes of Health for medical research than we were 2 years ago. We are squeezing health professions training. We are providing an education budget that is $1.5 billion below last year in terms of No Child Left Behind education programs. We are cutting law enforcement grants by over $2 billion below the year 2001. We are providing a squeeze on Legal Services, despite the amendment that was adopted last night. Mr. GILCHREST from Maryland just made a compelling argument about the need to spend a lot more money to protect our oceans.

We don't have money for any of that, and yet, oh, we've got money to go to Mars. I am as excited as anybody else about the prospect of sending a man to Mars. I think that would be wonderful. But not if you have to do it on borrowed money and not if you are putting tax cuts for millionaires ahead of educating kids.

I get excited about the space program, but I get a lot more excited about the prospect of providing clean water for every community in this country. I get a lot more excited about cleaning up school districts and fixing up schools and training teachers so that every kid in America is trained by a competent teacher, rather than having a huge percentage of our kids trained by teachers who were never educated in the field that they are teaching. So I guess it depends on what you are most excited about.

It seems to me that the gentleman is pointing out that we ought to have a little common sense in deciding what ought to be put first in this country. I would prefer that we put Earth-based science ahead of sending somebody to Mars.

If you want to clean up the deficit, if you want to clean up the deficits we have in investments in education and investments in health care, if you want to take care of the fact that 44 million people in this country are without health insurance, you get that done, then, baby, I am all for you if you want to go to Mars.

Until then, I would like to send to Mars every politician that thinks that the existing priorities are the right ones. They are not. They are wacky. This amendment isn't even a close call. We ought to adopt it.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, if this amendment were adopted, it would shut off all funding for all high-technology work that NASA is doing that has multiple applications.

The amendment says, ''no money can be spent in support of the manned mission to Mars.'' There is no manned mission to Mars in this bill. But the technology application, the research work that NASA is doing to develop the next

generation of rocket propulsion, the research work that NASA is doing to develop the next generation of microcomputers, the technology, for example, in this BlackBerry can be used on a manned mission to Mars and also manned missions in low-Earth orbit.

The technology that NASA is developing to fight cancer, any astronaut that goes above the Earth's atmosphere is immediately exposed to a higher risk of cancer, yet the research NASA is doing to protect astronauts in space and low-earth orbit and to travel to the moon, for example, could obviously be used on a mission to Mars. But if the gentleman's amendment is adopted, it would cut off any of that work that is being done right now to help protect our astronauts' lives in low-Earth orbit, because that technology could arguably be used on a mission to Mars.

There is no manned mission to Mars in this bill. The gentleman's amendment is so broadly written, it will have the effect of shutting off most of NASA's research and development work in the cutting-edge technologies that are so essential to the success of the manned space program and to the success of the American economy.

I urge the Members to vote ''no'' against this shortsighted amendment.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Perhaps I should include some instruction in reading. The gentleman has simply not described the amendment. It does not say no money can be used in support of. It says no money can be ''used for.''

The gentleman from Florida said a small amount of money here is for Mars. It is a small amount of money now. It is a downpayment on a huge amount of money. So this would not prevent any of that spending. You could spend it on the astronaut issue. All it says is you cannot use it, and he said support for. There is a difference between ''support for'' and ''used for.'' So let us not leave reading out of the curriculum.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER) 1 minute.

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

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the chairman of the subcommittee.

I have been a member of this subcommittee since the subcommittee was formed, and I was a member of the VA–HUD Subcommittee before then. And, as a matter of full disclosure, I come from an area that has one of the NASA centers, the Marshall Space Flight Center.

But the gentleman's amendment is not well designed. This would kill, this would kill the core of NASA. This would redefine what NASA is all about, and I urge the Members to oppose this amendment.

We have balanced carefully, the chairman and the ranking member of this subcommittee, within the confines of this budget, to order what we could do for NASA versus what we could do for COPS programs, Justice programs, and NOAA and other programs in here. This is a good debate to have, because we don't have enough money and we don't have enough room in this budget.

But this is a bad amendment, and I urge the Members to oppose it.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield myself the remaining time.

That argument is further out in space than the Mars shot. The core of NASA is to send people to Mars?

All it says is that you can't use the money for a manned space shot to Mars. You have got the Moon, you have got aeronautics, you have everything else. That simply misstates it.

Here is where we are. Does this House have the right to say that we do or don't want to be committed to going to Mars? Here is what will happen if the amendment is defeated. They will say, well, some money was voted that way; and the defense is, well, we need it to do cancer research, we need it for the Moon, but it will be used as a downpayment for a very expensive mission to Mars.

The gentleman from Florida said, well, we shouldn't say we can't afford this. That would be terrible for America. But we can't afford to pay old people for all of their medical drug bills. There is a doughnut hole. The chairman of the Senate Homeland Security Subcommittee said we can't afford more border guards. We can't afford more beds.

Of course, there are things we can't afford. The notion is not whether or not we should acknowledge what we can't afford but whether we should be sensible about what we can afford and can't afford.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

□ 1545

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. We have laid out a compelling vision and mission for the civil space program to conduct a robust program of human and robotic space exploration.

Last year, this Congress overwhelmingly endorsed the President's Vision for Space Exploration with a vote of 383–15 on the NASA Authorization Act. This amendment would abandon those plans endorsed by Congress.

We cannot turn back NASA's long-range plans. I certainly urge all of my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and let's stay on track.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. Just the fact that the gentleman from Massachusetts has spent so much time explaining what his amendment means I think is the best proof that it is so vague that we don't really know what we are not funding with this amendment.

There is $3.9 billion in the Constellation Systems account. Conceivably, the amendment could prevent any of that spending. All of it, it could be argued, relates to a manned space mission to Mars.

The amendment is so vague that I think that is why everybody is really concerned about it.

It is absolutely true that NASA is having problems. There is no question about it. The President has proposed a space exploration initiative. He calls it a vision, in some ways of course it would be if, if, it were genuinely funded. My concern is that it is not genuinely funded.

There are a lot of problems with NASA funding, but it all has to do with not enough funding to do everything that we want to do. That is evidenced by the myriad of science programs that are either cancelled or cut in the President's budget. It is terrible.

Every scientist that is at all concerned about operating in the NASA camp has expressed how opposed they are to the NASA funding. But this, to me, is not the way to get at that.

What we do need is more money in NASA, and NASA, I think, frankly needs to come forward with a budget that is more specific, one that we can deal with, instead of coming up with these operating plans. That really is a very imperfect way to fund an agency.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I have to say to my friend, I would be impressed if they would come forward and say, yes, we think, as the gentleman from Florida said, we should be able to go to Mars. But to argue that because an amendment which says no money can be used for a manned space mission to Mars, that that means you can't use it for the Moon or anything else simply isn't the English language.

The fact is the amendment is very narrowly drawn. It says you cannot use the money for manned space to Mars or for another purpose.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Reclaiming my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Can't we get an honest debate about whether or not to go to Mars?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Not in 5 minutes, unfortunately.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON).

Mr. GORDON. As usual, my friend from Massachusetts raises good points, and, as usual, he is a good watch dog for our Congress. I agree with him; we have to have priorities. But I think he has picked the wrong priority on this occasion.

NASA, as has been said, under the right occasions is underfunded. It is not overfunded. It is an investment in our country. Then so you have to think, okay, within the NASA budget, where do we spend our money?

Let me agree with my friend from Massachusetts that I think that we do need to slow down some of the manned Mars missions and fund other programs. I would like to see more funds then. But if we are not going to have adequate funding, we need to slow it down. But it would be irresponsible to do away with some of the planning in other sorts of areas.

His amendment, I think there are really two main problems: one, that you don't just all of a sudden get in a space capsule and go to Mars. There is a lot of planning that goes before that. Additionally, there is overlap with a lot of the other missions.

Even though I know the gentleman is trying to be clear in what he is doing, it simply doesn't come out that way. It would be a major problem for this country, a major problem for NASA. I will certainly work with him to try to, again, help better prioritize the planning of a Moon-Mars mission.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Would the gentleman from West Virginia yield?

Mr. GORDON. If there is time left, I would certainly yield to my friend.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I do not believe that anybody seriously says that if the bill says you can't spend, an amendment says you can't spend it on a manned mission to Mars, that anybody would then think you had to stop it on the Moon.

Of course, that is one of the arguments you would make beforehand that you would have to disregard after. But let me disagree with my friend from Tennessee. He said, he agrees we should slow it down. What is stopping us? Where is the language that does that?

Mr. GORDON. If you could reclaim your time.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GORDON. What is stopping us would be this amendment. This amendment simply is not drawn, as much as the gentleman would like for it to be drawn in a narrow sense and as much as he would like for it to be a scalpel, it is not. Maybe, again, all working together in the future, we could come up with a better one. Right now, the intention is not what has resulted.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the amendment offered by Congressman FRANK that would put a funding limitation on manned space flight.

NASA is at a critical crossroads. Over the next few years, the agency must complete the International Space Station, retire the Space Shuttle, develop a new space vehicle, and maintain needed science and aeronautics programs. Congress has already spoken in support of a manned mission to Mars with the NASA Authorization bill earlier this year. Disrupting the vision now only sets America back. At a time when the United States is concerned about global competitiveness, cutting NASA funding would send our country in the wrong direction.

Mr. Chairman, NASA is a good investment. Over the last 10 years, NASA's budget has decreased or remained flat while overall domestic spending grew substantially. Fully funding the space exploration vision represents only 7 percent of the Federal budget and yet this small investment yields large returns in health care, public safety, and telecommunications. Space exploration technologies have produced advanced semiconductors that power our businesses, materials employed by our military to keep our men and women safe, and software that aids our law enforcement personnel in fighting crime and detecting illegal drugs. The Appropriations Committee has done a commendable job balancing our national needs with our budget realities. They have preserved vital funding for critical areas, including science initiatives, and I would urge the House to support the underlying bill and vote against the Frank amendment.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Frank amendment to H.R. 5672, which would prohibit funds from being used for a manned space mission to Mars. I believe the amendment should be defeated.

NASA recently announced the work assignments for Exploration Systems' Constellation program at NASA centers. These assignments will ensure that the agency can begin to meet the challenges of the Vision for Space Exploration while maintaining 10 healthy and productive field centers.

NASA's plan to implement the Constellation Program depends upon funds that carry over from fiscal year 2006–2007 into fiscal year 2008–2009. This authority ensures that funding will be available in 2008, when development work begins to ramp up significantly with the Critical Design Review for Constellation's Crew Exploration Vehicle, CEV.

If NASA is unable to secure the necessary resources, the gap between Shuttle retirement and CEV availability will expand. This will increase both the risks and overall costs for bringing the new CEV and CLV systems online, as well as increasing the safety risk of operating the International Space Station. An extension of the gap will also cause an unacceptably high number of departures of our skilled workforce across the NASA Centers, and threaten to erode the Nation's industrial base for human space flight activities. We therefore consider preservation of this funding an important economic issue for our districts, as well as a national priority.

The CEV and the companion Crew Launch Vehicle are once-in-a-generation development efforts. The effective transition from the Space Shuttle to the CEV will be NASA's greatest management challenge over the next several years. NASA's Exploration Systems ought be fully funded, not cut, to ensure that NASA has the resources it needs when the critical moment arrives.

I urge defeat of the Frank amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. CHOCOLA

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. CHOCOLA:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for business class or first class airline travel by employees of the Department of State in contravention of 41 CFR 301–10.122 through 301–10.124.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Chairman, not a day goes by that I am not amazed by the waste of tax dollars by Federal agencies. Sometimes the waste is a result of bad management. Sometimes it is the result of willful violation of established policies, but it is always inexcusable.

A recent GAO report reveals just how bad it can get. In March of 2006, the GAO found that the State Department is wasting nearly $100 million a year on unauthorized premium travel. In 2004, the State Department spent $140 million on premium travel; that is usually business class travel, and 67 percent of that travel was either not justified, not properly authorized or both. And that resulted in $94 million of taxpayer money wasted.

Not only is the fact that the money was wasted troubling, but the management practice of disregarding what it cost when it is not your own money is a cause for great concern. As an example, most of the authorizations for the premium travel came from subordinates of those that were traveling who told the GAO that they were afraid to challenge senior executives of the State Department for violating established travel policies.

It is not just an excusable practice of putting subordinates in intimidating positions at work here; it is also a lack of basic management practices. As an example, GAO also found that although government tickets that are purchased and not used are fully refundable, the practice of the State Department is not to bother to try to reconcile tickets that are purchased and not used, which resulted in a flat-out waste of $6 million of taxpayer money.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply requires the State Department personnel to follow established travel policies, and it is an understatement to say that it is unfortunate that I even have to come to the floor and offer this amendment.

I guess we have to send a clear message to senior State Department officials that when they are traveling on

their own dime, they can sit wherever they want on a plane, but when you are traveling on the taxpayers' dime, you should follow established policies and sit in the back of the plane.

Although I understand that flying coach can be cruel and unusual punishment, I think that those that willfully waste the taxpayer dollars for personal comfort are getting off easy if we pass this amendment.

I encourage my colleagues to support it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. I rise in support of the amendment. It is a good amendment. There has been a government-wide review of the waste, fraud and abuse of the government travel card program. The Government Accountability Office has reviewed the State Department policy and has concluded a similar review of the Department of Defense policy.

The State Department manages the second largest centrally billed travel card program in the Federal Government after the Department of Defense. A GAO audit of the State Department's centrally billed foreign affairs travel found that 67 percent of premium class travel by State and other foreign affairs personnel during most of fiscal years 2003 and 2004 were not properly authorized.

Although GAO found deficiencies in documentation for premium class travel, GAO did not find in any instance travel that was conducted for other than official purposes. GAO has made 18 recommendations to improve the State Department's travel card program. The committee has looked into the issue and understands that, as of June 1, the Department of State has taken action on all the recommendations outlined in the GAO's March 6th report. The Undersecretary of State for Management has made this a top priority for the Department.

I wonder how they even got to this point. I agree with the gentleman, and I want to thank him for that. We must ensure that U.S. taxpayer money is not subject to waste, fraud and abuse, and I strongly, strongly support the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. CHOCOLA. Once again, Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman WOLF for his hard work and his support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CHOCOLA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. WATSON

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. WATSON:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDTIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to negotiate the accession by the Russian Federation into the World Trade Organization.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today with Mr. ISSA, and offer this amendment that disallows the use of taxpayer dollars to negotiate Russia's accession into the World Trade Organization until Russia is removed from the United States Trade Representative's priority watch list for intellectual property violations.

Russia should not be allowed consideration until it takes steps to protect intellectual property before we let them into the exclusive World Trade Organization. The cost of Russian piracy, from the copyright community from the motion picture and recording industry, to software inventors and patent holders, was over $1.7 billion in 2005, and losses topped $6.8 billion over the last 5 years.

Russia has been on the USTR's priority list for intellectual property violations for 9 straight years without showing any significant signs of improvement. Delaying Russia's entrance into the WTO until Russia enacts and enforces laws to protect intellectual property rights will send a strong and serious message that the United States values its Nation's ideas and products.

We learned this lesson the hard way with China. Once China became a member of the WTO, it has been a very difficult, time-consuming and expensive task to bring a case against them before the WTO to get them to enforce IP protections.

The time to pressure Russia, to put an end to their egregious intellectual property violations is now, and I urge my colleagues to support the Watson-Issa amendment.

POINT OF ORDER

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. GILLMOR). Does the gentleman from Florida insist on his point of order?

Mr. SHAW. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman. I raise a point of order against the amendment on the grounds that this amendment violates clause 5(a) of the House rule XXI because it is a tariff legislation not reported by a committee with jurisdiction over revenue measures.

The countervailing duty law provides special treatment to the World Trade Organization members. This amendment would impact Russia's membership in the World Trade Organization and thus impact the tariff treatment of Russia under the countervailing duty law in the Tariff Act of 1930.

The rule referred to is very specific that that is reserved to the House Ways and Means Committee, and the second portion of that rule provides, for purposes of this paragraph, a tax or tariff measure includes an amendment proposing a limitation on funds in a general appropriation of a fund for administration of a tax or tariff.

I insist on my point of order.

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

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Florida raises a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California on the ground that it violates clause 5(a) of rule XXI.

As the Chair stated on June 18, 2004, clause 5(a)(2) of rule XXI enables a point of order against limitation amendments addressing the administration of a tax or tariff whether or not the maker of the point of order can demonstrate a necessary and inevitable change in tax or tariff statuses or liabilities or in revenue collection.

The amendment would limit funds for the negotiation of Russia's entry into the World Trade Organization. As argued by the gentleman from Florida, membership in the World Trade Organization as a matter of law effects various changes in the treatment of a country's products under domestic tariff law. An example of such law is Section 1671 of title 19, United States Code. By limiting funds for an activity that, if completed, would engage tariff law, the amendment is a limitation on funds for the administration of a tariff within the meaning of clause 5(a) of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

□ 1600

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

I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA).

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, it is appropriate that we live under the rules of the House that we have voted in the 108th and the 109th Congress. But I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this important matter.

I appreciate that had the Ways and Means Committee addressed this issue in a timely fashion to make a stronger statement heard to Russia for their misconduct, for the billions of dollars lost to U.S. companies, including the music and television industry and software industries, all of which are very important to California, we would not be here today.

Additionally, it is with regret that I remind the Appropriations Committee that had they simply chosen not to fund this, this amendment would not be necessary, but the not funding by the Appropriations Committee is in order.

So although I don't approve of this rule, in hindsight, I recognize that the time to object to it was at the beginning of the Congress. Before yielding

back, I will, therefore, attempt to have this rule modified in the next Congress so as to allow people to determine where their funds will be spent. Because this rule effectively made it impossible to not fund something simply because in previous Congresses decisions had been made on tariff.

I do appreciate, though, that we will live under the rules of the House; and Congresswoman WATSON and myself will continue to work to make sure that Russia lives up to the standards before entering the WTO.

And, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for your kindness in giving me this opportunity to speak.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Chairman, very briefly, I would like to respond to the gentleman and his comments.

Actually, last month, the committee of jurisdiction, which is the Ways and Means Committee, and the Finance, sent a very strong bipartisan message to the administration, which I am sure you quite approve of, opposing concluding even a bilateral market access deal with Russia until that country meaningfully addresses its rampant IPR piracy problems.

The committee of jurisdiction is monitoring this issue very closely and is consulting with the U.S. Trade Representative at every step. The administration assures us that it will not allow Russia to join the World Trade Organization unless we achieve strong intellectual property rights protection with Russia. The United States will not allow Russia to become a World Trade Organization member until this is confronted.

Simply not negotiating with Russia, however, would be a mistake and would not be productive. Congress will have the opportunity to impact the World Trade Organization accession process because it must pass permanent normal trade relations in order for this to happen.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

Ms. WATSON. In conclusion, I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. ISSA.

When we traveled together to the Duma in Russia, we stated our position very clearly; and at that time there were 57 different locations in Moscow alone that were selling our copied materials. They would go out and close them and they would open right up in another location the next day. So we are acting as the watchdogs. I appreciate the help from the committee in keeping this on front and center and on the table, and we are going to continue to watch.

So thank you so much, Mr. Chairman, for this time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, look what China is doing. I think you are right on doing this. I wish you had actually been successful, from my own perspective. But look at what China is doing. Windows 95 was available on the streets of Beijing before it was available on the streets of Washington, D.C. So be careful. And I am not sure the administration is going to look out for your best interest on this either.

The CHAIRMAN. Who seeks time?

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

I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON).

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to engage the Chairman of the Science, State, Justice and Commerce Subcommittee in a colloquy regarding the importance of the State Department's Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, additional funding for the Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs is important to further diplomatic efforts to protect intellectual property rights in countries that are not members of the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development, or OECD.

Countries that joined the OECD did so because they share a commitment to a democratic government and market economy which depends on adequate protections for intellectual property rights. The non-OECD countries especially need the benefit of United States diplomacy to understand the importance of protecting intellectual property, not just for others' intellectual property but also because it is in the best interest to protect their own ideas and creations with laws and then enforce those laws.

Fighting intellectual property violations in developing countries will take more than cracking the whip on illegal sales. We need to create the political will at the top of the governance structure so we can drive a real impact on the ground.

Mr. WOLF, I would like to thank you for your leadership on our Nation's diplomatic priorities and ask if you would be willing to work with me to provide additional funding for the State Department's Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs to give them the resources to work on developing institutions to enforce intellectual property protections in non-OECD countries.

Mr. WOLF. Reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlewoman; and I will work with her to provide additional resources for the State Department's Economic Bureau to enhance their ability to pursue better enforcement of intellectual property protections in non-OECD countries.

But where is the amendment to put the will, the commitment, the passion? And frankly, we will be glad to do this. But some big law firm down on K Street is going to be retained by some of these people, and they will be coming up here and working the administration and working others. Funding is good, but give me somebody who really cares, really believes, really is committed.

When you have people out there representing the Khartoum Government in Sudan, when Darfur and China has all these big law firms on retention, just funding this, so unless there is the commitment, the determination, but, yes, we will work with you every way we possibly can.

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, we are going to see that your passion spreads throughout this House.

And I would like to ask, now, Mr. MOLLOHAN the same question. Would you be willing to work with me to allocate additional funding for the State Department's Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs to give them the resources to work on developing political will to enforce intellectual property protections in the non-OECD countries?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Yes, I would be pleased to work with the chairman and the gentlewoman; pledge to work to increase resources for the State Department's economic bureau to enhance their ability to improve enforcement of intellectual property protection.

Ms. WATSON. And I want to thank you so much, Mr. MOLLOHAN and Mr. WOLF.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CULBERSON

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CULBERSON:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act may be used in contravention of section 1373 of title 8, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, the State of Texas today executed one of the most dangerous, vicious killers in our State's history. Maturino Resendiz was known as the ''Railway Killer.'' He had killed repeatedly. He was a serial killer who had been arrested and deported seven times prior to the murder of Dr. Claudia Benton in Houston.

This individual was present in the United States illegally, but the City of Houston has a policy, in violation of Federal law, that prohibits Houston police officers from asking whether or not an individual they pick up is in the United States illegally.

The Federal law is very clear that local governments, local law enforcement agencies, cannot have any policy that prohibits or restricts the ability of a police officer from determining someone's presence in the country, whether or not they are legal. And my amendment simply enforces existing Federal law and makes it clear that, in order for a local government or police

agency to receive Federal money, they must comply with Federal law and follow Federal law in determining whether or not the person they have detained is here illegally.

The City of Los Angeles has a similar policy. Yet 95 percent of their outstanding warrants for homicide are for illegal aliens. This is a law and order amendment, Mr. Chairman.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it is a conflict, and you are conflicted when you come to the floor and a good friend and colleague wants to undermine his own city.

Frankly, I think my colleagues need to understand what this sanctuary means. It is a misnomer. It gives a suggestion that we are, in fact, welcoming and providing a grand parade. What it simply says is that we are going to burden, this amendment is going to be an unfunded mandate on local cities and jurisdictions whose law enforcement officers are busy in various parts of their communities trying to protect Americans from break-ins.

There is no way that you can connect the tragedy and horrificness of this executed individual, which no one has disagreed with, with the policies of individual cities where they make a decision that they are utilizing their police officers to take care of the juveniles who need help, to take care of the victims of rape, unfortunately, who need help, to take care of those who are victimized by homicide who need help.

The City of Houston is on record, the chief of police is on record, and the record is that our officers are there to do the work of the local government. They are not there to do the work of the Federal Government.

I would wish my good friend and colleague would add and join us in reinvesting into border patrol agents and ICE agents. And, by the way, any suggestion that they are not cooperating, I met with the police chief. There is no indication whatsoever in Houston that they are not cooperating with the local law enforcement and ICE.

What you do with this, and I hope my colleagues are listening. I know this sounds like Let's Bash an Immigrant Day. But what you will be doing is you will be cutting off funds from your local jurisdictions. They need to make their own decisions without the punitive measures of this Federal Government, particularly when we have fallen down on the job and not provided the kind of funding that we need for internal enforcement and for law enforcement and for border patrol agents.

So I would hope this distinguished gentleman would understand that you are putting an unfunded mandate on your own city and many other municipalities across America.

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

□ 1615

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 seconds to point out that the sanctuary policy my colleague is attempting to protect is a policy designed to protect and shield criminal aliens, and my amendment enforces Federal law. Federal law is intended to uncloak those criminal aliens and allow local law enforcement officers to identify people like the Railway Killer so they can turn them over to Federal authorities.

Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 1½ minutes to my colleague from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL).

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my friend and colleague from Texas for this amendment.

My hometown of Austin has seen the horrifying effects that a sanctuary policy can have on a community.

Nearly 3 years ago, an 18-year-old woman by the name of Jenny Garcia was found stabbed to death in her northwest Austin home. An illegal alien by the name of David Diaz Morales was one of Jenny's coworkers. He made it clear to her that he wanted to be more than that. When Jenny rejected his advances, this put him into a rage. And on January 26, 2004, Morales broke into Jenny's home, forcefully grabbed her, held her down, raped her and brutally stabbed her to death.

In less than 24 hours, the Austin Police Department arrested this 20-year-old criminal who had absolutely no business being in the United States, let alone Jenny's home.

However, Mr. Morales had no business being free to walk America's streets either. You see, before murdering Jenny, he had been previously arrested for molesting a child in Austin. Travis County District Attorney Ronnie Earle declined to prosecute the case. Morales wasn't deported. Instead, he was released on the streets of Austin, resulting in the murder of Jenny Garcia. Jenny did not have to die that day.

This is one of many horrific examples of the many preventable injustices that have resulted from this irresponsible sanctuary policy. We owe it to victims like Jenny Garcia and so many others to include this language in the underlying bill, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support the Culberson amendment.

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the House very briefly that the House has already approved this amendment on a vote of 218.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman of the committee, who, I understand, is going to accept this amendment. I want to thank the author of the amendment.

This has come up time and time again in front of this House. We have cities all over this country that are ignoring the law. It is part of the law today that says you cannot have sanctuary cities, and yet cities are doing it, and they are snubbing their noses at the Federal law. And as a result of it, crimes are being committed. People have been killed as a result of the fact that cities provide sanctuary for people who are here illegally, have come in contact with the police, and the police have refused to make that known to the ICE agency. As a result of that kind of policy, people in this country have died.

I, again, want to thank the author of the amendment and the committee for accepting this amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to clarify, I think, the discussion here on the floor, and my deepest sympathy for cases that have been previously cited.

The sanctuary terminology, again, is a misnomer. It is a suggestion that law enforcement has actually put a welcome mat out for criminals. It is well known that any criminal that does a criminal act or is stopped for a traffic infraction is, in fact, taken care of by the local municipality. Where we have had failures is that we have not had sufficient funding for internal enforcement officers and others dealing with immigration issues for these individuals to be transferred.

I cannot stand here on the floor and allow the debate to suggest that local law enforcement, sheriffs, constables, police are letting horrific criminals go. They simply are not. If you do the crime, you will be arrested and do the time if your law enforcement are engaged.

This will punish cities who are not turning their law enforcement, their meager law enforcement resources, into immigration patrols. That is a responsibility of the Federal Government. And to suggest that this amendment is going to stop the railroad killer and others; that was a combination of U.S. Marshals and FBI and HPD and everyone who was focused on finding that killer. No one is letting killers get away. And this particular amendment is not what Members may think it is, a way to get and to stand tall on illegal immigration. This is a way to undermine your respective local jurisdictions who have the responsibility of

the enforcement of the law to protect the citizens of the jurisdiction or this Nation. All this does is jeopardize their funding when one citizen says, ''You know what? They let this individual go that looked like they were undocumented, and they were driving a car.'' This is what this does. And you go to any of your towns and find out that there are individuals whose surnames are other than ours or other than what you would perceive to be a standard name, if you will, and has a Hispanic sound or has some other sound to it and you want law enforcement then to arrest them, and you would suggest that law enforcement is not doing their job if they release them. This is the kind of determination you are going to ask on the streets of your respective cities and counties and jurisdictions when you should be dealing with this from the funding perspective of the Federal Government.

This is a bad provision. Whether it has been voted on before, it is a bad provision, and all it is going to do is hurt the cities. And, clearly, my good friend and colleague knows that this debate is going on in the City of Houston as we speak, and those are the individuals that need to make that decision.

I ask my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to my colleague from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Texas for yielding.

Let me make it clear. What this amendment does, which I support, is very simple. There is a Federal law that says you may not prohibit, it does not require you do it, but you may not prohibit local law enforcement officials from cooperating on immigration issues. This amendment simply says you cannot use Federal funds to violate Federal law. Pretty simple. Pretty logical. Do not use Federal funds to violate existing Federal law. You do not have to make them, but do not prohibit your law enforcement from cooperating on immigration issues.

We should pass this amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I want to point out that Congress has passed and the President has signed Federal legislation on the books which requires local law enforcement officers to identify a person who is in the country illegally. Local law enforcement needs every tool in their tool kit possible to identify and uncover criminal aliens.

This amendment is aimed at enforcing Federal law, giving local law enforcement the tools they need to identify and uncover killers like the Railroad Killer, who was executed today in Texas.

The sanctuary policy that my colleague from Houston is attempting to defend is a ''don't ask and don't tell'' policy that prohibits officers from identifying criminal aliens. A vote for this amendment is to help law enforcement identify and report criminal aliens and enforce Federal law.

I urge a ''yes'' on the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ETHERIDGE

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ETHERIDGE:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. For the Public Safety Officers' Death Benefits program, as authorized by part L of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, to fund obligations of the Department of Justice resulting from subsection (k) of section 1201 of such part, in additition to amounts otherwise appropriated by this Act under title I for ''PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICERS'' for payments authorized by such part L and hereby derived from the amount provided in this Act under title I for ''GENERAL ADMINISTRATION—SALARIES AND EXPENSES'', $38,000,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

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

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, Michael Childress, Randelman, North Carolina; Roger Armstrong, Atlanta, Illinois; Steven Rosenfeld, Salem, Virginia; Donald Eugene Ward, Columbus, Ohio; Richard Allen Fast, Alum Bridge, West Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, these are just five of the 135 eligible firefighters who have died in the line of duty since this House unanimously approved the Hometown Heroes Survivor Benefit Act and it was signed by the President into law on December 15, 2003.

The Hometown Heroes Act, which had 281 bipartisan cosponsors, made sure that a public service officer, such as a fireman, law enforcement officer, EMT or other public servant, who died of a fatal heart attack or stroke in the line of duty would receive a benefit.

Since the President signed this bill into law on December 15, 2½ years ago, 135 firefighters have suffered a fatal heart attack or stroke while responding to a call. However, in 2½ years, none of these survivors have received one single penny of these congressionally authorized benefits because the U.S. Department of Justice has not approved the regulations.

I have offered this amendment to highlight the Justice Department's foot dragging and delays. The first delay came when they proposed regulations that were in direct contradiction to the legislation that was passed. They then delayed when they quibbled with the words and phrases. The last excuse is that they are waiting for approval from the Office of Management and Budget.

Mr. Chairman, Members and staff spent countless hours while writing this legislation to clarify what it really meant. During the Judiciary Committee markup on this measure, Chairman SENSENBRENNER stated, ''I believe this bill provides the Bureau of Justice Assistance with the direction they require in reviewing and granting these benefits to deserving and qualified public safety officers who dedicate themselves to the public interest and pay the ultimate price for the public good.''

Once the President signed the bill into law, we were in constant contact with DOJ, working through the queries.

The brave men and women who serve our cities and towns every day, many of whom are volunteers, do not delay when they are given a call and someone is in distress. They act, and they act immediately.

I call on Attorney General Gonzales to stop making excuses, to end the delays, stop denying these victims and families the benefits they deserve. The brave men and women should not have to wait another day.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY), who just lost a fireman in his district.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his work on this issue.

On June 13, Rhode Island and Providence lost Mike Day due to a heart attack just after he had returned from a fire to the fire station. He is the son of a firefighter, and he is one of four brothers who all became Providence firefighters. He was passionate about helping save people's lives and helping to serve people.

Who has he left behind? He has left his wife of 22 years behind, Cynthia, as well as four children, Mike Jr., Amanda, Brianne and Stephanie.

The Hometown Heroes Act was signed by the President 3 years ago. Where is the support for these families who put their lives on the line to save our lives and our communities? The delay out there from the Department of Justice means that these benefit applications of people like Mike Day are waiting, collecting dust in the Department of Justice. This is inexcusable.

Mr. Chairman, I believe our public safety officers need to know that if they lay down their lives for us that we are going to be there to back their families up and make sure those families are supported. The hardship of these families shouldn't wait on the Department of Justice and neither should we

in Congress wait for the Department of Justice.

I urge passage of this amendment.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1¼ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina has 30 seconds remaining.

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

I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

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

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

□ 1630

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, Congressman BOB ETHERIDGE should be commended for what he did 3 years ago; and we had an overwhelming vote on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Unfortunately, none of the survivors of the 135 firefighters that he mentioned just a few moments ago and which Mr. KENNEDY mentioned a few moments ago that died have received a single penny of the authorized benefits. This is because the Justice Department has not approved the regulations that would put the provision of the Hometown Heroes Act into effect.

This is unconscionable. This is wholly unacceptable. This is another time where the will of the Congress has not been activated.

This amendment sends a necessary directive to the Attorney General that the families of our Nation's first responders should not be made to wait for what they deserve any longer. This amendment is a clear message that the Congress will no longer allow the Department of Justice to inexplicably harm the families of our Nation's heroes.

This was the right thing to do 3 years ago. It is the right thing to do now, to pass this amendment now. I was proud to stand with the gentleman from North Carolina when we passed this, many of us, all of us, in December, 2003. We want their loved ones to be fully taken care of. This amendment is that message. It is time for us to act, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the gentleman is going to withdraw the amendment. On page 65 of the report, the subcommittee says the committee expects the Department of Justice to work swiftly toward full implementation of the Hometown Heroes Survivors Benefit Act.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), the ranking member.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I was just going to compliment the gentleman from North Carolina for bringing this issue up. I remember when he first brought it to the Congress, and I want to compliment him for bringing this amendment to the floor.

I also want to compliment the chairman for recognizing this has been a problem. It is contained in our report that the Justice Department move quickly. I just want to point out this isn't a hard thing for the Justice Department to do. Rulemaking as simple as this ought to be done in 30 days. Publish the proposed rule, get a few comments and get it out there. It is inexcusable that this program, which is so meritorious, hasn't been implemented for 3 years.

I support the gentleman's effort.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his willingness to work on this and also Ranking Member MOLLOHAN. They are absolutely right. There is no excuse for this. Men and women are doing their job, and we ought to support them.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment, with the understanding it is going to be in the report language.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAPUANO

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAPUANO:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. For grants for young witness assistance, as authorized by section 1136 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–162), and the amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''OTHER—SALARIES AND EXPENSES, DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT'' is hereby reduced by, $3,000,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

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

Mr. Chairman, very simply, this amendment will help protect young juvenile witnesses who have the courage to do the right thing and stand up and testify against criminals that they have witnessed.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I accept the gentleman's amendment. I was waiting to hear his speech. I was listening and settling in. I do accept the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ENGEL:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of section 303 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13212).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will be brief. I am offering the same amendment that I have offered to almost all the other appropriations bills which have all been accepted, because I think it is so important for the Federal Government to put its money where its mouth is.

We are all running around talking about alternative energy and alternative fuel vehicles. All the while, our Federal agencies are failing to fully implement the 1992 Energy Policy Act which the Congress passed and which the President signed into law.

Seventy-five percent of new vehicles purchased for the Federal fleet should be alternative fuel by now, but it is only about 26 percent. For the major agencies in this bill, the numbers are disheartening. The Department of Commerce has only 32 percent of alternative fuel vehicles, the Department of Justice came in at a paltry 6 percent, and the Department of State was just 9 percent.

We have not only the opportunity to end our addiction to oil, we have the need to do so. Our national security continues to be threatened because we are reliant on undemocratic sheikdoms in the Middle East that funnel money to the terrorists who would do us harm.

Our energy policy and our national security policy are intertwined, and we can start right here by mandating that our Federal agencies look for alternative fuel vehicles, which they have to do by a law that we passed more than a decade ago.

So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and provide the leadership that is so desperately needed.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, before beginning, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I have two amendments at the desk having to do with the medicinal use of marijuana. I understand that the first one has been allocated 10 minutes and the second one has been allocated 20 minutes, is that correct?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HINCHEY

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HINCHEY:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may used by the Department of Justice to prevent the States of Alaska, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Maine, Montana, Rhode Island, Nevada, Oregon, Vermont, or Washington from implementing State laws authorizing the use of medical marijuana, and the Attorney General shall transfer from available appropriations for the current fiscal year for the Department of Justice any amounts that would have been used for such purpose but for this section to ''Drug Enforcement Administration, Salaries and Expenses'', for the Drug Enforcement Administration to assist State and local law enforcement with proper removal and disposal of hazardous materials from illegal methamphetamine labs, including funding for training, technical assistance, a container program, and purchase of equipment to adequately remove and store hazardous material.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment was to reallocate funding in this bill away from the prosecution of the use of marijuana for medicinal purposes in those 11 States where either the legislature or the people of those States by referenda have decided that they would like to have marijuana use for medicinal purposes under the supervision of a licensed physician in those 11 States, to have it moved from there to the enforcement of methamphetamine violations.

My understanding is that the chairman is going to insist on a point of order, saying that this is legislating on an appropriations bill. Am I correct about that?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has reserved a point of order.

Mr. WOLF. I reserved the point of order.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I don't know why there would be a point of order against this amendment, because it seems to me that we have the ability to make these kinds of decisions now. This is not legislating on an appropriations bill. It is simply moving one appropriation for one particular purpose to a better purpose.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, regardless of how you have voted in the past, there are two critical developments since the last vote that make compelling arguments for a ''no'' vote on the Hinchey Amendment to the SSJC Appropriations bill. The Hinchey Amendment would deny law enforcement agencies Federal funds to enforce the Controlled Substances Act in those States where 'medicinal' marijuana is legal under State law.

First, the FDA in April of this year confirmed that there is no research to sustain the supposed ''medicinal value'' in smoked marijuana. On April 20, 2006, the FDA stated, ''A past evaluation by several Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) agencies, including the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) and National Institute for Drug Abuse (NIDA), concluded that no sound scientific studies supported medical use of marijuana for treatment in the United States, and no animal or human data supported the safety or efficacy of marijuana for general medical use.'' Furthermore, the ''FDA has not approved smoked marijuana for any condition or disease indication.''

Second, research from a 25-year longitudinal study by the Christchurch School of Medicine and Health Services showed that regular or heavy marijuana use was linked to a wide range of other illicit drugs and to a dependence or abuse of these other illicit drugs.

The research concluded that ''following tight statistical controls, there is a clear tendency for those using cannabis to have higher rates of usage of other illicit drugs. This tendency is most evident for regular users of cannabis, and is even more marked in adolescents than in young adults.'' These researchers, using the most robust longitudinal database in the world, show what we have long suspected—marijuana is a gateway to even more dangerous drugs of abuse.

A handful of states have legalized smoked marijuana for medical claims. Not only are patients being given an ineffective, unapproved, and even harmful drug, but also one that is illegal under Federal law.

Time and time again, research has demonstrated the harmful effects of marijuana. According to Dr. Nora Volkow, the Director of the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), marijuana ''can produce adverse physical, mental, emotional, and behavioral changes, and—contrary to popular belief—it can be addictive. Marijuana smoke, like cigarette smoke, can harm the lungs. The use of marijuana can impair short-term memory, verbal skills, and judgment and distort perception. It also may weaken the immune system and possibly increase a user's likelihood of developing cancer. Finally, the increasing use of marijuana by very young teens may have a profoundly negative effect upon their development.''

It is of the utmost importance that law enforcement be able to protect this country from dangerous drug trafficking, including marijuana. Join us in opposing the Hinchey amendment.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, in any case, I respect the chairman's decision; and, with that, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HINCHEY

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HINCHEY:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act to the Department of Justice may be used to prevent the States of Alaska, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Maine, Montana, Rhode Island, Nevada, Oregon, Vermont, or Washington from implementing State laws authorizing the use of medical marijuana in those States.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment has to do with two things: It has to do with compassion, compassion for people who are very seriously ill and/or dying, and the ability of States in which those people live to provide means by which their suffering can be relieved.

It also has to do with one other point, and that is the issue of States' rights, the ability of the States to determine how medical care will be regulated in those States.

We have 11 States in our country, Mr. Chairman, that have determined that it is in the interests of the people of those States that they be allowed to use marijuana for medicinal purposes to alleviate the suffering from such things as AIDS, cancer, glaucoma and multiple sclerosis: Alaska, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Maine, Montana, Rhode Island, Nevada, Oregon, Vermont and Washington. However, the Federal Government has decided that they are going to intervene and prevent those States from carrying out the laws which were passed in two cases by the State legislatures and in nine cases by referenda by the people of those States.

We will hear from the people who oppose this amendment that marijuana has something to do with a gateway drug. In other words, it introduces people to other drugs. This amendment has nothing whatsoever to do with that. This amendment has nothing to do with drug addiction. This amendment has nothing to do with the potential for drug addiction. This amendment simply has to do with the ability of States to relieve the suffering of their citizens without Federal intervention and the right of States to pass

laws regulating medical practice without Federal intervention. It is a very simple amendment, and it ought to be passed.

Those people here who believe in small government should support it. Those people here who believe in the issue of States' rights ought to support it. And those people here who believe that State governments and the people in those governments have the right to take care of their citizens and alleviate their suffering, those people in this House ought to support this amendment as well.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair would remind our guests in the gallery that demonstrations of either approval or disapproval are not appropriate.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the Hinchey amendment.

Let's be clear: Marijuana is not harmless, as some claim. It is a schedule 1 drug under the Controlled Substances Act, meaning it has no accepted medical use in treatment and has a high potential for abuse. In fact, marijuana continues to be the most widely abused drug in the United States.

Those who anecdotally claim that marijuana has a medical benefit do not differentiate between THC and whole marijuana. Whole marijuana contains hundreds of chemicals, many of which are harmful to one's health. An evaluation by several Federal agencies concluded that no sound scientific studies supported marijuana's medical use, and smoking marijuana is not approved as a legitimate medical use by the FDA.

The bottom line is, marijuana is an addictive substance that is linked to cancer and respiratory ailments and problems with the immune and reproductive system.

Let me say as a member of the Speaker's Task Force for a Drug-Free America, marijuana is the drug that will tell whether or not someone is going to get on methamphetamines. It is the precursor, the gateway drug, for heroin use. As we continue to fight this battle against illegal drug use, this is the drug that gets people started.

Anyone who is trying to send a message to our young people today should be embarrassed by having an amendment like this, because this is telling people that this is okay, that it is socially acceptable, that you can start here and it won't hurt you. And, in fact, medically, scientifically, that is dead wrong.

The message we are sending to our children today is very strong. Whether we support legal use of marijuana as a precursor to methamphetamines, to heroin, this is the message we will be sending if we approve this. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the cosponsor of this amendment, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Hinchey-Rohrabacher amendment. Our amendment would prohibit any funds made available in this act to the Department of Justice from being used to prevent the implementation of legally passed State laws in those 11 States authorizing the use of marijuana for medical purposes.

Our coalition of freedom-minded Republicans and Democrats on this issue is based on compassion for those who are suffering, a commitment to personal liberty and a firm belief in the principles of federalism.

□ 1645

The use of marijuana to relieve the pain of victims of a wide variety of medical conditions is well known and increasingly documented in the media and in medical journals. For many of these people, medical science has not been able to relieve their pain.

Just recently a friend of mine and a friend of many years passed away, Lyn Nofziger, and many of you here probably know him. He was Ronald Reagan's first press secretary. I went to see him after he got out of the hospital with his treatments for cancer.

He had his good days and his bad days. I saw him about a week before he died. And I asked Lyn about it, and he said, yes, sometimes it is bad, and other times it is not, but I could not get myself to eat, and I had the pain no matter what they did for me.

And I said, well, did you ever try that medical marijuana that we have been talking about and debating about? And he got a twinkle in his eye, and he said, yes, I did. And it brought my appetite back, and I slept like a baby. Do not tell me that we should have Federal law enforcement people come into a State where the people have voted to approve that if a doctor agrees and get in the way of Lyn Nofziger or anyone else who is suffering and use Federal money and Federal resources that should be going to fight crime in order to create that obstacle.

That is a travesty. Individuals who live in the 11 States affected by the amendment have been granted by the voters of these States the legal right to use marijuana to alleviate their pain if a doctor agrees. If the voters have so voted and a doctor agrees, it is a travesty for the government to intercede, the Federal Government, allocating our scarce resources to fighting this, getting in the way of someone using something to alleviate their suffering.

This is something which should be left to the States as American tradition dictates. Sandra Day O'Connor stated it best, and she stated that States should serve as a laboratory so that people can try certain new ideas out to see how they work.

Well, the Federal Government should not get in the way of what is going on in these 11 States to see how this works. The most recent decision of the Supreme Court has thrown the ball into the hands of the U.S. Congress. Paul Stevens, Justice Paul Stevens, made it clear: the voices of the voters may one day be heard in the Halls of Congress on behalf of legalizing marijuana. Eleven States have already acted.

I would hope you would all join us for the principles of federalism, compassion and individual liberty and not get in the way of the people who are suffering.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, we have people out there, not just Lyn Nofziger but others, and my mother suffered. I remember how she lost her appetite after suffering a debilitating disease in which she had to go through treatments.

This is a travesty to use scarce Federal resources. Join this coalition of people who are Republicans and Democrats who believe in federalism, who believe in compassion and believe in personal liberty. Let doctors prescribe these things, not Federal Government bureaucrats.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the authors of this amendment. I simply want to say this: If I am terminally ill, it is not anybody's business on this floor how I handle the pain or the illness or the sickness associated with that illness.

With all due respect to all of you, butt out. I did not enter this world with the permission of the Justice Department, and I am certainly not going to depart it by seeking their permission or that of any other authority.

The Congress has no business telling people that they cannot manage their illness or their pain any way they need to. I would trust any doctor in the country before I trust some of the daffy ducks in this institution to decide what I am supposed to do if I am terminally ill.

The idea that somehow this is a gateway that we are creating for a drug like meth is a joke. I detest meth. I have seen what it does. It is a plague on my district. It is especially horrendous in the midwest, and it is getting worse every day. That has nothing whatsoever to do with the management of pain and misery for people who are sick and who are dying.

When is this Congress going to recognize that individuals in their private lives have a right to manage their problems as they see fit without the permission of the big guy in the White

House or the big guy in the Justice Department or any of the Lilliputians on this Congressional floor? Wake up.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me time and for the privilege to address this issue.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard from the other Member from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) that the Food and Drug Administration has classified marijuana, along with heroin, LSD, methamphetamine, hashish and a number of other drugs, as Schedule I drugs. That is because they carry a high potential for dangerous abuse.

And so doctors in most States even prohibit them for being prescribed for medicinal purposes. That is a standard. That is the national standard. The issue was raised about States' rights. But no one has raised the issue about States' rights about the other drugs that are Schedule I drugs.

But we do have a right, a constitutional right and an obligation to regulate drugs in America. The question really is, is marijuana among them? And it is. And so we would be seeking to, by this amendment, usurp that decision and change that standard.

But with regard to the addictive nature of marijuana, I am looking at a study here that says that if adults started at a fairly young age, say by the time of 26 or older, they used marijuana before the age of 15, 62 percent reported a lifetime cocaine use, 9 permanent reported lifetime heroin use, and 54 percent reported nonmedical use of psychotherapeutics. And this does not include methamphetamines, which is abused more than any of these drugs that I mentioned here.

So this is a high use issue. It is also something that infringes upon or inhibits our ability and our reflexes with regard to driving. So, for example, the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration reports that marijuana use has been shown to impair driving performance. These things we know.

Then with regard to the gentleman from California's statements about he could not, that Mr. Nofziger could not get himself to eat, if that is our issue, then let us focus on the synthetic THC that is now available. It is available in a drug by the name of Marinol, and it has been proven to be effective, especially dealing with cancer patients and with the nausea associated with the chemotherapy treatments and also with the appetite, that might help assisting the appetite with AIDS patients.

There is a way that we can use the THC, and there is a way also that we can protect this country against that kind of Schedule I drug.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time do we have?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Four and a half minutes.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hinchey-Rohrabacher-Paul-Farr amendment.

Mr. Chairman, every year we bring this amendment to the floor. So far it has never passed. Some may ask, well, why are we doing this again? Well, the answer is because of the statements that have been made already by Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. OBEY about compassion for people who are suffering.

We offer this amendment for terminal cancer patients, for AIDS victims, for persons who suffer chronic pain. We offer this amendment not only to protect those people; we offer this amendment to protect these States that are progressive enough to provide alternative medical options to those who need it.

So often this body insists on protecting the rights of States to define marriage. So often this body insists on protecting the rights of States to set abortion policies. So often this body insists on protecting the rights of States to determine education curricula and standards.

But when it comes to protecting the rights of States to set medical scope of practice, this body balks. All of a sudden States no longer have the right to determine what is best for their citizens when it includes medical marijuana.

The Hinchey amendment does not change Federal law. It does not change drug policy. It does protect States' rights. For those of you who come from States that do not have medical marijuana laws, nothing in this amendment will affect your State. Everything in your State remains status quo.

For those of you who come from States that do have medical marijuana laws, very little in this amendment will impact your State. The only difference now is that your State will be able to implement its laws without little old ladies being busted by Federal cops. I support this amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON), a member of the committee.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment. For 20 years, in State government, I worked on health issues. I chaired the health committee for a decade. I asked leaders and major medical groups; I asked leaders in the medical societies; and since I have been here I have asked leaders at NIH, do we need to legalize marijuana? And I have never had a positive answer.

They said, we have more drugs than we need. We have more things that are out there for people that will perform better than marijuana. But what I tell you what I do not want to do, I do not want to support the belief that too many of our young people already have that marijuana is a harmless drug. I know better. I had young people work for me in my supermarket who I knew were using marijuana.

And they used it for a period of years, folks. And they are not as sharp after years of marijuana use as they would have been. It dulls the brain. It holds back the growth. Brains are not mature until they are 25. And marijuana use has been proven to deter brain growth. A close friend of mine in Harrisburg who was a prominent State legislator was having dinner with me 25 years ago, and he was talking about Johnnie, who was attending Penn State, the brightest of three children.

And all of a sudden, Johnnie in his junior year in college was not doing well. He could not figure out why. He visited him two or three weekends in a month, 3 months in a row, to try to figure out what was wrong with Johnnie. In his senior year of high school, Johnnie had started using marijuana.

Johnnie lost his thrust for life. Johnnie lost the keen mind that God had given him. Marijuana stole him from the potential he had. Folks, if I thought the American public needed legal marijuana for pain and suffering, I would support it. We have more drugs than we need on the marketplace.

Marijuana destroys young people's chances to have good lives. I have close friends and even relatives who are living less of a life than they would have if they had not spent years abusing marijuana. Marijuana is a dangerous drug that is not adequately respected by the young people of this country because they have been seduced by leaders in this country advocating that it is a perfect, wonderful drug.

Mr. HINCHEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) for the purpose of making a unanimous consent request.

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I stand to support the Hinchey/Rohrabacher Amendment, an amendment to end federal raids on medical marijuana patients and providers in states where medical marijuana is legal.

Despite marijuana's recognized therapeutic value, including a National Academy of Sciences' Institute of Medicine report recommending its use in certain circumstances, federal law refuses to recognize its medicinal importance and safety.

This amendment does not change the classification of marijuana as a Schedule I narcotic. It does not legalize marijuana, or stop law enforcement officials from prosecuting individuals for recreational use of marijuana. It does not require that states adopt laws protecting the medicinal use of marijuana. It simply extends the protections already provided at the state level in ten states to the federal level. It ensures that critically ill patients can find relief from nausea and pain without worrying that the federal government will prosecute them.

The federal government should use its power to help terminally ill citizens, not arrest them. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have never been an advocate for drug testing for Members of Congress, but hearing that marijuana use can dull the brain makes me think maybe this is something that we ought to be checking into.

I am always heightened in my support of an activity, an amendment, when those opposing will not argue it directly. We are not talking about 18-year-olds getting into methamphetamines. This is a very narrow amendment. It says, where a State has decided by its own democratic processes to legalize marijuana according to a doctor's prescription, we will not arrest people who try to do it federally.

□ 1700

Very few of the arguments have met that. The question of marijuana in general is not before us. This does not legalize marijuana. We have many drugs that can legally be prescribed that are far more behavior altering, far more addictive than marijuana has ever alleged to be.

This is a question about whether or not we are going to reach into medical practice and say to medical practitioners whose States would allow them to do it that, because of cultural and other concerns about this drug, we ban its use when you might find it medically appropriate.

This is, again, the time when I think the slogan of this House ought to be: We are not doctors; we just play them on C–SPAN.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN).

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the amendment. As a member of the medical community, I understand the importance of effectively treating and preventing pain.

However, the medical use of smoked marijuana has been rejected by the American Medical Association, the American Cancer Society and other leading health care organizations.

The concern is that marijuana smokers are exposing themselves to a crude and harmful drug delivery system.

Marijuana smoke contains a variety of toxic chemicals that can cause damage and may even exacerbate the underlying medical condition.

The Federal Government has provided money for research into the medicinal use of THC, which is believed to be the primary chemical component responsible for marijuana's psycho-pharmacological effects. I support that approach.

As a result of such research, synthetic forms of THC have been available as an oral prescription for 20 years.

Ultimately, inhaling marijuana smoke and tar are not effective treatments for medical conditions.

For these reasons and primarily because of the opposition of leading health care organizations, I must rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, over the past months, we have all met with them. They live in our towns. They come to our offices. They come to the Hill every single year, and they come from all walks of life. They share with us their experience or the experiences of someone they loved, someone with epilepsy, glaucoma, cancer, AIDS or other chronic pain. Their stories touch our lives, and if only for a moment, we feel their misery.

But unless we are affected personally or know somebody who is affected, after a few hours, we inevitably get caught up in something else. Today, we can actually do something that might improve their lives. We can stop prosecuting the use of medical marijuana in the States that legally permit it.

The choice to use medical marijuana is mostly made out of medical necessity and the desire to get through the day with as much normalcy and strength as possible.

This is the right thing to do for those who are sick, who are in pain and those who cannot keep a meal down. Let's not be bad politicians. Let's make smart decisions. Let's help these good people.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

I rise in opposition to the amendment. There has been a lot of talk about the Fraternal Order of Police and how we support our police. Here is a letter from the Grand Lodge Fraternal Order of Police, Chuck Canterbury, National President, saying, referring to the Hinchey amendment:

> Such an amendment threatens to cause a significant disruptive effect on the combined efforts of State and local law enforcement to reduce drug crime in every region of the country. On behalf of the more than 324,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police, we urge its defeat.

We talked a lot about the police and how we want to do this to support them. I think we should support the police here. I urge a strong ''no'' vote on this amendment.

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

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 45 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman for yielding and for, once again, his leadership on this important issue.

Taxpayers dollars quite frankly should not be spent on sending seriously or terminally ill patients to jail. Their doctors, not Congress, should decide which drugs will work best. So I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this amendment and ensure patients' rights because that is what this is about, that patients' rights are upheld.

This amendment does not encourage nor does it make legal the recreational use of marijuana. For example, Angel Raich, my constituent from Oakland, has been diagnosed with more than ten serious medical conditions, including inoperable brain tumors. She, and others who use medical marijuana, are simply trying to relieve their crushing pain while following the guidelines and the laws that their doctors and that their States have already established.

So please pass this amendment. Patients deserve this. We should not send terminally ill patients or seriously ill patients to jail.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Chairman, the arguments that have been put forth against this amendment have nothing to do with this amendment. This amendment has nothing to do with legalizing marijuana. It has to do with two simple things: being compassionate for people who are suffering and dying under the lawful provisions of laws passed in their States, the 11 States that have done so; and States' rights, the right of States to govern medical malpractice, not this Congress. This Congress should recognize States' rights and live up to the provisions of the Constitution and pass this amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

For 5 years in the Senate, I was a staffer under Senator Hawkins, who chaired the Drug Policy Committee on the Senate side. I have served most of my time in the House on the Criminal Justice Drug Policy Subcommittee or one of its predecessors. I chaired Criminal Justice Drug Policy.

I point that out to tell you, in the nearly two decades, I have never heard one credible source that said that there is a need for medical prescription and use of marijuana, not one credible source through dozens and dozens of hearings.

In fact, we have heard the other side say, let the doctor decide, and in fact, the experts, and there is no bigger association than the American Medical Association of doctors. The National Multiple Sclerosis Society has opposed this. The American Glaucoma Society has opposed it. The American Academy of Ophthalmology and the American Cancer Society have all opposed this type of use.

Millions of dollars have been spent in an effort to try to push this agenda, and we know Mr. Soros has spent millions.

In 1979, Keith Stroup, the NORML founder, announced that NORML would be using the issue of medical marijuana as a red herring, not my term, red herring to give marijuana a good name.

You have heard the testimony. In over half the instances of use of cocaine and marijuana, the gateway drug that is used, in fact, is marijuana.

So this is a gateway opportunity to use and encourage the use of marijuana. In fact, early marijuana users are eight times more likely to use cocaine and 15 times more likely to use heroin and five times more likely to develop a need for treatment. That is according to our Office of National Drug Control Policy.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, this 15-minute vote on the Hinchey amendment will be followed by 2-minute votes on the amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona regarding Arthur Avenue, the amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona regarding the Bronx Council, the amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona regarding JARI, the amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona regarding Fairmont State University, the amendment by Mr. FLAKE of Arizona regarding Kentucky Tourism, and the amendment by Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

Again, the Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 163, noes 259, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 333]

AYES—163

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldwin
Bartlett (MD)
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Campbell (CA)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Crowley
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Doggett
Doyle
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Frank (MA)
Garrett (NJ)
Gilchrest
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hinchey
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Porter
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rehberg
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Simmons
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Solis
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tancredo
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—259

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
English (PA)
Etheridge
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Gene
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Meek (FL)
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Sodrel
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Cannon
Davis (FL)
Evans
Gerlach
Holden
Hyde
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Poe
Sherwood

□ 1735

Mr. SHAW, Ms. HART and Mr. MEEK of Florida changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. SIMMONS, BURTON of Indiana and GILCHREST changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SKELTON was allowed to speak out of order.)

HONORING CONGRESSMAN JIM MARSHALL ON HIS INDUCTION INTO THE UNITED STATES ARMY RANGERS HALL OF FAME

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I announce to our colleagues today that a gentleman, a veteran from Vietnam, a member of the Armed Services Committee, is receiving an extraordinary honor tomorrow. Tomorrow afternoon, the gentleman from Georgia, Congressman Jim Marshall, will be inducted into the United States Army Rangers Hall of Fame, and we are very proud of that.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 76, noes 345, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 334]

AYES—76

Akin
Barrett (SC)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bradley (NH)
Campbell (CA)
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Conaway
Cooper
Cubin
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Ehlers
Everett
Feeney
Flake
Ford
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gingrey
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Harris
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Inglis (SC)
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
Kline
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Matheson
McHenry

Miller (FL)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Norwood
Otter
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Porter
Price (GA)
Ramstad
Rohrabacher
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Thornberry
Upton
Westmoreland
Whitfield

NOES—345

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Cannon
Davis (FL)
Evans
Farr
Gerlach
Holden
Hyde
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Poe
Sherwood

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1742

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 74, noes 343, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 335]

AYES—74

Akin
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackburn
Bradley (NH)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Chabot
Chocola
Cooper
Cubin
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Ehlers
Everett
Feeney
Flake
Ford
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Harris
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Inglis (SC)
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
Kline
Leach
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
McHenry
Miller (FL)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Norwood
Otter
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thornberry
Westmoreland

NOES—343

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar

Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Cannon
Davis (FL)
DeGette
Evans
Farr
Gerlach
Hinchey
Holden
Hyde
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Neal (MA)
Poe
Sherwood
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1746

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 63, noes 356, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 336]

AYES—63

Barrett (SC)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bradley (NH)
Burton (IN)
Chabot
Chocola
Conaway
Cooper
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Everett
Feeney
Flake
Ford
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gingrey
Gohmert
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Inglis (SC)
Jindal
Jones (NC)
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
Kirk
Leach
Linder
McHenry
Miller (FL)
Musgrave
Myrick
Norwood
Otter
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rohrabacher
Ryan (WI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Thornberry
Westmoreland

NOES—356

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Cannon
Davis (FL)
Evans
Farr
Gerlach
Holden
Hyde
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Poe
Pombo
Sherwood
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that there is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1750

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) regarding Fairmont State University on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 70, noes 350, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 337]

AYES—70

Akin
Barrett (SC)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bradley (NH)
Cantor
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Cooper
Deal (GA)
Duncan
Everett
Feeney
Flake
Ford
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Harris
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Inglis (SC)
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
Kirk
Kline
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
McHenry
Miller (FL)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Norwood
Otter
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rohrabacher
Ryan (WI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Upton
Westmoreland

NOES—350

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Cannon
Davis (FL)
Evans
Farr
Gerlach
Holden
Hyde
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Poe
Sherwood
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that 1 minute remains in this vote.

□ 1755

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 56, noes 363, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 338]

AYES—56

Akin
Barrett (SC)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Bilirakis
Blackburn
Bradley (NH)
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Cooper
Deal (GA)
Ehlers
Everett
Feeney
Flake
Ford
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gingrey
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Harris
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Inglis (SC)
Istook
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kennedy (MN)
Linder
Miller (FL)
Musgrave
Myrick
Norwood
Otter
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Price (GA)
Ramstad
Rohrabacher
Ryan (WI)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thornberry
Westmoreland

NOES—363

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sessions
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)

Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Cannon
Davis (FL)
Evans
Farr
Gerlach
Holden
Hyde
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
King (IA)
Poe
Sherwood
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1759

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANK OF MASSACHUSETTS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 145, noes 274, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 339]

AYES—145

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Barrow
Bass
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bono
Boswell
Bradley (NH)
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson
Chabot
Clay
Cleaver
Coble
Conyers
Cooper
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dingell
Doggett
Duncan
Emerson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Gibbons
Goodlatte
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hart
Hefley
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Holt
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (CT)
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kline
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Markey
Matheson
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McKinney
Meehan
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Moore (WI)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neal (MA)
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Ramstad
Renzi
Rothman
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanders
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Simmons
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tiberi
Tierney
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Woolsey
Wynn

NOES—274

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Becerra
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Capito
Carnahan
Carter
Case
Castle
Chandler
Chocola
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (AL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Tom
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Honda
Hooley
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keller
Kildee
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lucas
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Northup
Nunes
Ortiz
Osborne
Oxley
Pastor
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Stearns
Strickland
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Van Hollen
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Cannon
Davis (FL)
Evans
Farr
Gerlach
Holden
Hyde
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Poe
Sherwood
Simpson
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that 1 minute remains in this vote.

□ 1805

Mr. WU and Mr. TOWNS changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEARCE) assumed the Chair.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 889) ''An Act to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2006, to make technical corrections to various laws administered by the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.''.

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

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 21 offered by Mr. STEARNS:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to carry out any provision of section 203 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 1973aa-1a).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

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

Since 1975, the Bilingual Election Assistance Provisions of the Voting Rights Act have forced States and political subdivisions to accommodate multiple languages at the polls. The provisions prohibit States from providing voting material only in the English language.

While all of us enjoy hearing a wide variety of languages spoken here in the United States, I think that official government functions of the government ought to be conducted in English. Let me repeat that. I think the official government functions of this government ought to be conducted in English.

Let me state that my amendment is not about immigration, intimidation or discrimination. It is about assimilation. This is also an amendment about States' rights. States or political subdivisions can provide voting assistance in other languages if they want to, but I do not believe this is good for the United States to mandate.

The United States of America is a Nation of immigrants. We are the original melting pot. Importantly, though, the first motto of the United States of America was E pluribus unum: ''Out of many, one.'' This motto symbolizes the integration of the 13 independent colonies into one united country. The motto assumed even further meaning as Americans welcomed ever more immigrants from many lands to our shores. And one of the most unifying elements of one Nation is a common language.

Since our Nation's founding, there have been people who would literally suffer life and limb to be an American citizen. And I think that if you have the good fortune to be able to vote in the United States, then it is not too much to ask that this be accomplished in English. You can bring your own assistance to the polls if you need it, but I do not think the United States Government should be forced to pay for such assistance.

So, in my opinion, section 203 of the Voting Rights Act would exacerbate isolation and segregation. If individuals are not nudged, not pushed by the circumstances of daily living, including voting, to get out and master the basics of the English language, then they are denied all the rich opportunities that life in this great Nation offers. Further, depending upon how you got here, it is generally expected that you have a command of the English language. If you are born here and you obtain voting age and are limited for some reason in English proficiency, then I consider this quite a failing of the schools. And for most naturalized proceedings, you must pass a limited English proficiency requirement. Of course, democracy does not end at the polling place, so if one faces a language barrier to voting, then I suspect that he or she is secluded from enjoying all the full rights and privileges of democracy in the United States.

And, finally, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is about applying our scarce resources wisely in this country. The Bilingual Election Assistance Provisions come at no small cost to our States, our counties and our small towns.

For example, does a language with several dialects, such as Chinese, trigger the assistance requirement? Then the statute says that the jurisdiction's obligation is to ascertain the dialects that are commonly used by members of the applicable language minority group in the jurisdiction and to provide oral assistance in such dialects. Does a language that is unwritten trigger the requirement? Then oral assistance and publicity are required. We simply cannot, Mr. Chairman, afford to translate government documents and transactions into every possible conceivable language.

Now, if my amendment passes and becomes the law of the land, what would happen? Here is what: Voters not confident of their command of the English language would do what all of us would do, bring in their friends and neighbors and ask for help and assistance. Until 1975, there was no government duty to provide ballot translation, but a voter could certainly bring an interpreter of his choice to the voting booth.

I think that all eligible voters should knowledgeably, vigorously seeking knowledge, exercise their franchise. But let us just be a Nation that votes united, not divisively.

And I would say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, States should not have to print ballots in all these various languages. Let us just have the ballots printed in English.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in opposition to the amendment of my good friend, whom I admire in an extraordinary fashion, Mr. STEARNS.

One of the great advancements, Mr. Chairman, in our American democracy and of our American democracy was precisely the Voting Rights Act that made it possible, in effect, for millions of American citizens, minority American citizens, to have access to that sacred right that is voting. It is important, Mr. Chairman, that we keep in mind that this is not an immigration debate, as Mr. STEARNS said. We are talking about American citizens and only about American citizens.

There are, Mr. Chairman, millions of native born American citizens that speak languages other than English. For example, there are over 4 million native born American citizens from Puerto Rico who speak Spanish. Many speak English; others do not. They speak primarily Spanish. It is our belief and it was a great advancement of American democracy to say that American citizens whose primary language is not English should also be able to understand ballots, even the most complicated or simple of ballot initiatives, petitions, ballots with candidates.

□ 1815

What this section of the Voting Rights Act says is when there is a community that has a significant number of people whose language is other than English, that that community should have access to ballots in their language of preference, in their language of most fluency.

In addition to the fact that there are millions of American citizens who are native born and who speak languages other than English, our laws also establish and call for elderly resident aliens, residents of the United States, immigrants, who have resided legally in the United States for more than 15 years, our law says that they can take the exam to become a citizen of the United States in their native language.

So there are many elderly American citizens, naturalized American citizens, who are allowed, according to our laws, the laws of our Congress, to take their naturalization exam to become a proud American citizen in languages other than English. They should also, Mr. Chairman, be allowed to vote, and they should also be allowed to understand even the most complicated of ballot initiatives. So that is what the law does.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. HONDA).

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the comments of my colleague from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART).

Mr. Chairman, as Chair of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, I rise also today to oppose the Stearns amendment.

Section 203 of the Voting Rights Act provides protection to enable every American citizen to exercise their most fundamental and important right, the right to vote. In short, voting is power.

Unfortunately, even today, many minority voters face impediments or barriers to voting, including language barriers. The Stearns amendment will eliminate funding for enforcement of section 203. When that happens, States and localities will be free to discriminate against tax-paying American citizens and impede their right to vote.

Section 203 has support from both Democrats and Republicans in Congress and from Ronald Reagan to Bill Clinton to George W. Bush.

The Tri-Caucus strongly believes that VRA continues to effectively combat discrimination and protect the

gains achieved for minority voters. For instance, the U.S. Department of Justice has reported that, in one year, registration rates among Spanish and Filipino-speaking American citizens grew by 21 percent and registration among Vietnamese-speaking American citizens increased over 37 percent after San Diego County started providing language assistance.

In Apache County, Arizona, the Department's enforcement activities have resulted in a 26 percent increase in Native American turnout in four years, allowing Navajo Code talkers, veterans, and the elderly to participate in elections for the first time.

The Stearns Amendment to H.R. 5672 would undermine the Voting Rights Act reauthorization process and effectively disenfranchise language minority voters through the appropriations process.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Stearns amendment (#21) to H.R. 5672, the Science, State, Justice, Commerce Appropriations Act for FY 2007.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated, this is a great advancement in our democracy that we should be proud of. We are talking only about the rights of American citizens. American citizens whose primary language is other than English should also be able to vote.

As a Nation, we took an important step forward that, as I say, we all should be proud of when we facilitated that sacred right to vote to American citizens whose primary language, whose most fluent language, is one other than English.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to my dear friend, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Texas is recognized for 30 seconds.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think the focus of the debate has gone awry. You are right. It is not an immigration issue. It is a citizen issue.

But I do want to tell my colleagues that many people have fled persecution, sought asylum, and then become citizens. They come as adults, they come as elderly persons, but they are now citizens. They have been fleeing the persecution of oppression, and they come here for hope, and they come for a dream of opportunity.

When they become citizens, this will simply allow them to partake of that dream, and that is to vote. This is a bad amendment because it does not respect the idea that this is a country of freedom. I ask my colleagues to oppose the Stearn Amendment and support the full implementation of the Voter Rights Act Reauthorization.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Stearns amendment to H.R. 5672, which would prohibit the Department of Justice from enforcing section 203 of the Voting Rights Act. The amendment is divisive, punitive, and will take America in exactly the wrong direction.

Section 203 removes barriers to voting faced by tax paying American citizens: Citizens who do not speak English well enough to participate in the election process. Tax-paying citizens should not be penalized for needing assistance to exercise their fundamental right to vote. Language minority citizens are required to pay taxes and serve in the military without regard to their level of English proficiency. If they can shoulder those burdens of citizenship, they should be able to share in the benefits of voting with appropriate assistance to exercise the vote.

Section 203 protects citizens, not illegal immigrants: Section 203 mandates language assistance based on a trigger formula for language minorities from four language groups: Native Americans, Native Alaskans, Asian Americans, and persons of Spanish heritage. The immigrant debate should not influence the debate on ensuring that the fundamental right to vote is exercised equally by English and non-English proficient citizens. According to the 2000 census, three-quarters of those protected by Section 203 are native-born citizens. For example, 100 percent of Native Americans and Native Alaskans were born in the United States; 98.6 percent of Puerto Ricans protected by Section 4(e) were born in the United States; and 84.2 percent of Latinos were born in the United States.

Section 203 was enacted to remedy the history of educational disparities, which have led to high illiteracy rates and low voter turn out: These disparities continue to exist. As of 2000, three fourths of the 3 to 3.5 million students who are native-born were considered to be English Language Learners (ELLs), meaning the students don't speak English well enough to understand the basic English curriculum. ELL students lag significantly behind native-English speakers and are twice as likely to fail graduation tests. California has over 1,500,000 ELLs; Texas has 570,000 ELLs; Florida has 250,000 ELLs; and New York has over 230,000.

Since 1975, there have been more than 24 education discrimination cases filed on behalf of ELLs in 15 states: Fourteen of the States in which education discrimination lawsuits have been brought are covered by language assistance provisions. Since 1992, 10 cases have been filed. Litigation and consent decrees are currently pending in Texas, Alaska, Arizona, and Florida. Discrimination cases that have been brought address issues such as inadequate funding for ELLs, inadequate curriculum to assist ELLs become proficient in English, and lack of teachers and classrooms. These disparities increase the likelihood that ELLs will achieve lower test scores and drop out of school, ultimately, leading to lower voter registration and turnout.

Adults who want to learn English must endure long waiting periods to enroll in English Second Language (ESL) literacy centers: The lack of funding to expand the number of ESL centers around the country leaves minority citizens unable to enroll in classes for several years. For example, in large cities such as Boston citizens must wait for several years to enroll. In New Mexico, citizens must wait up to a year. In the State of New York, the wait lists were so long, the State eliminated them and instituted a lottery system. Once enrolled, learning English takes citizens several years to even obtain a fundamental understanding of the English language—not enough to understand complex ballots. Citizens should not be barred from exercising their right to vote while trying to become English proficient.

Most jurisdictions covered by section 203 support its continued existence: According to a 2005 survey, an overwhelming majority of jurisdictions covered by Section 203 think that federal language assistance provisions should remain in effect for public elections. In fact, in a poll of registered voters, 57 percent believe it is difficult to navigate ballots and instructions and that assistance should be provided.

I urge defeat of the Stearns Amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) has 15 seconds remaining.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, it is a Federal mandate for foreign language ballots. Anybody can vote locally on that. But it takes away the Federal requirement for foreign language ballots and allows individuals to bring interpreters into the voting booth. That is protected by Federal statute, those two points. So it doesn't take away foreign language ballots. It just takes away the Federal mandate that requires them. There is surname analysis. We are also using dialects, 16 to 17, in Michigan; and that has got to stop.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the right to vote is precious, almost sacred, and one of the most important blessings of our democracy. The Stearns amendment is an attack on the voting rights of millions of American citizens. It is a modern day literacy test.

This is not about illegal immigration. These are American citizens we are talking about. If the Stearns amendment becomes law, what message are we sending to the Apache, to the Navajo Nation, to the Native Alaskan, to Vietnamese Americans, to Russian Jews, who are all citizens?

These are our neighbors. They are taxpayers. They are Americans. We should be opening up the process to each and every American. Let them come in and participate.

Instead, this amendment will return us to the dark past. I don't think we want to go back as a Nation and as people. Vote "no" on Stearns.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this is a very shameful amendment, and I will tell you why it is shameful.

Here we are on the eve of the 4th of July at the very foundation of this country when those noble words were spoken by Thomas Jefferson, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among those, life, liberty and

the pursuit of happiness,'' and the most important guarantee of that pursuit of happiness is the right to vote.

Not long ago, many of my colleagues on that side of the aisle stuck their finger in purple ink and proudly went around and promoted it because the Iraqis had the freedom to go and vote. There was a private first class named Private First Class Rincon from my district in Conyers, Georgia, who gave his life and died for that right, and he was not even a United States citizen. This House had to approve his citizenship posthumously.

Now we want to pass an amendment that would give just a little bit of help to his wife, to his mother, to his grandmother, who have difficulty with the English language.

This is a terrible moment at a terrible time, when we should be speaking to the greatness of this country, to the right to vote, to cherish it. Here we are on the eve of the 4th of July being what was referred to 40 years ago in the best-seller, being the Ugly American.

Let us prove that we are the good American and vote down this ''Ugly American'' amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting. I have a button on my television that, if you click it, you can convert everything that you hear to Spanish so that people can hear American Idol and Desperate Housewives, and my English-only friends on the other side have not so much as lodged an objection to that button on my TV. They don't have a problem translating what goes across the dial every night. It is more than passing strange that they are troubled by making the ballot accessible, when our televisions are accessible.

My friends from Georgia have said it very well. This is about American citizens. You can't vote unless you are an American citizen. If you are an American citizen, we all have a stake in removing the obvious impediments toward voting, and what do we gain in terms of high ground by objecting to some of our fellow citizens having all the tools that they need to translate the choice of the elections? How do we justify televisions translating, and ballots not being translated?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the fact that the gentleman yielded to me.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment prevents the Department of Justice from enforcing section 203 of the Voting Rights Act. We know from our hearings that section 203 works. If you enforce section 203, more people vote. It only applies where there is a large number of voters with that particular language, a critical mass, enough to affect an election.

If we pass this, it won't encourage people to learn English. There are waiting lists to learn English already. If people could vote, maybe they could have more resources applied to English language.

We need a fair opportunity for people to vote. Section 203 brings that opportunity to people. We should reject this amendment and enforce the Voting Rights Act. This is a very important aspect, the Voting Rights Act, and we should enforce the Voting Rights Act, not tell the Department of Justice to fail to support it.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, this is our opportunity to state whether or not we believe that the United States of America is benefited by bilingualism.

In every other country of the world where we have permitted and they have actually promoted bilingualism, it has led to divisiveness and balkanization of countries and hatred between peoples.

One of the things that has created the unity of our country that is made up of so many different ethnic groups, so many different races, so many different religions, has been the English language. We are not doing anyone a favor by making it easier for them not to speak English. We are, in fact, doing a great disservice to those least fortunate people and those immigrants who come to our country by not encouraging them, by not giving them the incentive to learn English. It is a crime against those people and against their children.

More than this, what we have here is an expensive mandate. In my county, we have five different languages that are mandated, and two more on the way. In L.A. County, there are 10 different languages, an enormous expense in order to produce ballots and ballot measures and the descriptions of those measures for the population.

What are we doing this for? In the long run, it is damaging to our country. Vote against bilingualism. Support the Stearns amendment. If States want to do it, let them go ahead, but the Federal Government should not be mandating this and putting this burden on the States, something that, again, hurts the very people that they are claiming it is trying to help and will definitely in the long run hurt the United States as it keeps us divided into groups, rather than bringing us together as our Founding Fathers suggested that they wanted to have in the first place.

Vote against bilingualism. Vote for the Stearns amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ).

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Stearns amendment. This amendment would allow States and localities to discriminate against tax-paying American citizens. This amendment forces the Federal Government to disenfranchise American citizens from our most precious right of voting.

Unfortunately, a misinformed few from the other side of the aisle have confused this issue. The Voting Rights Act has nothing to do with immigration. Let me repeat that: section 203 of the Voting Rights Act has nothing to do with immigration. One hundred percent of the people served by section 203 are U.S. citizens.

I know a little bit about this. Both of my parents are naturalized citizens. My mother is an elementary schoolteacher who teaches other people's children English. She has difficulty sometimes.

□ 1830

Mr. Chairman, if we want to spread democracy around the world, we should not be disenfranchising American citizens who want to vote here. That is why I strongly urge a ''no'' vote on the Stearns amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, there are really only two reasons that a person might ask for a ballot in a language other than English. One of those reasons would be if you are a naturalized citizen and you had received and earned your citizenship here. That is a Federal requirement, though, to demonstrate proficiency in the English language, both the spoken and the written.

So one would presume that if you are a naturalized citizen and you ask for a ballot in a language other than English, that you somehow circumvented the standards that are in Federal statute. So I do not think that is a legitimate reason to ask for a foreign language ballot.

The second reason would be if you were born in this Nation, by birthright citizenship, and you had grown up in an enclave where you did not absorb enough English to be able to go to the ballot box and cast a ballot in English. In that case, we have a Federal statute to protect your right to vote, and you have a right to vote, because you can bring someone into the voting booth with you to do that interpretation.

So those two things are covered. What this Stearns amendment does is removes the Federal funding that enforces this multilingual ballot mandate. It ends the Federal foreign language mandate, at least for a year. It is a good thing to do.

But if localities want to express this, they can. The States or the counties or the voting districts can still continue to present ballots in any language that they choose. That is why this is a good Stearns amendment. That is why it is something that we ought to do for the future.

We are looking at bringing in perhaps millions and millions of new citizens. That is hanging in the Senate today. If

we do that, with the President talking about the need to learn English, then for those reasons we need to assimilate and encourage people to use the English language. This is a gentle amendment. I urge its adoption.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Steams Amendment to H.R. 5672, which would prohibit funds from being used for the design, renovation, construction, or rental of any headquarters for the United Nations in any location in the United States.

I believe the amendment is unwise, shortsighted, and harmful attack on one of the most important international institutions in the world. Withholding funds that are lawfully owed to and desperately needed by the United Nations to perform its essential functions is harmful to the U.N. and against the interests of the United States.

In this era of new global challenges, the global war on terror to the problematic war in Iraq to the threats to world peace posed by ambitions of North Korea and Iran to acquire nuclear weapons, we need the U.N. more than ever. And for the most part, the U.N. does a good job meeting these challenges. The organization conducted the first-ever national election from scratch in Afghanistan and trained 150,000 Iraqis as election staff for the elections in that country. The U.N. also was instrumental in coordinating the massive tsunami relief and reconstruction effort, involving multiple governments and hundreds of NGOs, that brought relief and healing to hundreds of thousands of people suffering in Indonesia. The U.N. helped to end violence and instability in Haiti, Sierra Leone, and Liberia.

With 191 diverse members, the U.N. is not perfect. It is unrealistic to expect perfection from an imperfect international system. The U.N. surely has many of the virtues and faults of its member countries, including our own country. But with all its faults, it is still an indispensable forum for the peaceful resolution of conflict.

Despite both managerial and systemic limitations, the U.N. has shown resourcefulness in confronting the new challenges posed by failed states, infectious diseases that transcend borders, global climate change, famine, weapons trade and terrorism.

The U.N.'s current Secretary General, Kofi Annan, is a leader determined to implement serious reforms. He recognizes that the United Nations is at a critical crossroads and that it must be modernized and rationalized if it is to survive. For over a year now, informed by the work of the high-level panel he appointed, the Secretary General has been working on a plan to overhaul the U.N. completely so that it is more professional and more capable of confronting global threats, challenges and change.

I caution my colleagues to resist the temptation to withhold the payment of our U.N. dues. As we all know, the United States just recently completed a multi-year process of paying off a massive debt to the U.N. that had accumulated over many years. During that process, we successfully reduced the percentage of the U.N. budget that U.S. taxpayers are responsible for funding.

So as we map out our nation's strategy for the next decade at the glass edifice on the East River, we must remember that operating the United Nations costs a lot of money. But not nearly as much money as international strife and chaos. The United Nations is deserving of the continuing support of the world, and of the United States of America.

I urge defeat of the Stearns amendment.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Stearns Amendment. This amendment would set a dangerous precedent in the way that this Nation and Congress approach minority voting rights.

Section 203 of the Voting Rights Act sets specific guidelines and requirements for providing bilingual ballots for political subdivisions with limited English-proficiency populations. The Stearns Amendment would essentially eliminate Section 203 and would discourage and disenfranchise entire populations of American citizens from voting. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 sought to protect the right to vote for those in our Nation whose voices were not being heard, the very same voices that this amendment seeks to extinguish.

Voting is one of the most important duties that citizens perform. It allows citizens to choose who will represent them and who will make decisions on important issues that will impact their everyday lives. Nothing is more fundamental to our democracy than the knowledge that no citizen's right to vote will be hindered.

Any election reform should break down barriers that face minority voters, not increase them. The Stearns Amendment would instead build new barriers to democratic participation for American citizens.

H.R. 9, the Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization Act of 2006 would extend Section 203 provisions for 25 years, until 2032. I urge my colleagues to oppose the Stearns Amendment, and urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to work with Democrats to enact H.R. 9 in order to protect the voting rights of all Americans.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the amendment by the gentleman from Florida, Mr. STEARNS.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment before us seeks to disenfranchise millions of American citizens by placing obstacles on their right—and their civic duty—to vote. The essence of our democracy is the right to vote. No right is more precious.

Section 203 of the Voting Rights Act provides for ballot and language assistance for language minority citizens, so all citizens are fully able to participate in our democracy.

Ballots and procedures are often complex and bewildering, even for those completely proficient in English. To ensure that all are able to participate on free and fair terms, language assistance is vital to protecting the right to vote, especially among Latinos, Native Americans, Asian Americans, and Alaskan Natives.

Impact of Section 203: A key objective of the Voting Rights Act is not only to remedy past and current attempts to suppress the vote, but also to remove obstacles to the right to vote and bolster voter participation among populations where participation has historically been low.

As the Judiciary Committee noted in its recent bipartisan committee report, Section 203 is needed today, and should be reauthorized to continue to achieve its purposes. For instance, after San Diego County provided language assistance, the registration rates among Spanish- and Filipino-speaking American citizens grew by more than 20 percent and registration among Vietnamese-speaking American citizens increased by nearly 40 percent. Likewise, in Apache County, Arizona, enforcement activities resulted in a 26 percent increase in Native American turnout in four years, allowing Navajo Code talkers, veterans, and the elderly to participate in elections for the first time.

The Stearns amendment, however, by preventing enforcement of Section 203, will allow states and localities to discriminate against taxpaying American citizens because of their language ability, and impede their right to vote.

That is wrong. In our country, our laws and our Constitution draws no distinction between American citizens born here or not. In fact, three-quarters of those who are covered by the language assistance provision are native-born United States citizens. The rest are naturalized U.S. citizens.

The opponents of Section 203 claim that the costs are too great. Studies disprove that contention, but costs are not the issue. Securing the right to vote must never—and cannot—ever be considered a burden. It is our moral and constitutional obligation.

The arguments of the opponents of Section 203 are suspiciously similar to the arguments once employed for literacy tests to disenfranchise African American voters. I had hoped we had passed that period in our country's history when such tests were widely used. We cannot permit the use of these tests once again.

Mr. Chairman, we are supposed to unite together as Americans with one voice to reaffirm our commitment on the fundamental subject of voting rights for all of our citizens. Instead, this ugly amendment seeks to undermine that moral and historic commitment. The constant scapegoating of our fellow American citizens—and attempts to suppress their voting rights—must end.

Any diminishing of language assistance is a diminishment of our American democracy. We must defeat this amendment, and affirm our support of Section 203.

The right to vote must never, ever be compromised. Every vote counts—every vote must be counted.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, as Chair of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus (CAPAC), I rise today to oppose the Stearns Amendment (#21) to H.R. 5672, FY 2007 Science, State, Justice and Commerce Appropriations Bill.

Section 203 of the Voting Rights Act, or VRA, provides protections to enable every American citizen to exercise their most fundamental and important right—the right to vote. Voting is the most important tool Americans have to influence the policies our government adopts that affect every aspect of our lives. In short, voting is power. Unfortunately, even today, many minority voters face impediments or barriers to voting including language barriers.

The Stearns Amendment (#21) would eliminate funding for Section 203 of the Voting Rights Act (VRA). By eliminating funding for Section 203 enforcement, states and localities would be free to discriminate against taxpaying American citizens and impede their right to vote.

The VRA that includes Section 203 has received bi-partisan support from both Democrats and Republicans in Congress and from

Ronald Reagan to Bill Clinton to George W. Bush. The Tri-Caucus strongly believes the VRA continues to effectively combat discrimination and protect the gains achieved for minority voters.

It is well documented that language assistance is needed and used by voters. For instance, the U.S. Department of Justice has reported that in one year, registration rates among Spanish- and Filipino-speaking American citizens grew by 21 percent and registration among Vietnamese-speaking American citizens increased over 37 percent after San Diego County started providing language assistance.

In Apache County, Arizona, the Department's enforcement activities have resulted in a 26 percent increase in Native American turnout in 4 years, allowing Navajo Code talkers, veterans, and the elderly to participate in elections for the first time.

The Stearns Amendment to H.R. 5672 would undermine the Voting Rights Act reauthorization process and effectively disenfranchise language minority voters through the appropriations process.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Stearns Amendment (#21) to H.R. 5672, the Science, State, Justice, Commerce Appropriations Act for FY 2007.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this mean spirited Amendment, which would prohibit any federal funds to be used in enforcing bilingual balloting.

Let's be crystal clear, we are not talking about undocumented residents. These are citizens of the United States. Many of whom have voted you and me into the office that we hold today.

It is apparent that instead of passing meaningful bi-partisan legislation to reauthorize the Voting Rights Act; instead the majority plans to use these little tricks and delaying tactics to disenfranchise ethnic and minority voters.

From not counting votes, forced mid-century redistricting and voter intimidation it is clear now more then ever that the Voting Rights Act must be reauthorized as the original drafters of the legislation intended—including bilingual assistance to voters.

These people have earned the right to vote just like everyone else in this chamber.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. DEGETTE

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. DEGETTE:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by increasing the amount made available for ''OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS—JUSTICE ASSISTANCE'' and reducing the amount made available for ''DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION—SALARIES AND EXPENSES'', by $3,000,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, the Internet Crimes Against Children Task Forces, or ICACs, are Federal-local partnerships that help track down the perpetrators of online child exploitation.

Ninety percent of this important work occurs at the local level by ICAC investigators all across the country. Their jobs become more important every day as the incidence of child pornography rises to nearly epidemic proportions.

I want to consider these chilling statistics: In fiscal year 2003, ICACs received 3,741 reports of Internet crimes against children. In fiscal year 2004, that number was 24,138. But, Mr. Chairman, in fiscal year 2005, that number was 198,883, an increase of 5,216 percent in just 2 years.

The increase is not just a result of better reporting. It reflects an unthinkable rise in the worst kind of crimes. The ICACs are in need of more funds for three reasons: number one, to increase investigations; number two, to enhance law enforcement training; and, number three, to conduct forensic analysis.

The budget for ICACs has increased incrementally the last few years; and, Mr. Chairman, I want to commend you and the committee for adding $5 million to the Internet Crimes Against Children Tasks Forces, but, frankly, with these increases in the crimes, even if we tripled the ICAC budget, it would still barely manage to keep up with online child pornography.

The extra funding is critical for training, for investigations, for forensic exams, and to stop these terrible perpetrators from committing these crimes against children.

Mr. Chairman, the problem of online child pornography is growing. This amendment will simply increase the budget by $3 million. And I ask my colleagues, what lengths are we willing to go to to save them? I urge a ''yes'' vote on the DeGette amendment.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment.

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WEINER

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WEINER:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by increasing the aggregate amount made available for ''COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES'' (consisting of an additional $476,574,000 for grants authorized under section 1701 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended by section 1163 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005), and by reducing the amount made available under the item relating to ''SCIENCE, AERONAUTICS AND EXPLORATION'' for exploration systems (and conforming the aggregate amount set forth in such item, accordingly), by $476,574,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment with Mr. RAMSTAD and other Members of this body. It is very simple. It takes perhaps the single most important anticrime program of the 1990s and the early part of this decade, the COPS program, and restores the hiring component, which is the portion of the program that puts cops on the beat.

It has been zeroed out in this budget. We are not going to restore it completely to its authorized level, but we at least are trying to put a little more funding in that would allow us to hire about 6,500 additional cops.

For those of you who are unfamiliar with the COPS program, this is perhaps the most democratic, with a small ''D,'' program, anticrime program Congress ever envisioned, from coast to coast, State by State. West Virginia got 692 officers, Virginia got 2,400 officers, Texas got 600, big towns, small cities, all across the country.

This bill zeroes out the COPS program. What we seek to do is to authorize an additional 6,000 or so police officers. The offset that we seek is in the space exploration, the Mars program. We do not zero it out by any stretch of the imagination. We still ensure a large increase in it, about a 10 percent increase.

But this would be a way to take this single crime fighting program, and, frankly, an antiterrorism program, and breathe some life into it. We have already said in this body that we believe the COPS program should live. We reauthorized it. Now this is an effort to put some funds in.

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

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

The COPS Program is already $468 million over the request, $57 million over last year. The amendment proposes reductions to NASA that are devastating. If you are opposed to the space program or you do not like the space program or you do not want America to be number one, you ought to support this amendment.

But if you want America to have a strong space program, you ought to strongly defeat this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY).

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me time; and I especially thank him for his strong support for America's space program. The Weiner amendment would take $477 million from NASA's space exploration budget, essentially would cripple the CEV–CLV program.

Ladies and gentlemen, just so you know what that means, we are scheduled to fly our last shuttle mission in the year 2010. We have a bird on the pad. We hope we get it up July 1 or sometime soon. But we will be down for sure by 2010. We will have no manned space flight program after that unless we continue with the CEV development. This amendment basically wipes out that development in this budget cycle.

I will tell you we need a next generation of vehicles or we will not be in the human space flight business. The Weiner amendment raids the account that is necessary to keep the workforce in place.

If you allow the workforce to disappear from 2010 to, say, 2015 or 2020, you can never replace these people. The expertise that you lose cannot be put back together again. Once Humpty Dumpty and the skilled workforce is dead and depleted, you can never put it back together.

But I am not here just to talk about America's space program. I want to tell my colleagues about a firsthand experience I had. If you are not concerned about space, you ought to be.

I was the first American, along with our colleagues RICK LARSEN and MARK KIRK, invited to see the Chinese human space flight program. They got started in 1995. They are 35 years behind us in time, but they are remarkable in how fast they have caught up in their human space flight program.

The Shenzhou vehicle has flown five times now, twice with Taikonauts that have come back successfully, and they have had extraordinary success. While our workforce is basically keeping healthy a 40-year-old, 30-year-old technology, the young Chinese engineers have put together a remarkable new technology that will be very, very powerful in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I want to read the Chinese announcement of their own human space flight program. They say, by 2007, there will be a series of unmanned satellites from the year 2007 through 2015. Starting in 2017, they expect to have unmanned missions to the Moon to bring back lunar samples. By the year 2024, they say they will have landed men and women on the Moon.

Folks, I think their real schedule is much more ambitious than that. If and when we get back to the Moon under the Weiner amendment, we will be looking at Chinese flags and maybe Chinese bases when we get there.

And if that does not stimulate your competitive interests, I am telling you that they are producing 5 to 600,000 engineers a year, by a factor of 8 or 10 what America is able to produce. Nothing stimulates our math and science brains in middle and high schools more than space exploration. The Weiner amendment would put an end to that.

Finally, I will tell you if you are not worried about human space, China is developing the Long March 5 vehicle. It will be able to take 25 tons into orbit. It is not just their human space capabilities that they are working on. They are trying to get space predominance so that they can potentially incapacitate all of our communications satellite and all of the satellites that America depends on for our force multipliers that allow our military to be the most capable in the world.

Ladies and gentlemen, please do not gut the human space component of America's exploration; and, if you do, be prepared for what happens when the Chinese beat us to outer space.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, first of all, with all of the discussion about China, I am curious, is the crime rate high in China? Is the crime rate high on Mars? No one is saying to zero out the program. I am saying give it a 10 percent increase.

Mr. FEENEY. Will the gentleman yield? He asked a question. Will he yield for a second?

The COPS program has been completed.

Mr. WEINER. It is completed.

Mr. FEENEY. It was intended to put 100,000 officers on the street.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time is controlled by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FEENEY. I apologize. I thought he asked a question.

Mr. WEINER. Apparently, the gentleman from Florida is unfamiliar with the rhetorical question which is so commonly used in New York and frequently in Washington.

Florida got 7,400 police officers under the COPS program. The COPS program was reauthorized in this body for additional hiring. We reauthorized it.

Now I am saying, put a few dollars in there. And I am not saying, do not go to Mars; I am not saying, do not go to the Moon. How about this? Let's make a deal. Let's have a 10 percent increase in that program that is so important. That is a pretty healthy increase. And if we do that, then we do not go from 7,400 cops in Florida to what the bill proposes, which is zero cops in Florida. That is what voting against the Weiner-Ramstad amendment would propose.

We are saying that this is a successful program. When Tom Ridge said that homeland security starts in our home towns, when John Ashcroft said this has been a remarkable program, you know, frankly, it has been a bipartisan, across-the-board success. We have reauthorized it in this body. All I am saying is, breathe new life in it.

I would just remind the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, that large increase that you described still is zeroing out, I would say to the gentleman from Virginia, the hiring component.

□ 1845

What the Department of Justice has done is put a whole lot of programs in this one line. The hiring component is zero, none, kaput, despite the fact that we reauthorized.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment not because I not recognize that we need lots of additional dollars in law enforcement and particularly to support our State and local law enforcement, as we have talked about a number of times on the floor today and throughout this session.

This administration made a point of cutting local law enforcement, and it is a travesty because the demand is out there, and there is this real correlation between the reduction in Federal support to State and local law enforcement and an increase in violent crime rates. It is there. We can see it. That is why the gentleman is offering his amendment.

But the bottom line is, we do not have the allocation, and this offset is terrible. I mean, we are trying to keep these programs alive throughout the bill.

The President came forward with a budget that devastated what in the NASA budget? Science. What else? Aeronautics. Well, this amendment would cut an additional, as I understand it, $100 million from NASA. Science, aeronautics would be further cut. These programs cannot survive in NASA with these kinds of cuts. We cannot do it.

We need to restore additional money to law enforcement. There is no question about that. That is a debate that maybe will go beyond this Congress; maybe it will go beyond this appropriation bill, and perhaps that debate should be had across the land. But right now, given the money that we have in the bill, we cannot afford the offset for funding the COPS program or any other State and local law enforcement, and is that not a sad comment?

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

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

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me just acknowledge that I agree with much of what the gentleman says, except the part about us gutting anything.

What we did is we took the space exploration program and limited the increase to 10 percent. We by no means cut it to last year's level. We by no means slashed it to the bone. What we did is we took a program that grew the most and said, we are going go allow it to grow only 10 percent in the alternative.

I want to point out the program that did get slashed to the bone, which was the COPS hiring component. You know, if you have a COPS program which put 117,000 police officers on the street and you say, we are going to reauthorize it but we are not going to provide any funding to do the hiring component, then we are going to start seeing what we are seeing now, which is, nationwide the seven index crimes are starting to creep up again.

We saw the single best Federal program against crime perhaps in history was the COPS program, and despite the protestations of some of the folks who were here at the time, it was distributed throughout the country. Now the COPS department at Justice in the hands of the Republican party fervently says, you know what, having a COPS program without having hiring in it is like having no COPS program at all.

Also, in the reauthorization, we acknowledged in a bipartisan way some of the weaknesses of the program. Some departments said, you know what, the way it was structured was too limited. They wanted flexibility. We acknowledged that. The chairman, to his credit, and this House, to its credit, overwhelmingly reauthorized that program, but it is a hollow victory if we have the COPS program and no money.

So the offset admittedly is not ideal. I think you and the gentleman from Virginia do yeoman's duty each year trying to squeeze more and more into a smaller bag.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas to speak in opposition to the amendment.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, Mr. WEINER knows that I have voted with him consistently on the COPS program and, of course, am chagrinned to stand here to argue against a program that is so vital, but Mr. MOLLOHAN is correct.

These are tough decisions that have to be made, and the decision that has to be made is whether we want to remain competitive in science and technology, and we have to cut the science programs. It is a bad budget that we have to operate under, but frankly, in the shadow of a pending launch and the commitment to remain at the cutting edge of science that generates out of exploration and technology and science that comes under this particular funding, we are losing ground.

I would hope that we go back to the drawing board and get the money that we need for the COPS program. It is a good program, but this is not the kind of decision that draws anyone to a degree of happiness. This is splitting the baby, and we have nothing when we get through with it.

This is an important program to support, and that is the space exploration, the science programs. The minimum moneys we have and the fact that we have to take moneys for the COPS program, we need to fund it from the President's budget. He needs to fund the COPS program. This is not the way to do it.

I would ask my colleagues to oppose the Weiner amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reluctantly rise in opposition to my colleague's amendment, not because of the merit of the intent, but because of the harm it does in taking money away from an already under-funded NASA. This amendment would cut $476.5 million from science, aeronautics and space exploration systems. I wish the President's budget had allowed for full funding of the COPS program. The quarral is with the White House not with NASA.

I wholeheartedly support the work of NASA, and I am committed to the future of scientific and space exploration. I am deeply concerned that the amount appropriated in the FY07 budget does not meet all the needs for future space exploration as we move forward in this new century. A lack of necessary budget authority makes scientific innovation and space exploration very difficult. As I have stated before, this Administration has made many bad budgetary choices, including zeroing out the COPS program. However, it is not in the nation's best interest to compound that mistake with this one.

My greatest concern at this point is that we may not allocate enough money or resources to ensure the safety of all NASA astronauts and crew. After the Columbia disaster, safety must be our highest priority and it is worrisome that there is not a noticeable increase in funding to address all safety concerns.

Additionally, I am concerned that pressure to retire the Shuttle by a fixed date to free up resources for other activities, coupled with the need to fly up to 28 Shuttle flights to assemble the Space Station, could—if not handled properly—lead to the types of schedule and budgetary pressures that were cited by the Columbia Accident Investigation Board, CAIB, as contributing to the Columbia accident. I know that this concern is paramount at NASA as we move forward in the future.

NASA has the ability to inspire the generations toward untold discoveries. As always I look forward to working with the good men and women of NASA as we push the boundaries of our world once again.

Thus, because this amendment cuts funding so desperately needed by the researchers, engineers, and innovators at NASA, I cannot support it, and I urge my colleagues to follow my lead.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would simply point out that if we were not immersed in this stupid war in Iraq, the money that we are spending in just 2 months would correct all of the problems we have in all of these appropriation bills and we would not be facing this tradeoff. We could, in fact, afford to do both the COPS program and the space program that others in this chamber would prefer to see us pursue.

But the fact is, our Republican friends have voted for a budget resolution which has imposed these kinds of tradeoffs, and given that fact, I worry a whole lot more about Chinese products wiping out American jobs than I worry about Chinese flags somewhere else in the world, although I do not like either.

Some people attack Members of Congress for having Potomac fever. I think some Members of this House have Mars fever. The fact is, if we are going to make a choice about where to put the best money, right now, I think a far better bet is law enforcement.

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

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member and also my cosponsor. I rise as the cosponsor of this amendment.

President Clinton was right back in 1994 when many of us worked in a bipartisan way to fashion the 1994 Crime Control Act and when community policing was made part of that important legislation. I remember those meetings at the White House, talking about community policing, and President Clinton was right. The COPS program has been a key component of the Federal effort to keep our communities safe, and crime has dropped significantly.

President Clinton was right that community policing works to reduce crime. Ask any cop on the street, whether it is in the Third and Fourth Precincts of Minneapolis Police Department or my suburban police departments in the Third Congressional District, they all say it is shortsighted and counterproductive to underfund this critical law enforcement tool.

I think it is simply wrong to shortchange public policy, and I understand the dilemma faced by the appropriators, believe me. This amendment, the Weiner-Ramstad amendment, would fund the COPS program at its fully authorized level by adding about $476 million for the program.

I understand how painful that offset is to many of you who prioritize NASA, but I think we have to ask ourselves, all of us, the simple question: What is more important, spending more money to fly to Mars or keeping millions of Americans safe here on earth? That is the key question.

As I said, I have seen in my home State of Minnesota firsthand the importance of the COPS program to local

police in reducing crime and improving public safety. The COPS program really does work, and it has helped State and local law enforcement agencies in their hiring, technology, school safety grants, personnel, equipment, training, technical assistance.

In short, the COPS program has been a critical tool in the war on drugs and now in homeland security efforts.

So as cochair with my friend from Michigan, Mr. STUPAK, of the Congressional Law Enforcement Caucus, I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment to increase the funding levels for the COPS program. I think it is critical to all Americans. Certainly Edmund Burke had it right over 200 years ago when he said, the main reason we have government is to keep people safe.

No question the COPS program has kept people safer, and I believe we should pass this amendment to increase the funding here today. By passing this funding, we also honor the sacrifices made each and every day by our country's law enforcement community and give our Nation's finest the support they need.

Again, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

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

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Let me conclude by saying that I have been listening to what has been said, and I think I have got a compromise we can all accept.

What if we pass an amendment that increases the number of COPS by 6,500? There are none in the bill now. We make it 6,500, and we still give a $300 million plus up, an increase of 10 percent in the President's moon and Mars initiative, give an increase in space exploration and COPS program? Sound like a deal?

Well, this is the amendment. That is what the Weiner-Ramstad amendment does. It gives an increase to both. This notion that we are eviscerating a program is just not true. We are taking a program and giving it a 10 percent increase and funding another program that has done this much good around the country. This is the number of police officers around the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

The Chair would remind Members that the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER) has 1½ minutes remaining on his time, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) has 1 minute remaining. Who seeks time?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, if I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida, then if I strike the requisite number of words, I can get 5 minutes, correct?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment, and it is not exactly correct to say this is just going to cut money from the Moon and Mars. We have a program underway to develop a safer, less expensive, more reliable vehicle than the space shuttle, and that is called the crew exploration vehicle. If this amendment goes through, it is going to delay that program; it is going to run up the costs, and it is going to create a situation where we are going to have no way to get men and women into space.

Now, this program, I agree, sounds like a worthwhile program, but frankly, when it got established, I had serious misgivings in the 1990s because I thought we were going to have a real serious problem finding the funding for it on into the future. It was originally sold as just a short-term thing, but as you would expect, people are going to come back.

This is really the Federal Government getting involved in a local issue, and I would say the decline in the crime rate in the United States was because of locking up repeat offenders and not because of the COPS program.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, do not make any mistake about this. The Weiner amendment will gut NASA. Do not make any mistake. This amendment will transfer the preeminence that we presently have in space to India and others and China especially.

As my friend, Mr. FEENEY, from Florida was saying, China is investing significant amounts of dollars in their program, and their program is not a civil space program.

Our country's economy and success is because we prevailed in doing hard things. That is why we have the technology and the ability to do the computers, the cell phones, the satellites, that NASA helped create.

Do not vote for this amendment. It is the wrong thing to do. Vote down the Weiner amendment.

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

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for this time. I am a member of his subcommittee, and I appreciate his leadership and the leadership of the ranking member as well.

I rise in opposition to this amendment, and it troubles me to do that. I was a district attorney prior to my time in Congress, and so I know a little bit about law enforcement and what law enforcement needs.

These programs that are the object of the Weiner amendment, they are important programs, there is no doubt, but the chairman and the ranking member have worked together in a bipartisan manner to restore $1.1 billion in proposed cuts to State and local law enforcement programs.

□ 1900

Now, that is not as much as it should be, but that is a good-faith effort within the budget allocation to get money here. This is the wrong offset. Please vote against the Weiner amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding, and I rise in opposition to this amendment, regrettably for my friend from New York.

I also am a very strong supporter of the COPS program, like my friend from Alabama, a former prosecutor. I have always supported and continue to support the COPS program. But robbing one vital program to support another is not the answer.

Representing Southern California, the home of the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, I have seen the tremendous space science that has come out of our robotic exploration of Mars and out of the entire space program. This has manifest itself in health technology and telecommunications technology. It has had tremendous benefits to all of our constituents.

I don't want to see that research go away. I don't want to see that space science go away. And already there are dramatic cuts and delays in some of the space sciences that we just cannot afford. We have to find a different way to fund the COPS program. Taking the money out of this vital NASA effort is not the answer, and I must oppose the amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, let me say that I strongly urge defeat of the amendment. China is using their space program for military reasons. They now have laser beams. For the members of the committee that came to the subcommittee briefing, the closed briefing, you saw where they are. It is frightening. China has 200,000 engineers working on the space program, and we have 75,000.

If the Weiner amendment passed, the nmber of U.S. engineers would drop. America, under the Weiner amendment, would no longer be number one. That would be dangerous to our country and absolutely wrong. So I strongly, strongly urge the defeat of this amendment, which I think would almost guarantee, if it passed and stayed in the law, the loss of American leadership in space.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me say that I disagree with very little of what has been said on both sides. I think the chairman and ranking member have done a remarkable job balancing the equities, but it is simply not fair that the COPS program gets zero.

To keep saying that State and local enforcement has got additional funds, let us not forget that we authorized the COPS program at $1 billion. This amendment doesn't seek to fund it at that level, but it seeks to put some money in.

And if you think we are going to lose the edge in space exploration because

we have the audacity to give it a 10 percent increase this year, I just disagree. It is a matter of trying to find a way that we can do both.

We do not gut the space program. We give it a 10 percent increase with the Weiner amendment. But what we do is we make sure that we don't have this. This is what the bill presently has in the number of new cops under the COPS program. None. Zip. Zero.

Crime rates around the country are creeping back up. I heard at least one gentleman over there say, at least he is being honest, he believes that cops deserve no credit for the reduction in crime. It is an unusual position to take. The Fraternal Order of Police, the National Association of Police Associations, and every law enforcement group nationwide supports the Weiner amendment.

What we are seeking to do here is to say, you know what, we can't in the Federal Government be at the sidelines in the fight against crime. We need to be in the game. We need to participate.

The COPS program was a success. Congressman SENSENBRENNER said it. Attorney General Ashcroft said, and I quote, ''Let me say that I think the COPS program has been successful. The purpose of the COPS program was to demonstrate to local police departments if you put additional people, feet on the street, that crime would be affected and people would be safer.''

He is right. I am sure if he were here today he would say support the Weiner amendment. I ask for an ''aye'' vote.

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

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

Mr. WEINER. On that I request a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 20 offered by Mr. STEARNS:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the design, renovation, construction, or rental of any headquarters for the United Nations in any location in the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

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

My amendment would prohibit funds from the United States being used for the design, renovation, construction or rental of any headquarters for the United Nations in any location in the United States.

I offered this type of amendment 1 year ago, and then I agreed to withdraw it. My honorable colleague, Chairman WOLF joined me in requesting a GAO investigation of the United Nations headquarters renovation. That ongoing investigation has done little to advance our understanding of what the U.N. is doing besides how good the U.N. is at spending our taxpayers' money.

One of the lead experts in the GAO's ongoing investigation, Thomas Malito, testified in the Senate just last week. ''The U.N. is vulnerable to fraud, waste, abuse, and mismanagement due to a range of weaknesses in existing oversight practices.'' That is why I have returned to ask that we withhold funding until the United Nations makes public and transparent its contracting and disbursement information relative to the renovations.

The United Nations estimates that the planned renovation of its headquarters building in New York City would cost $1.7 billion, billion, for a work site that is over 2½ million square feet.

The most expensive building sold in Manhattan, the General Motors building, recently sold for $1.4 billion. The entire U.N. building could be built again for under $2 billion. Still, repair and refurbishing are activities that involve greater financial opportunities, one would suppose.

Now, even if the U.N. cost estimates remain constant, a big if, the U.S. share of renovation would be about $480 million. That would be in addition to our regular annual dues of $423 million, plus all other contributions of nearly $2.4 billion.

The General Assembly has yet to approve a plan amongst the four being considered, but the U.N. has already spent almost $40 million on preferred renovation plans, $20 million in the last month alone, according to the GAO.

The GAO also found that the $1.7 billion cost estimate only scratches the surface of the expected costs. The estimate does not include any of the following: new furniture, at least $100 million per year for an unknown number of years; new security costs, as well as temporary security costs during construction; new phones and information technology systems; and new office equipment.

Moreover, according to the GAO, ''While the U.N. has yet to finalize a specific procurement strategy for the renovation project, to the extent that it relies on current U.N. processes, implementation of the planned renovation is vulnerable to the procurement weaknesses we have identified previously.'' And the GAO continues: ''For example, it has not,'' the U.N. now, ''has not established an independent process to consider vendor protests that could alert senior U.N. officials of failure by procurement staff.'' And the U.N. has yet to establish an independent bid process, something that the U.S. Government has in place and we all take for granted.

In addition, although the U.N.'s Office of Internal Oversight Service, OIOS, has a mandate establishing it as an independent oversight entity and to conduct oversight of the renovation, it lacks the budgetary independence it requires to carry out its responsibilities. The OIOS is dependent on the whims of the very department and program heads it is auditing. The problems with this setup were made plain in the Oil-for-Food program when OIOS was prevented from examining high-risk areas where billions of dollars were subsequently found to have been misused.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the patience of my good friend from Virginia, Chairman WOLF, on this amendment, and his approach to the very difficult work of crafting and passing the appropriation bill for this subcommittee. In this case, dealing with the United Nations, we have 61 years of patience, and this patience has to be very frustrating for all of us. But, Mr. Chairman, do we simply continue to grant the United Nations the possibility of continued corruption and possibly graft with this project? I don't think so.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment; and I would first like to yield 2½ minutes of my time to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I thank the chairman for yielding; and I want to join him in opposing this amendment.

Really, to support this amendment you have to oppose the U.N., because this goes to the very ability of the United Nations to perform its responsibilities. It has to have a home. It has to have a house. It has to have space to operate in.

The U.N. is old. It is a fire hazard. There is a number of safety concerns associated with it. There is a request in this bill from the administration for $22 million to address these concerns, or our share of these concerns, and I think that a limitation amendment is exactly the wrong thing to do here.

We have had a lot of cuts in this bill, and this kind of a limitation really is a statement that the United States of America does not want to participate in the U.N. into the future. It is just that serious. It has to have a home. It is, in my judgment, not only ill-advised but really silly if you believe we should have a United Nations to begin with.

I oppose the amendment and encourage very strongly that everyone oppose the amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment, and let me read a letter from our Secretary of State, Secretary Rice.

She says, ''I write in strong support of our contribution to the U.N. Capital Master Plan.'' That is what we are talking about, CMP.

''The U.N. facilities pose a number of serious safety and security concerns for the American and foreign staffs, diplomats, and visitors.'' Many of these are American citizens. ''In particular, the U.N. facilities do not,'' do not, ''meet fire and life-safety building codes or modern security requirements. We support the renovation of the facilities to address these deficiencies.

''The Department remains strongly committed to ensuring transparency and effective oversight of the project. We have worked closely with U.N. Under Secretary General Chris Burnham,'' who is an American, ''to take steps to strengthen internal controls of the CMP. In particular, Under Secretary General Burnham, with our support, has set up a U.N. CMP Project Office as an independent office reporting to him. The U.N. CMP Project Office has allowed access to project documents and review of ongoing work. And, the CMP Project Office has used a value engineering process and third-party contractor reviews of design documents to improve cost and quality control.

''We realize this will be an ongoing effort and are committed to close U.S. Government monitoring of the project's implementation throughout its life span. I urge full funding for this important renovation project.''

What if there were a fire at the U.N.? What if something happened and we were to deny this money?

I have been as critical of the U.N. as anybody for their failure to deal with the issue of Darfur and things like this. They stood by and allowed Srebeniza to take place. They stood by and allowed Rwanda. But I am not going to stand by and allow the building to crumble and not have safety conditions in the building.

So I ask you, before you vote on this, take a minute to look at the letter of the Secretary of State. The administration is not for the Stearns amendment. It is a safety issue not only for American citizens but also the foreigners at work in the building. But also American visitors. If you go to the U.N., there are many tourists that go through the building.

So I strongly urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment; and again I urge you, if you have any doubts, come over and read the letter from Secretary Rice. It is a safety issue.

I urge defeat of the Stearns amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1915

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

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

Mr. STEARNS. 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 Florida will be postponed.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. ROTHMAN. I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding and would ask to enter into a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. Chairman, recent data released by the FBI shows violent crime on the rise for the first time in 15 years. The violent crime rate rose 2.5 percent across the country. Areas of New Jersey, including the cities of New York and Jersey City have disproportionately high rates of crime, two to three times more than the average national rate.

These cities, while only about 5 miles apart are the two largest cities in my State. Preliminary data for 2005 shows that the violent crime rate for Jersey City, New Jersey, is 1,302 crimes per 100,000 people and the violent crime rate for Newark, New Jersey, is 1,008 crimes per 100,000 people. The national average is significantly lower, 478 violent crimes per 100,000 people, less than half of Newark's and Jersey City's.

These high levels of violent crime, including murders, rapes and aggravated assaults, tear families and communities apart. Just this past Sunday evening, at least two people were killed and eight injured in four separate shootings in Newark.

Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding there is $16 million in the bill for 15 violent crime impact teams. These teams of ATF agents, U.S. Marshals, DEA agents and Federal prosecutors work together to reduce violent crime for an area. Will you, Mr. Chairman, work with me to direct one or more of the violent crime impact teams to these areas of New Jersey?

I yield to the chairman.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman. I completely agree with what he said. I appreciate his efforts to combat violent crime, and I am happy to do everything I can to work with the gentleman and the ATF to address the crime in New Jersey. Quite frankly, there ought to be an office in New Jersey.

I thank the gentleman, and will try to help.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. JONES OF OHIO

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. JONES of Ohio:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used for operation of the National Contact Center (NCC) of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit any funds under this act to be used for the operation of the National Contact Center of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, something that was created and has already failed, and now they want to make it permanent.

As a result of the support that I enjoy from my colleagues, I yield 1½ minutes to Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON. Congresswoman NORTON was the former member, actually Chair, of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Ms. NORTON. I thank the gentlewoman for her initiative. As a former chair of the EEOC credited with bringing efficiencies that eliminated the backlog, I strongly support her amendment. The efficiencies that I brought to the commission included settling cases. At first, they were controversial, but the civil rights community focused in and around them. When the remedy rate increased, the businesses were very grateful for them because they got them out of the city.

The call system is not such an efficiency. It makes work that has not saved either work or money. Callers instead want to get to somebody who really knows something, the way when you have a recording or a customer service person and you say, let me speak to a real person who can tell me some real information.

Meanwhile the Nation's civil rights enforcement agency is being dismantled. What other agency has lost 20 percent of its staff since this administration took power? What kind of message is the 109th Congress sending to civil rights. Eliminate the call center. Let trained staff do their work.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, at this time, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I am honored to support this amendment because it properly refocuses the mission of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. The goal is to ensure that all Americans are protected against discrimination in the workplace, and to do this, we should make sure that EEOC offices are properly staffed with workers to handle complaints and assist employees in taking action.

Instead, the current chair has pushed for the development of this National Contact Center. In effect, we are outsourcing the protection of civil rights on the job to entry level personnel who rely on scripts instead of expertise. The National Contact Center, which costs $2.5 million annually, continues to have a backlog of cases. The caseloads grow. The staff has expressed great frustration in dealing with this new structure.

In fact, 91 percent of the employees when surveyed reported that the process required through the call center is as long or even much longer than when calls come directly through the field offices. That doesn't sound like a streamlined process to me.

Focusing resources into the contact center is directly inhibiting the EEOC's ability to perform its duty of protecting victims of discrimination. I urge passage of this amendment that we may end wasteful spending and refocus our energies in hiring more qualified staff on the ground where the workforce is.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. In 2003, the National Academy of Public Administration, NAPA, completed a study recommending the creation of the EEOC National Contact Center. So NAPA, a nonpartisan, bipartisan group, has recommended that the call centers, which the gentlewoman wants to shut down, be established.

Following a 6-month startup period, the National Contact Center handled 402,383 inquiries in a 12-month period in addition to the 118,322 hits on frequently asked questions. The National Contact Center staff handled 302,622 of these inquiries, resolving 70 percent without further involvement of EEOC field staff.

Also, it has been said, if you shut these call centers down, the technology that EEOC would have to have would cost anywhere from $10 to $12 million. Currently, the volume of inquiries coming into the National Contact Center is increasing as field offices have begun to route their calls through the contact center.

By handling these inquiries, the National Contact Center has not caused any further staff reductions but rather has freed up EEOC employees to devote more time to the critical functions of mediating, investigating and litigating charges.

I do agree it has to be monitored, but to that, I believe the staff and Mr. MOLLOHAN's staff have worked together to provide oversight in this regard. The report accompanying the bill includes language to require the commission to implement the recommendations of the Inspector General. We are working to ensure a better EEOC National Contact Center, but prohibiting the funds for the center would increase the workload on the EEOC front line, detract from the people that are helping. So I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

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

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, in all due respect, that is not what the IG report, in fact, stated. It stated that the EEOC backlog continued to accelerate with 39,061 unresolved cases in 2006. In fact, they are up from 33,562 in 2005. It only saves the agency six full-time positions. The contractors do not understand their role as an agency. That is the report of the IG.

The importance that I need to bring to your attention, sir, is that a contract center for equal employment opportunity complaints is not like a contact center for your utility bill or your telephone bill or your gas bill. This is about employment discrimination in jobs across this country.

Having worked as a trial lawyer for the EEOC, as a person who worked in the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, I know that the contact center is not the place in which you want to resolve your claims. If you had an age discrimination claim, you wouldn't want to do it over the telephone.

So what I am suggesting to you is, the reason I am opposing these contact centers is because it is not giving people the opportunity to do what they really do need to do, which is have the opportunity to talk with a person who is experienced. It is like all the centers now who are using India in order to take calls from people in America, and you have to explain four or five, six times. I don't have anything against Indians. But in order to make my complaint, I want to make sure that I have someone who is experienced and knowledgeable of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the laws and what I need to do.

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

Mr. WOLF. Do I get to close?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia has the right to close.

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

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. I want you to note, recently the Washington Post published preliminary findings of a study commissioned by the EEOC which highlighted various concerns by job performance commissions, recommended significant changes, significant changes, or that the national call center be eliminated. I agreed with them that the center should be eliminated, that people across America who have claims with regard to employment ought to have the opportunity not to deal with the call center but to deal with an experienced employee who has worked with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and has the background and experience to take those claims.

I want to thank my staffer, Terence Houston, for all the work he did in helping us put this amendment together. I thank you for the opportunity.

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

Mr. WOLF. I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment. But what I would like to do, this is a pilot program, and the pilot, if my memory serves me, ends in September of this year, September of 2006, so the pilot has not finished.

So to destroy the pilot before the pilot is finished, what I would like to do is, when we finish the pilot in September or maybe even we could try to expedite it a little bit to see, is to invite the gentlewoman up and ask NAPA to come up with us and sit down and have NAPA take a look at that, maybe at an appropriate time.

But I think the pilot has to go. NAPA is a very good organization. We have used the NAPA people with regard to the reorganization of the FBI and many other agencies.

What I would ask is we have a ''no'' vote. At the end of the pilot, in September, I am going to remind the staff; we will call NAPA up, also call the EEOC. I would invite the gentlewoman to come to the meeting and kind of see where we are. Fortunately, we will still have time to kind of deal with the issue, because I don't believe that we will be in conference by then.

But we are in the middle of the pilot; you don't kill it while the pilot is still operating. This is the National Academy of Public Administration, which so many individuals have used so many times.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, would you yield for just a moment?

Mr. WOLF. Yes, I would yield.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. The reason I am making the amendment, I brought up the amendment, is the proposal is to make the NCC permanent before the pilot is over with. That is why I am screaming and hollering. If you are saying to me that it is not going to be made permanent by this bill and that we will have an opportunity after the pilot is completed to have a conversation about this and make sure things are taken care of, I am willing to work with you. I would love to be able to wait until the pilot ends before we make an amendment.

Mr. WOLF. I can't answer that. The staff said they are going to vote. But what I would like to do tomorrow is write the commission or ask the commission that they not vote in July to make it permanent until the pilot is finished.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. I would love to join you in a letter like that.

Mr. WOLF. Does that mean you withdraw the amendment?

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Let me just say this, if I have the assurance of the chairman, and I have not worked with you before, but I know that you are a man of your word, you are willing to work with me to try to keep it from being permanent until we hear what is happening with the pilot, I will withdraw my amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Yes. I would do that. I would also ask if we can ask the National Academy of Public Administration also be part of that process.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. If you would allow me, I would love to have my colleague, Congresswoman NORTON, join me. She was a former commissioner and worked with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Mr. WOLF. Sure.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment based on the comments of the Chair.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GINGREY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GINGREY:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in title IV of this Act may be used for negotiating the participation of additional countries under the visa waiver program described in section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

□ 1930

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I believe our Nation needs to secure its points of entry and we need to do it now. Specifically, I believe we should prevent any additional countries from joining the United States Visa Waiver Program until we have the technical and human resources to secure our points of entry. And that is my amendment. I do not believe our Nation can afford the security risk of allowing more visitors to the United States without screening them prior to arrival. This amendment would prevent funds from being used to negotiate additional visa waiver countries.

Mr. Chairman, the State Department would not be using funds to negotiate new visa waivers until the machine-readable and tamper-resistant biometric identification standards on passports that were mandated by the PATRIOT Act and the 9/11 Act in 2004 as the cornerstone of this entry-exit system are fully operational. There are currently 27 visa waiver countries, and I believe it is simply too risky to negotiate additional countries without first having our security screening system in place.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot allow additional visa waiver countries which could provide more opportunities for terrorists to breach a loophole in our security. How long will it be before Immigration Customs Enforcement, ICE, the Air Marshals, or TSA, Transportation Security Administration, misses the next Richard Reid?

Mr. Chairman, I understand concerns about how spending or limiting the Visa Waiver Program may adversely affect cultural exchange or possibly hurt the airline and tourist industry. However, at what point are we willing to risk security for new pen pals and business as usual?

Habib Zacarias Moussaoui, a French citizen of Moroccan descent and a name we all know very well, used his French passport without a U.S. visa on February 23, 2001, to fly from London to Chicago and on to Oklahoma City where he began flight training at an aviation school. On August 16, 2001, the INS arrested Moussaoui because he remained in the United States well beyond the 90 days allowed for the Visa Waiver Program entrants and was in violation of the requirement that Visa Waiver Program travelers enter for business or tourism.

Had INS and law enforcement not been on top of their game, Moussaoui could have been a part of the 9/11 attacks, thanks to a visa waiver. In fact, we have referred to him as the twentieth hijacker.

So, Mr. Chairman, the Visa Waiver Program was only designed to be a temporary program for a small and a select group of nations, starting with the UK, Japan and France in 1986. Today, 27 countries are eligible under visa waivers, opening the door widely for unscreened terrorists to attack the United States. Twenty-seven countries are enough to keep ICE and TSA exceedingly busy. Do we really need to fund efforts to add a 28th and 29th country to their list of responsibilities?

I just don't want to see our Nation attacked because we couldn't carry through with our commitments to security first.

So, Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues, please support this Gingrey amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for Dr. Gingrey. We have talked about this amendment prior to him bringing it up; and I know he is very, very sincere. But there is more that has to be told about the visa waiver and the success of not the program itself but in the way in which it is moving to get to an arena where we all want it to be, where we want biometric passports, where we want identification.

I chair the Baltic Caucus. The Baltic Caucus has about 45 Members of this body. The Baltic countries are Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. Some of the newly emerging democracies have only been in existence after the fall of the Soviet Union, and yet they are some of our strongest allies in the war against terror. They have had successful integration into NATO, NATO membership. They are members of the European Union. They have soldiers that have not only fought and died in Afghanistan but also in Iraq. In fact, Lithuania is leading one of the provincial reconstruction teams. These countries are doing everything that we are asking them to do as a nation, as part of the coalition of the willing.

How does this relate to visa waiver?

Well, we have other allies who aren't part of the coalition of the willing, who already have this venue of visa waiver. So what kind of message are we telling these new emerging democracies, those that are, by percentage of soldiers, committed by far outstripping some of the larger countries that are part of our alliance? We say, these countries have this visa waiver process, but you can't have access to that; and I would say that that sends a terrible signal that we, in essence, now are asking some of our strongest allies, and we are discriminating against them.

And the point that really, the point about the amendment is that Chairman SENSENBRENNER, I think, is going to come down and speak on this amendment. We disagree on some of this visa waiver debate. I would like to see it happen now.

He wants to proceed on the plan with the State Department which says there has got to be a road map. Let's bring in these new countries, but let them meet these requirements, requirements like recidivism. Get their numbers down. Process like biometric passports, things that countries that have visa waiver now aren't even required to do.

So when you pull the money and freeze it from the developing of the road map, then what you are, in essence, doing is stopping the encouragement of people to do the very things we want to do to secure our borders.

So, with that, I am going to strongly oppose this amendment.

I would like to yield to my colleague from Chicago for as much time as he may consume, Mr. LIPINSKI.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I completely understand the concerns that the gentleman from Georgia has, talking about the potential that this could have if we would just open up the Visa Waiver Program to any country, to open it up wide.

But there are specific countries, Poland, for example. Poland was included in the Senate Immigration Reform bill. Poland has been a great ally of the United States, has been a fantastic ally, has given troops to the war on terror; and, as Mr. SHIMKUS said, I believe that this would be a very bad signal to say, no, no more countries can be included here, even on a temporary basis, even if we put all these other restrictions on. So I think we need to continue to allow other countries to possibly be accepted into the Visa Waiver Program.

So I understand the concerns with terrorism, concerns with protecting our country. Security needs to be up there foremost. But part of security is also bringing in more of our allies.

So I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I have tremendous respect for my colleague from Illinois; and I know his passion for the Baltic countries and particularly Lithuania. And this is not about them. This is not about any specific country, although there are two that are in line to expand this Visa Waiver Program from the current 27 to 29. It is not the Baltic countries. But we are in a situation where we have got to accept the reality of the risk that we are in.

If I really had my way, I would like to see the Visa Waiver Program completely suspended, all 27 countries suspended. In fact, I have introduced a bill to that effect and brought that amendment to the 9/11 bill. And I had a colloquy then, withdrew that amendment with the agreement that hearings would be held and this issue would be addressed.

The 9/11 bill in 2004, the PATRIOT Act called for making sure this entry-exit system and the biometrics on the passports were secure by a date certain. We are beyond that date certain, Mr. Chairman. And now, from these countries, no, they weren't coalitions of the willing, but France certainly has been our friend and for the sake of tourism, but we can't afford to continue to do that in this time.

I urge my colleagues, I beg my colleagues to support my amendment.

I yield back.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I will just end in saying it is about these new emerging democracies. It is about our friends, the smallest countries and the new emerging democracies and the former captive nations. If anyone understands freedom and democracy, it is the governing officials of these Baltic countries who had fathers and grandparents enslaved in Siberia. They know what it is about to defend and fight for freedom. And you know what? They have chosen sides. And you know whose side they have chosen? They have chosen the United States.

What this amendment does is just like capital formation. You show that there is no ability of return, you lose the investment. And this is a loss of investment for our friends.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia Mr. GINGREY. His amendment would deny any Federal funding to negotiate the addition of other countries to the U.S. Visa Waiver Program.

This amendment would essentially kill the expansion of the U.S. Visa Waiver Program, something that I believe is a diplomatic mistake for our country to undertake.

The Visa Waiver Program enables nationals of certain countries to travel to the United States for tourism or business for stays of 90 days or less without obtaining a visa. The program was established in 1986 with the objective of promoting better relations with U.S. allies, eliminating unnecessary barriers to travel, stimulating the tourism industry, and permitting the Department of State to focus consular resources in other areas.

Currently there are 27 countries participating in the Visa Waiver Program, all strong allies of the United States. Currently South Korea is seeking to become part of the Visa Waiver Program. We have very strong economic, cultural, and diplomatic ties with South Korea and the time has come to expand that relationship further to include the citizens of South Korea under the Visa Waiver Program.

While the sponsor of this amendment states the Visa Waiver Program makes the USA less safe, I argue the exact opposite. Not all countries participate in the Visa Waiver Program, and not all travelers from Visa Waiver Program countries are eligible to use the program. Visa Waiver Program travelers are screened prior to admission into the United States, and they are enrolled in the Department of Homeland Security's U.S.–VISIT program.

The reason this program is needed is that processing visas in some countries can tie up about 80 percent of American Embassy and Consulate resources. If we extended the Visa Waiver Program to countries that have met the requirements and conditions set by our Department of State, we can free up much needed resources and devote them to other tasks such as: stopping terrorists, combating illegal immigration, drug trafficking, human trafficking, and weapons proliferations.

To stop funding the Visa Waiver Program, is wrong and dangerous for Americans.

As a Representative from one of the most diverse districts in the United States, I know first hand the contributions that our naturalized citizens can make to a community.

I have constituents, that would like their families to legally come, visit and enjoy the United States, but are having a difficult time because the visa application process has become arduous and too time consuming. On the behalf of my constituents, I say that we must expand and continue the Visa Waiver Program.

I oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LIPINSKI

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LIPINSKI:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. For ''OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS—STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE'' for the Law Enforcement Tribute Act program, as authorized by section 11001 of the 21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act (Public Law 107–273), and the amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION—SALARIES AND EXPENSES'' is hereby reduced by, $500,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bipartisan amendment to provide $500,000 in funding for the Law Enforcement Tribute Act program. This program provides one-time grants to help State and local governments complete permanent tributes that honor the men and women of law enforcement and public safety who have been killed or disabled in the line of duty.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) for their cosponsorship of this amendment. This amendment would simply restore the funding for this program to the fiscal year 2003 level.

There are currently 17,535 names engraved on the walls of the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial in Washington, including 72 who were killed on 9/11, so many heroes who have given their lives to protect our families.

Many communities also want to honor their local law enforcement heroes with memorials or other permanent tributes. This program provides support to States and localities to help them do this. Without this support, many of them could not provide these worthy tributes.

Mr. Chairman, law enforcement and public safety officers dedicate their careers and their lives to protecting us. Tributes provide us with a constant reminder of the sacrifices that they have made. The least we can do is help local communities honor these brave heroes.

I urge my colleagues to join us with their support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, the committee has no objection to the amendment and is prepared to accept it

Mr. LIPINSKI. I thank Chairman WOLF, Ranking Member MOLLOHAN for their support on this amendment; and I thank them for accepting the amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. We commend the gentleman for his amendment and are willing to accept it.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment restoring funds for the Law Enforcement Tribute Act Program to its FY03 funding level of $500,000.

Mr. Chairman, only seven weeks ago, the Fairfax County Police Department suffered the loss of two officers in the line of duty, the first fatal shooting in the department's long history.

As I join the Fairfax County community in mourning the loss of Master Police Officer Michael Garbarino and Detective Vicky Armel, I also have in my thoughts the roughly 740,000 officers nationwide who put their lives on the line for the safety and protection of others on a regular basis.

Mr. Chairman, every day, we are honored by the service these men and women give to our communities. This amendment will allow us to give those who sacrifice the most for our community and safety the recognition they deserve. I am pleased that the chairman has agreed to accept the amendment.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Chairman, hundreds of thousands of men and women each day put

on a uniform and put their lives in danger to protect our neighborhoods. Just last year, 154 police officers were killed in the line of duty in the United States. There were 17 police officers who were killed in the line of duty in 2005 in my home State of California, alone. These are men and women who serve us bravely and with distinction, and they will not be returning home to their families.

When I introduced the Law Enforcement Tribute Act in 2001, the city of Glendale had wanted to honor Officer Lazzaretto as well as three other police officers and one sheriff's deputy that had been killed in the line of duty. Chuck Lazaretto was tragically killed in a shooting in May 1997. Because of this House's support, we enabled Glendale to place a memorial honoring its fallen heroes outside its new police department headquarters.

The parameters of LETA are very simple. Maximum grants are $150,000, and they must have at least a 50 percent local match. This amendment would appropriate $500,000 for fiscal year 2007.

In addition to the memorial that was erected in my district, the Law Enforcement Tribute Act program provided funds in 2004 to 17 local law enforcement memorials all over this Nation, including memorials in Tacoma, Washington; Fairbanks, Alaska; Tucson, Arizona; and Memphis, Tennessee.

It is a fitting tribute for the Federal Government to continue to provide a small amount of assistance to honor these fallen heroes.

I ask for my colleague's support in honoring the fallen men and women of law enforcement, and restore funds for the Law Enforcement Tribute Act Program to its FY 03 funding level of $500,000.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCAUL OF TEXAS

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCCAUL of Texas:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to fund a United Nations peacekeeping mission if an individual who is participating in that mission is under investigation for alleged human rights abuses, including sexual exploitation, and that individual has not been removed from that mission for the duration of that investigation.

□ 1945

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

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise to offer this amendment, which will prevent individuals who are under investigation for human rights violations, including sexual abuse, from participating in current peacekeeping missions.

The underlying bill includes good language that will prevent funds in the bill from being spent on new peacekeeping programs until the allegations of human rights violations have been investigated and the guilty have been purged. My amendment simply expands on this initiative and makes current U.N. peacekeeping missions accountable for human rights violations.

Over the past year, several cases of human rights abuses, specifically sexual exploitation and abuse, by individuals involved in U.N. peacekeeping operations have raised the suspicions of many Members of Congress and members of the International Relations Committee. The U.N. Office of Internal Oversight Services has opened an investigation into these allegations, and the evidence in several of these cases is compelling and very disturbing. Sadly, in some cases, the U.N. has failed to remove the accused individuals from their posts, leaving them in a position to continue abusing innocent victims. Whatever the world gains by placing peacekeeping forces in an embattled country or region we lose tenfold by having deviant and abusive members of the peacekeeping force exploit the local populations.

Peacekeeping funds are an important and necessary part of what America does for humanity and the rest of the world. It is a worthwhile cause and a very important resource in spreading American goodwill to other nations. However, I believe the U.N. peacekeeping program must be reformed and Americans should not be spending their valuable tax dollars on the program until this serious problem has been fixed.

I thank the chairman for allowing me to discuss this issue. I understand it is subject to a point of order, and I will withdraw my amendment with the hope that the chairman and ranking member will address this issue in conference and in future appropriations bills.

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. DELAURO

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. DELAURO:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by increasing the amount made available for ''VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN AND PROSECUTION PROGRAMS'' (consisting of an additional $2,000,000 for grants to assist children and youth exposed to violence, $2,000,000 for services to advocate for and respond to youth, and $1,000,000 for the national tribal sex offender registry, as authorized by sections 41303, 41201, and 905(b), respectively, of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005, and $5,000,000 for grants for sexual assault services, as authorized by section 2014 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, as amended by section 202 of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005), and by reducing the amount made available for ''DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION—SALARIES AND EXPENSES'', by $10,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

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

This amendment, which I offer with Mr. INSLEE, would provide $10 million for several newly authorized Violence Against Women Act programs, including $2 million for children exposed to violence, $2 million for youth services and $1 million for the national tribal sex offender registry, as well as $5 million for the Sexual Assault Services Program.

The House last year voted almost unanimously to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act, which dedicated $50 million for the Sexual Assault Services Program, funding vitally needed. It was the first Federal program to provide direct funding for counseling, legal accompaniment, training for law enforcement, and the prevention and education services that rape victims rely on.

Sexual violence remains a problem in this country. Rape remains the only violent crime to still be on the rise. One out of every six women are raped or sexually assaulted in their lifetimes, more than 200,000 in 2004 alone. Worse, only 36 percent of victims say they reported the crime to the police.

Those most likely to be raped or sexually assaulted are young women between the ages of 16 and 24, women with their whole lives ahead of them. This one act of violence will alter their lives forever. But absent proper treatment and timely counseling, it could destroy any possibility of a healthy life, resulting in depression, addiction, eating disorders and even suicide.

The need to take action is now. When Congress recognized the need to authorize this program, it was one time when we spoke with one voice in this

body. While the program was authorized at $50 million, the underlying appropriations bill includes no funding for it whatsoever.

We can take a small step toward following through on a commitment for direct services with this amendment, to get funding where it is needed most, to rape crisis centers.

Let us start to truly make go ahead on this commitment that we made. And by simply redirecting $5 million from the Department of Justice general administration account to this program, we can give these women hope that there are better days ahead.

Let us pass the amendment and let us do it today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Chairman, we know two things about domestic violence and violence against women. Number one, it is still at epidemic levels across our Nation. And, number two, it is almost an inherited trait where children who are exposed to domestic violence themselves become perpetrators frequently. Ten million children a year are exposed to domestic violence in our country, and we know that men who have experienced it and viewed it as children are twice as likely to become perpetrators themselves.

So one aspect of this bill is to fund a portion of the Violence Against Women Act to break that chain, nip this in the bud, stop that chain from continuing across multiple generations. The other part of our amendment will make sure that we treat children. Teenagers are a special group that are increasingly submitted to sexual harassment, sexual abuse and domestic violence themselves. These are bills that we need to get funded. Third, this will deal with the tribal problem. We need to have a tribal registry for sexual abuse.

And just in conclusion, there will come a day, I hope, where we fathers are successful in teaching our sons that it is unmanly to abuse women. That is an obligation upon all of us as fathers. But as part of that, I am happy today and I hope this amendment will pass. It will fulfill our obligation in Congress to help break this chain of domestic violence.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, the committee has no objection to the amendment and applauds the authors for its intent and for bringing it to the House tonight and are prepared to accept it.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, we thank the gentleman, and we appreciate the opportunity to move forward on this issue.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MCCAUL OF TEXAS

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MCCAUL of Texas:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to fund the administration and operation of the United Nations Human Rights Council while countries designated as state sponsors of terrorism by the Secretary of State are members of the Council.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MCCAUL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today to offer this amendment, which simply seeks to prevent the funding of a Human Rights Council that represents state-sponsored terrorists.

Currently, the United States provides 22 percent of the U.N. annual budgets, over $900 million in fiscal year 2007, and some of that funding goes to the Human Rights Council. My amendment states that no funds in this bill may be used to fund the administration or operation of the Human Rights Council while countries designated as state sponsors of terrorism remain as members of the council. The reforms to the Human Rights Council by the United Nations over the last year are purely cosmetic and without substantive change.

Today, countries that sponsor terrorism and countries that have atrocious human rights records still remain on this council, and the American taxpayer funds them. And in my opinion, that is unacceptable. Any Human Rights Council reform that allows countries that sponsor terrorism to remain as members, such as Cuba, is not real reform. And in the past, countries such as Libya, Iran and Syria have participated on this council.

Additionally, any Human Rights Council reform that allows countries with despicable human rights records to remain as members, such as China and Saudi Arabia, is not real reform. I believe that it would not only be a waste of America's valuable tax dollars, but it would be an insult to some of our taxpayers who are also soldiers who have fought so hard to defeat terrorism worldwide. It is an insult to elevate countries that sponsor terrorism to a position of authority over other countries for human rights abuses.

Until the United Nations engages in true reform to defeat terrorism, we should send them a strong message through this amendment by cutting off U.S. funding to the Human Rights Council.

I urge all my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment which will work to prevent terrorism worldwide.

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

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

It is unfortunate that the United States did not participate in the establishment of the Human Rights Council. We were one of four nations out of over 170 that did support it who opposed it. But following the elections to the Human Rights Council, the Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations, Kristen Silverburg, had this to say: On the whole, we think this demonstrates some progress. Those are her words.

And the truth is that the Human Rights Council is an improvement over the discredited Human Rights Commission. Is it perfect? Of course not. But it does require candidates to be elected for the first time by an absolute majority of the General Assembly, not through selection. It also requires that those who serve on the council have their human rights records regularly reviewed and allows the human rights abusers to be suspended from the council. And the reality is that the only member of the council that is on the list of state sponsors of terrorism is Cuba. Sudan, Syria, Libya, Iran and North Korea were kept off. And the dominant majority of its members are democracies.

I note that my friend and colleague from Texas, the proponent of the amendment, sent around a ''dear colleague'' about his amendment, and therein was a statement that a council that includes China does not signify reform. Well, I would submit that that puts him at odds with our ambassador to the United Nations and the Bush administration. Because Ambassador Bolton has initially suggested that the five permanent members of the Security Council, which clearly includes China, automatically be given membership on the Human Rights Council. And the administration subsequently, through Ambassador Bolton and Secretary Rice, have publicly committed to work with the council to make it effective.

If the United States turns its back on the council, it will condemn the principal international human rights forum to failure and allow the handful of bad apples that remain in the body to dominate it.

Instead, the United States should work with the 37 democracies elected to the 47-member council to strengthen and depoliticize it and ensure future elections to the council exclude members that commit human rights abuses.

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

Mr. McCAUL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is amazing to me that anybody could agree that state sponsors of terrorism, that it is somehow acceptable that they serve on the Human Rights Council, and specifically countries like China, when we look at their human rights record in Tiananmen Square and the oppression that they have put on their people, countries like Iran, which is a state sponsor of terrorism, which has oppressed women in their society, oppressed their own people to a great extent.

□ 2000

Also Libya and Syria. I think this is a commonsense amendment, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding the time; and I commend your efforts in this regard to limit the funding to this council and limit the funding, in essence, to the U.N. as well.

This council and even the process by which members are selected to it are basically symptomatic of the problems that we see within the U.N. not just today but over its entire 60-year history.

When we step back for a moment and say this is good and the next forward step because these members are selected to it by the entire body, we must remember what the entire body is made up of. This is the same body that is made up of the G–77 that is basically thwarting all efforts to reform the U.N., efforts that this House and this gentleman has also worked for to make sure we would have going forward in the U.N.

But the G–77 and the other minority nations have worked to make sure that those reforms that this House has tried to envision and has envisioned and tried to get across in the U.N. have been thwarted.

This same group of states, made up, as you indicate, of terrorist states as well, have seen to it that they have selected nations such as China, such as Pakistan and others, terrorist nation states, to be on this body.

How can anyone sit back in good conscience and say that this council is going to be able, therefore, to judge any other nation in the world when their own nations have the problems within it?

And, yes, it is true that these nations may have the opportunity or have the responsibility of having their human rights records reviewed more intensely, but I don't think that a more extensive review is necessary. The world has already seen these nations and how they conduct themselves on the international scene, and the world has already seen as well how they conduct themselves with regard to their own citizens.

A nation that subjects their own people, a nation that puts their own people under the thumb of their leadership, a nation that subjects its own women to an inferior status within their country, is not a nation that I wish to be judging the quality of life in this country or any other country.

So I commend the gentleman for his work in this regard. I think that this House should stand up behind him and make sure this legislation passes.

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

Mr. Chairman, I acknowledge that it is not a perfect mechanism. Would I have preferred to see a pure and pristine body created? Of course. But the truth is, and the gentleman has acknowledged it, we live in an imperfect world; and I would suggest the best example of that is the allies that this Nation has brought into the coalition of the willing. Let me just cite a few:

Uzbekistan. Uzbekistan, headed by an individual by the name of Islam Karimov, who is responsible for the massacre of almost 1,000 innocent civilians in Andijan.

Part of our coalition of the willing includes Azerbaijan. Azerbaijan, where the son of the president recently came and visited with President Bush in the White House. Read our Department of State's human rights reports on Azerbaijan.

Another traditional ally of the United States, Egypt. Go read the Department of State's human rights reports on Egypt.

And the gentleman is correct to talk about Saudi Arabia, where women don't have the right to drive.

We are in a world that is imperfect, but there is no doubt that this particular council represents an improvement and has the support of the Bush administration.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk read the amendment so we can understand what amendment this is.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. For ''OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS—JUVENILE JUSTICE PROGRAMS'' for the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Block Grant program, as authorized by Part C of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, and the amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS—INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING OPERATIONS'' is hereby reduced by, $5,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to not offer my amendment concerning the Juvenile Mentoring Program but will present this one concerning the Delinquency Prevention Block Grant program.

Initially, the amount of money designated earlier for these programs was $33 million. That was the initial amendment. However, that has been reduced to $7 million, and I rise today to support the funding for Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Grants, because the funding is limited.

Mr. Chairman, as violent crime continues to rise throughout this country, it is important that we give our young people the support they need to become productive adults. Delinquency Prevention Block Grants do just that.

These grants provide assistance to at-risk youth through a number of programs, including family strengthening programs, drug and alcohol abuse treatment programs, gang prevention programs, job training and employment programs, and youth development programs. These activities are designed to prevent and reduce juvenile crime in communities that have a comprehensive youth crime prevention plan.

Simply building more prisons is not an effective crime prevention strategy. Mr. Chairman, we must give our children a path to success, not a path to prison. Delinquency Prevention Block Grants give our young people a chance to excel and become productive adults. Through youth development, prevention and intervention efforts, we can keep our children safe and out of trouble. Research has shown that early investment in youth can dramatically reduce youth crime and violence.

Additionally, delinquency prevention programs offer a considerable savings in the long term. For every dollar invested in prevention programs, we save about $4 to $7 in the long term.

Providing all children and youth with constructive programs and alternatives is essential for our Nation's at-risk children. We must give our youth every opportunity to grow into responsible, productive, healthy and law-abiding adults. I ask my colleagues for

their support for this important amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will not offer the amendment earlier we talked about. I ask for support for this one. I think this is the one that we had discussed. The one that I withdrew had to do with the mentoring program that I was told already had funding in under various organizations like Girls Clubs and Boy Scouts and organizations like that. So that is the one that I withdrew.

This one was altered to show $7 million, which had been $33 million. That was an agreed amount. It is reduced to $7 million.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. WOLF.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlelady from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman WOLF for agreeing to enter into this colloquy with me on the subject of intellectual property rights.

Discussions of international trade and intellectual property rights are often dominated by talk about China, but I would like to bring up that there is no country in the world who is doing a worse job at fighting piracy right now than the country of Vietnam. Ninety percent of all the software used in Vietnam in 2005 was pirated. That is more than the deplorable rate of 86 percent that China has. Piracy in Vietnam is costing our businesses $45 million a year.

I know that the chairman shares my disappointment with the lack of action that we have seen from the administration on this issue so far, but despite Vietnam's complete failure to protect intellectual property rights, the administration and certain Members of this House want to grant Vietnam permanent trade relations and WTO membership. I think that it is a huge mistake.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlelady. I want to be on record I am absolutely, opposed to granting PNTR to Vietnam.

If you read the Human Rights Report of the State Department of Vietnam, which probably not many people read, it is a disaster. It is a disaster. I cannot understand why a bill would even come to the floor.

On the issue of intellectual property, if you look to see how they are treating the Catholic Church and the Buddhists, do you think they are going to be any better on intellectual property? No way.

President Bush is going to visit this fall. We are hoping that the President will meet with dissidents here and also dissidents over there and speak out on human rights, religious freedom and on the intellectual property issue. So anything that we could do in this bill that would be helpful with regard to beefing up intellectual property and doing as much is helpful.

But, also, as I told another Member from your side earlier today, it isn't just putting a couple dollars in. I want somebody who really believes, and, as of now, I think this whole issue of trade trumps everything.

I wish we could harken back to the days of Ronald Reagan, whereby Ronald Reagan just spoke out so boldly on the issue of human rights and religious freedom in Eastern Europe, called the Soviet Union the evil empire, was laughed at by the liberal media, and lived to see the fall of the Soviet Union.

That type of approach that Ronald Reagan took would be the right approach to take with regard to Vietnam, whereby we could see additional trade and human rights and religious freedom and, lastly, the respect for intellectual property, so they are not just stealing everything that we have.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, as you know, I represent the largest Vietnamese population outside of Vietnam in the world in Orange County, California; and certainly our number one issues with respect to how people are treated in Vietnam are the human rights issues, the issues of freedom of the press. There is no press that is not state-owned.

I remember being with an archbishop, and he said that he couldn't even pass out information inside the church after the church service because that would be considered the printed word, and that would not be allowed because he was not a state agency, as well as confiscation of land rights, which I have got a bill in the House and we are working on to try to get that returned to religious institutions.

But certainly there are moneys in this bill for intellectual property rights, and I would hope that this administration would concentrate some of that. Of course, we need to do it on China. It is a large economy that is growing there. But I think we really need to send a message.

As I stated before, I have voted every single time against normal trade relations with Vietnam because I believe that their human rights record is so atrocious and they really haven't changed it.

By the way, I have also been denied three times entry into Vietnam in the last few years, simply because I continue to bring up these issues.

So I hope that the chairman will work with me, especially as we move forward as the President is deciding to go to Vietnam and as many in this House have decided to push for WTO entry and for normal trade relations with Vietnam. I would hope that people would begin to read some of these reports to understand just how terrible the human rights conditions are in Vietnam.

□ 2015

With that, I thank you for the time, Mr. Chairman.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MRS. MUSGRAVE

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 16 offered by Mrs. MUSGRAVE:

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

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to carry out section 924(p) of title 18, United States Code.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment will prohibit any funds in this bill from being used to enforce the burdensome trigger lock law that was passed and that went into effect on April 24 of this year. I believe this law is needless and equivalent to a tax on citizens who purchase firearms.

The law states that all licensed manufacturers, licensed importers and licensed dealers must provide a trigger lock with every handgun they sell. This is not a cost that will be absorbed by the gun industry; it is a cost that will be passed on to lawful gun owners.

Trigger locks do not stop gun crimes or accidental shootings. Mandating gun buyers to pay for a gun lock is not making America safe; it just is making guns and self-defense and personal protection more costly.

Mr. Chairman, should the government mandate safety devices for every possible household danger? Lawn mowers can be dangerous. According to the American Academy of Pediatrics, approximately 9,400 children younger than 18 years of age receive emergency care for lawn mower related injuries every year. Should we mandate that all lawn mowers be sold with a blade lock?

Medicine cabinets contain dangerous substances. According to the Center for Disease Control, in 2000, over 1 million children younger than age 6 were exposed to poison, with some of the most common exposures being cosmetics and personal care products.

Should we make medicine cabinet locks mandatory? Knives, electrical outlets, power tools. I could stand here and list hundreds of household mechanisms. Safety needs to be a priority in all households; we all know that. I believe that parents should be responsible

and store and manage household products in a safe manner.

But should lawn mower dealers be required to sell blade locks with every lawn mower sold or every cabinet maker sell a cabinet lock with every cabinet sold?

Mr. Chairman, my point is that many things around the home are dangerous when used without proper instructions or supervision. But it is not the government's job or responsibility to mandate every conceivable protective mechanism imaginable.

Responsible adults do not need the government to force them to purchase protective mechanisms for their homes or businesses. Responsible gun owners who need a trigger lock would have purchased one on their own without a government mandate. A government mandate is not the answer.

Forcing gun buyers to purchase gun locks will not make guns more safe; it will only result in gun lock manufacturers making larger profits and increasing costs for all lawful gun owners.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my fellow Members to vote in favor of my amendment.

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

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, when the legislation was passed, it was passed with the help of 70 bipartisan Senators. With that, we had many strong certainly gun rights Senators voting for the amendment. We talk about gun safety. We talk about trying to certainly save and prevent as many injuries as possible. We talk about, you know, having it mandatory when you buy a gun. But we are not asking mandatory that the person use the gun lock.

The whole idea was, hopefully, educational-wise, as we do with so many other products, we will have that gun owner use it. Many gun owners use storage locks. And that is great. We are trying to reach out to more.

I have nurses around the country that actually go to gun stores and hand out gun locks like this. They are not expensive. They are $5 to $7. We have seen safety issues certainly at the forefront, helmets for kids when they ride their bicycles. That has saved a lot of head injuries.

When we look at the health care issues on gun violence, unfortunately, especially to children, we see a lot of money in the health care system being used. It is just one other step to hopefully bring down certainly medical care costs in this country, but also more importantly than ever before, certainly work with children to save their lives.

In this past week, we had an incident in New Jersey. A 12-year-old unfortunately got hold of a family gun. Playing with it with his friend, he shot and killed his friend. It was an accident. It was an accident that certainly could have been prevented.

I happen to think that when the Senators on the other side voted, and by the way, this House also voted for the bill, to pass it with the gun safety locks mandatory in that legislation, it is one more thing. Is it a perfect answer? No. We do not have perfect answers.

Since I have been here, I have been trying to convince people that I am not out to take anybody's right to own a gun. But I also talk to an awful lot of gun owners. And they understand the responsibility that they have. Now, if someone buys a gun and it is mandatory to have a gun lock with that gun, they can choose to use it or not to use it. I hope that if they choose not to use it, they would at least give it to someone that would.

As I said, my nurses, they do not have large budgets. But because they work in the emergency rooms and because they are the ones on the front line when these young kids come in, we have done, in my opinion, a very good job on bringing down the number of deaths with children, especially those under 18.

To take away something that this Congress and certainly the other body felt was important enough to put into legislation is something that I think that we should be fighting for. I hope that my colleagues will oppose this bill.

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

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, can I inquire how much time I have left?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) have 2 minutes remaining.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Congresswoman MUSGRAVE for her leadership on this amendment, which would prohibit any funds in the appropriations bill being used to enforce the mandatory trigger lock provisions, essentially a tax on citizens who purchase a handgun.

It is my view that the new trigger lock bill is bad public policy. The new bill provides, or the law is a tax on citizens who purchase firearms. Responsible and law-abiding gun owners do not need the government to tell them to be safe. Responsible gun owners will take protective steps without the government mandating trigger locks.

Responsible users who will use a provided lock would also be using safer and more secure methods, such as a lockbox, quick-action safes or full gun safes. I would like to thank Congresswoman MUSGRAVE for her leadership in understanding there can be unintended consequences.

It is my view that many people who in good faith are working for restrictions on the use of weapons are actually not achieving what they meant. My experience with this, I worked in the State of South Carolina in the State senate. To provide concealed weapons permits, we were warned that if persons who were law-abiding citizens could apply for a concealed weapons permit, it would lead to the shootout at OK Corral. The exact opposite has occurred. There has been a reduction in gun violence, a reduction in crime, almost 50,000 people in my home State now have a concealed weapons permit.

And people who were opposing our bill now tell me that it works. And so I would like to commend Congresswoman MUSGRAVE on her vision to protect the people of the United States.

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I think we are trying to change the debate again. Again, it is about gun safety. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from New York for yielding me time.

I rise to strongly oppose this amendment, which if enacted will lead to more accidental gun shootings in this country, including more deaths of children. Just last October, this Congress passed a piece of legislation that brought broad immunities to the gun industry. And we can have our differences on that issue.

But as part of that legislation that was passed by this Congress and signed by the President back in October, there was a provision, Child Safety Lock Act of 2005. Let me just describe the purposes: To promote the safe storage and use of handguns by consumers; to prevent unauthorized persons from gaining access to or use of a handgun, including children who may not be in possession of a handgun.

Who can argue against those purposes? That was the intent of the legislation. It said, if you are a gun dealer and you are selling a gun, let's at the very least ensure that you have to sell at the same time a gun safety lock to protect against accidental shootings. We know the terrible statistics of accidental shooting deaths of children in this country. Let's not change what this Congress did on a bipartisan basis.

And when this came up in the Senate, there was a bipartisan vote in support of this.

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am here on the floor to present a different amendment. But I listened to the debate on this, and I am really amazed. This House voted overwhelming to require v-chips on television sets so parents can protect their children from improper programming.

But it would be absurd to do that and then say we are not going to at least have a gun lock to protect children who may pick up a gun and use it inappropriately, use it out of ignorance.

So I want to join you in opposing this amendment. I see nothing wrong with a

gun lock. I do not think that means people want to take away the guns or anything else, just to make sure that it is locked so if it gets in the hands of a child, that the child will not use it, kill someone or do harm to other children and members of the family.

We do have requirements of locks on all sorts of products in order to protect children. I think the rule that is in effect ought to be allowed to be continued without this amendment stopping it.

Mrs. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, with that being said, you have to remember, we are not forcing anyone to use the lock. We are trying to educate them to save lives. It is a commonsense law. Hopefully, everybody will oppose this amendment.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the law is needless and equivalent to a tax on law-abiding citizens who buy guns. I urge Members to support my amendment.

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

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

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

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. 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 Colorado will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WAXMAN

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WAXMAN:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for—

(1) the Industry Trade Advisory Committee on Chemicals, Pharmaceuticals, Health/Science Products and Services (ITAC 3) unless the membership of the committee is ''fairly balanced in terms of the points of view represented'' pursuant to section 5(b)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5. U.S. App.); or

(2) the Industry Trade Advisory Committee on Intellectual Property Rights (ITAC 15) unless the membership of the committee is ''fairly balanced in terms of the points of view represented'' pursuant to section 5(b)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, the law for advisory committees requires that it be fairly balanced in terms of points of view represented, pursuant to section 5(b)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee.

Well, there are two trade advisory committees that influence a wide array of policy and negotiating decisions that impact access to medicine, both domestically and overseas. One is known as ITAC 3. It covers chemicals, pharmaceuticals, health products and services.

The other, ITAC 15, advises the USTR on intellectual property rights. Pharmaceutical companies are represented already on these panels. But input from the public health community is nonexistent.

To its credit, in December of 2005, the administration moved to rectify this imbalance by soliciting nominations for public health representatives to be added to the two committees.

Yet more than 6 months later, despite numerous applications from the public health community and repeated inquires from Congress, no appointments have been made.

□ 2030

The longer the USTR delays, the more we need to be concerned about biased advice that is resulting in controversial trade policies on drug pricing, drug competition and reimportation and other sensitive issues.

For example, recent free trade agreements extend patent terms, delay generic competition and make it more difficult for governments to respond in the case of a public health crisis.

The USTR's 2006 Special 301 Report on intellectual property violations threatens sanctions against our ally Israel because the Israeli government declined to adopt drug regulations that go beyond the requirements of the WTO and even U.S. law.

Our FTA with Australia interferes with the pricing system they use to keep down drug prices.

Well, the consequences of not getting a balanced input from these advisory committees could lead to serious problems for people in these developing countries because, unless they have access to generic drugs, their people will not be able to afford the drugs that could be as successful in dealing with HIV/AIDS treatment programs, and it could even have an impact on the price of drugs in the United States.

The status quo is unacceptable. USTR ought to live up to its commitment to add public health representatives and meet its obligation under the Federal Advisory Committee Act, and that is what the amendment seeks to do.

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

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Virginia rise?

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I understand the Ways and Means Committee has concerns with this amendment. Although, looking around, I see no one from the Ways and Means Committee.

We also are aware that the Office of the United States Trade Representative has committed to ensuring public health experts are included on this advisory committee. We have been led to believe this issue will be resolved in the near future, but with that understanding, I have no objection to the amendment personally. So I would accept the amendment.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope this will be resolved very quickly. This is to give a push so it will be resolved.

Mr. Chairman, I have time, and I yield the balance of the time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a cosponsor of this amendment, who wishes to speak on it.

(Ms. LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman for yielding.

I also want to acknowledge the leadership of the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) and the work of his staff, Zahava Goldman, and Jamila Thompson on my staff for their tireless advocacy for access to affordable medicines for all people.

I am delighted this amendment has been accepted tonight because it is a very important policy that we must have. It is not really an extraordinary request.

Basically, we just are asking that what has been required in the past, public health officials, that they actually be appointed to these committees. Unfortunately, 7 months later, neither the USTR nor the Department of Commerce has provided a name or a plan or even a timeline to begin these appointments.

Now, with these very aggressive bilateral and multilateral trade negotiations continuing, we cannot afford to wait.

So this is a very important step in the right direction, and I thank both sides for accepting this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

Page 110, after line 8, insert the following:

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to send or otherwise pay for the attendance of more than 50 employees from a Federal department or agency at any single conference occurring outside the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I come to the floor this evening with an amendment that, quite frankly, I have offered and has been accepted on various other appropriation bills throughout this process, and I think it is time to, once again, thank the various chairmen of those respective committees for accepting some of those similar amendments.

We may differ on each side of the aisle as to how we exactly got to the point that we are today, but one thing that we do agree on, as I have said on this floor in the past, one thing we do agree on is that we spend too much and our deficit is way too high.

So my amendment that I come to the floor with tonight is basically a commonsense approach to see, how do we rein in that spending? How do we deal with the angst of our constituents at home that say we are spending too much of their hard earned dollars?

What does that amendment do? It places a limit, a number, a ceiling, if you will, on the number of staffers that can travel on international conferences. The number that we place on here, the limit that we place, is 50 staff members. I am not saying that staff are not important. All we have to do is look around us and recognize the significance that staff plays in the role of the House of Representatives and right here on the floor as well, but we are just saying that, when it comes to going over to other international conferences, there should be some reasonable limit to numbers that go there.

In the other House, the Senate has held hearings on this, and Senator COBURN from Oklahoma has actually pointed out egregious examples of over 100 or more staffers attending various conferences and literally close to millions of dollars for those respective conferences. If I wanted to take the time, I could go through a litany of such egregious examples.

But I will be brief and just simply say that, to rein in the spending, to put some appropriate, reasonable standards on this, we are going to try to do the same on this legislation as we have in the past and say that all agencies of the Federal Government should be responsible in the number of staff they send.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be read.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NADLER:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. For ''OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN—VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN PREVENTION AND PROSECUTION PROGRAMS'' for the Jessica Gonzales Victims Assistants program, as authorized by section 101(b)(3) of the Violence Against Women and Department of Justice Reauthorization Act of 2005 (Public Law 109–162), and the amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION—SALARIES AND EXPENSES'' is hereby reduced by, $5,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

First of all, I want to make it clear, I am just reading this revised amendment. This should increase the Jessica Gonzales program. It should put money into that by $5 million and reduce by $5 million the general administration salaries and expenses. I want to make clear that that is the intent of the amendment.

The Nadler-Capps amendment will increase the funding for the Jessica Gonzales Victim Assistance Program by $5 million. The offset is from the Department of Justice general administration account.

The Jessica Gonzales program places special victim assistants to act as liaisons between local law enforcement and victims of domestic violence in order to improve the enforcement of protection orders.

The current system has undermined the effectiveness of protective orders. Last year, the Supreme Court decided the case of Jessica Gonzales, who had obtained an order of protection against her violent husband. Despite Ms. Gonzales' numerous pleas to the police to arrest her husband for violating the order, even providing the police with information on his whereabouts, the police failed to do so. Mr. Gonzales then murdered their three children. When Ms. Gonzales sued the police for their failure to protect her and the children by enforcing the protective order, the Supreme Court ruled the police did not have the mandatory duty to enforce the order by making an arrest. The Jessica Gonzales Victim Assistance Program restores some of the effectiveness of restraining orders that the Supreme Court destroyed with this ruling.

This is the first opportunity to fund this program which was authorized last year in the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act.

The Jessica Gonzales Victim Assistance Program will help enforce restraining orders and protect women who are victims of domestic violence. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support the Nadler-Capps amendment to provide it with more adequate funding.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), the cosponsor of the amendment.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, and I also thank the chairman very much for his acceptance of this amendment already.

But I want our colleagues to know how much we all appreciate the fact that there was a tremendous bipartisan victory this past year with the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. In VAWA 2005, we were able not only to keep in place the successful programs of the past 11 years but also to initiate new programs to serve victims of domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking.

One such program is the Jessica Gonzales Victim Assistance Program, which improves our local law enforcement agencies' effectiveness in complying with restraining orders.

Now that we have taken the initiative and instituted this program, we must also now take that next step and properly fund this program. That is why I thank the chairman very much.

Nearly one in three women experiences at least one physical assault during her adulthood, assaults by a partner, but far too many of these cases go unreported, often because victims are skeptical about receiving adequate protection against their attackers. Not surprisingly, nearly half of all victims who obtain restraining orders are abused again.

What kind of message does that send about our Nation's ability to protect victims of domestic violence? This newly authorized program to address the shortfalls of restraining order enforcement is named after, as my colleague has said, Jessica Gonzales who, as many of you may remember, was ignored when she informed police that her estranged husband had violated his restraining order and kidnapped their three children. Ms. Gonzales' three children were murdered that night by her husband, even though the police had been informed about Mr. Gonzales' whereabouts with the children. We must vow not to let this happen again.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment so that we can properly fund the Jessica Gonzales Victim Assistance Program. We owe victims enforced protection against their attackers, and we must ensure that the next time a woman is attacked, she knows that reporting a crime and obtaining a restraining order are not fruitless gestures.

I thank the chairman, and I thank my colleague.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

Page 110, after line 8, insert the following:

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. (a) ANNUAL REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress a report listing all assessed and voluntary contributions of the United States Government for the preceding fiscal year to the United Nations and United Nations affiliated agencies and related bodies.

(b) ELEMENTS.—Each report under subsection (a) shall set forth, for the fiscal year covered by such report, the following:

(1) The total amount of all assessed and voluntary contributions of the United States Government to the United Nations and United Nations affiliated agencies and related bodies.

(2) The approximate percentage of United States Government contributions to each United Nations affiliated agency or body in such fiscal year when compared with all contributions to such agency or body from any source in such fiscal year.

(3) For each such contribution—

(A) the amount of such contribution;

(B) a description of such contribution (including whether assessed or voluntary);

(C) the department or agency of the United States Government responsible for such contribution;

(D) the purpose of such contribution; and

(E) the United Nations or United Nations affiliated agency or related body receiving such contribution.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I come to the floor tonight to address the issue of funding for the U.N. We have heard some discussion about it already, whether we are spending too little, not enough; whether we should not be making cutbacks in the various funding for the U.N.

The real question is, how can we make any of those decisions if we do not know the total amount of money that we are spending for the U.N. and its programs and its services?

Each year, the United States spends literally billions of dollars to fund the United Nations and its work. We fund the U.N.'s work year after year, regardless of how it is used or misused, and certainly, with the countless instances of waste, fraud and abuse, scandals and corruption over the last several years that we have talked about on this floor in the past, we can at the very least question the body's ability to police itself, at the very most call for that money as being misused.

At this time, the United States Government does not have a method for knowing the total amount of money we send to the U.N. While we can tally what is paid in dues, what we can contribute to various peacekeeping operations, additional funding is spent on voluntary programs and other support; there is no collective number for it. There is no comprehensive and public report of all the different ways that we fund U.N. operations with U.S. tax dollars.

□ 2045

So the amendment that I bring to the floor today calls for such a comprehensive accounting of all those dollars. Not for a cutting, not for increasing, just an accounting so we know what is being spent.

A similar amendment was made on various legislation on the Senate side.

Reform at the United Nations, that is that this Congress has encouraged in the past, has been complicated, as I have indicated earlier this evening, by the fact that the majority of the nations in the U.N. General Assembly oppose even the most modest forms of reform put forth by this House or even by the General Secretary. For instance, almost 5 years after the events of September 11, the U.N. has not yet even today agreed on a definition of terrorism. As I spoke earlier, they have also not agreed on a definition of genocide, even though that continues to go on to this day.

How can the U.N. expect to contribute to the fight against genocide or continue to fight against terrorism, one of the greatest threats to peace in the world today, if it can't even decide how to define it? Yet while the majority of the nations at the U.N. stand in the way of progress, they only fund 10 percent of the U.N.'s budget.

So it is up to the United States to lead for the U.N. That has worked in the past. In 1979, the Camp-Moynihan amendment successfully limited the U.N.'s support of terrorist organizations simply by the threat of withholding funds. And when the U.N. budget was ballooning in the 1980s, our use of financial leverage helped to bring about a compromise in 1986. And in 1992, Congress again had to withhold funds in order to see that an inspector general would be appointed to expose and fix mismanagement.

You see, Mr. Chairman, reform is possible at the U.N., but only if the United States is willing to lead. And for us to be able to lead, we must be fully aware of just how big a stick we carry; that is, how much we are funding. We must be fully aware of how much U.S. tax dollars goes from this House to the U.N.

So on behalf of the citizens that we represent at home who demand that we call for accountability in the U.S. Government, we should be doing the same from the U.N. We must have an accounting for those dollars spent.

I reserve the balance of my time.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill and therefore violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law. The amendment imposes additional duties.

I ask for a ruling of the Chair.

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

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman's citing the point of order; and I am in agreement that the point of order appropriately falls within this amendment that I bring before the House tonight.

It is, of course, a frustration for us when we are dealing with spending of dollars that we do not know exactly how much of the total dollars we are spending for a particular purpose, especially when that purpose is the U.N. and especially with their dismal record of the past.

With that said, Mr. Chairman, at this point I seek unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NADLER:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to issue a national security letter to a health insurance company under any of the provisions of law

amended by section 505 of the Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism (USA PATRIOT ACT) Act of 2001.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment prohibits any funds from being used to issue National Security Letters to health insurance companies to obtain people's private and personal medical records.

Currently, under section 505, any FBI field office director can demand your personal medical records without a warrant or any judicial approval and the insurance company is legally required to give it to them and is legally prohibited or gagged from telling you or anyone else about the order.

Last year, almost 10,000 unreviewed National Security Letters were issued by the FBI without showing any connection between the records sought and any suspected foreign terrorist. Post PATRIOT Act reauthorization, I remain very concerned, because National Security Letters are still issued without court approval simply on the letter's assertion that the request is relevant to a national security investigation, without any showing of a connection to a suspected terrorist.

The right to challenge the gag order is not real, since the government's mere assertion that lifting the gag order would pose a threat to national security must be treated by the court as conclusive, with no evidence necessary as to the truth of that assertion.

Government officials already have access to so much of our personal information, such as credit reports, library user, and telephone communications. Do we want the government to have such unchecked access to personal and private information as revealed by our medical history: psychiatric profiles, lab studies, and diagnostic tests like CAT scans and MRIs?

If somehow your medical records are necessary in fact to a terrorist investigation, the government should be required to explain to a judge why they are needed, as is provided in section 215 of the PATRIOT Act, rather than simply allowing an FBI field agent to demand those records in secret.

The FBI already has far-reaching compulsory powers to obtain documents when it is investigating terrorism under both its criminal and intelligence authority. The FBI can obtain a search warrant if there is judicial finding of probable cause that a crime has or will be committed. The FBI can use Grand Jury subpoenas; and, in terrorism cases, the FBI has sweeping authority to obtain all the records, including medical records, under section 215 of the PATRIOT Act. But it has to go to a judge.

Given these existing search powers, there is no reason to authorize the FBI to issue unchecked National Security Letters demanding medical records without any showing of anything to a judge.

Mr. Chairman, if you have visited a doctor's office or a hospital in the last few months, you may have seen a notice telling you that your medical records may be turned over to the government for law enforcement or intelligence purposes. We can all agree that giving the FBI access to our most intimate private information is too great an intrusion on our privacy to leave unlimited and unsupervised.

There may very well be reasonable legitimate reasons for the FBI to need this information in terrorist investigations. Section 215 of the PATRIOT Act provides for them to get that information if they simply go to a judge and tell them why they need it. The NSLs, which this amendment would stop, or would say you can't spend money on, skips the necessity of even going to a judge in private, in secret, and saying why they need that.

Let them use section 215. We had almost a majority on this floor to eliminate section 215, but at least that requires a showing to a judge. The National Security Letters allows any FBI field office director to get these most private records without any showing to a judge. That is wrong, and I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

We are talking about terrorism. Every time the gentleman gets up, he paints something that really is inaccurate; and I think the gentleman from California will explain what you said. There have been changes in the PATRIOT Act.

The threat of terrorism and espionage is real. Thirty people from my district died in the attack on the World Trade Center. Two of my children live up in your congressional district. And if you read the article the other day about gas in the subways, you sort of make these statements, and you act like the Justice Department and the FBI is going to go after somebody's medical records. They are trying to stop terrorism. They are trying to stop what took place on 9/11 from taking place again.

We have a letter from the Justice Department. ''National Security Letters are extremely valuable to investigations of international terrorism.'' Not your MRIs, but international terrorism and espionage, al Qaeda.

This Congress stood by and did nothing while Osama bin Laden lived in Sudan from 1991 to 1996. I was the author of the National Commission on Terrorism, which came out in the year 2000. In 2000, NANCY PELOSI supported me in the committee when we got the funding for it. On the cover of the Bremer Commission report that came out in the year 2000, there is a picture of the World Trade Center on fire, and this body did nothing. It stood by and it watched, and the previous administration did nothing. And now there are people that have died because they have done nothing.

This is a bad amendment. The PATRIOT Act has been authorized by the Judiciary Committee. Mr. LUNGREN will tell you the changes that have been made. There have been protections put in it.

My goodness, do we want to tie the FBI's hands when they are trying to catch bin Laden and people like that? This is a bad amendment. We went through it on the authorizing act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear what Mr. LUNGREN has to say before I use the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York reserves his time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, do I have the right to close?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia has the right to close.

Mr. WOLF. How much time do I have?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let us be clear what this would do. The Nadler amendment would prohibit the FBI from using these NSLs to obtain any financial records or health records from health insurance companies even if those records are indisputably relevant to an international terrorism or espionage investigation.

Indeed, the FBI would be prohibited from using the NSL to obtain financial records of a known terrorist from a health insurance company, no matter how much evidence the FBI possessed of the target's involvement with terrorism. It would not just prevent the FBI from obtaining medical records.

Currently, the FBI can obtain health insurance records through the use of administrative subpoenas without the approval of a judge to investigate not terrorism but health care fraud offenses. So if the FBI is allowed to use administrative subpoenas to obtain these records to investigate health care fraud by dirty doctors, then it should be allowed to use these NSLs, which are similar to administrative subpoenas, to obtain these same records in international terrorism investigations which may involve dirty bombs.

This is basically the same amendment Mr. NADLER offered to last year's appropriation bill that was defeated on

this floor. The only thing that has changed since that time is not the language of his amendment but in fact the enactment of the reauthorization of the USA PATRIOT Act which contains several new protections to prevent abuse of this authority.

However, even without the new protections, there is no evidence of the abuse of these letters. Nonetheless, in March of this year, the President signed the bill; and it adds these protections which were not present last year when we debated this same amendment:

Clarification that recipients may disclose that they have received an NSL to an attorney or others necessary to comply with the NSL.

Secondly, explicit language that a recipient may challenge an NSL in court.

Third, explicit language that a recipient of an NSL may challenge the prohibition on publicly disclosing that he or she has received an NSL.

Next, for the first time, language requiring public reporting on the use of NSL authorities.

Next, requirement for additional classified reporting to Congress on the use of NSL authorities so we can exercise oversight in a more effective way.

And, finally, requirement that the Inspector General conduct two audits of the Justice Department's use of NSLs.

Last year, we debated this same amendment, same issue, similar appropriation bill. The only difference is we have added protections since that time by the reenactment of the PATRIOT Act and the signature of the President.

So if you voted against it last year, if you thought we should defeat it last year, you have more than sufficient reason to defeat it this year.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NADLER. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. I thank the gentleman.

Right now, everybody has access to your medical records. Obviously, I would like to support more privacy. But, frankly, your insurance company has a right to your medical records, all the data processing companies have a right to your medical records, and all the financial institutions that are collocated with the insurance companies have your financial records.

The Health Care Information and Privacy Act in this country has no teeth. Some nurse or doctor can sell your medical records and not be liable civilly or criminally. Someone can sell your records to a tabloid, and you have no right to sue the tabloid. They can obtain it under illegal and false pretenses. No recourse whatsoever.

This notion of privacy is really bunk. We have no privacy in terms of medical records. And I would ask the American people, please call your representative and demand medical privacy from our HIPAA laws.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would remind Members to address their remarks to the Chair and not to a viewing audience.

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

Mr. Chairman, I respect everything that the gentleman from Virginia said. 9/11 happened in my district. Terrorism is terrible. We are waging a war against it, and we have to wage that war against it, and we have to protect ourselves. The question is intelligent protection.

The FBI should not have the right to get our medical records without going to a court. That is what this question is about. Should they have the right to get these records simply on an assertion or a letter that nobody even has to look at, that it is simply relevant to an investigation, without going to court?

Yes, certain protections were put into the bill. Those protections are insubstantial. For example, you can challenge the gag order. Yeah, but if the government says that lifting the gag order would harm national security, that assertion must be taken as dispositive. The court can't say, really? The court can't say, what evidence?

□ 2100

For all practical purposes, they have an absolute right to these records without showing them to a court. I am not saying they should not get the records. My amendment doesn't say they shouldn't get the records. What it says is a general principle, one that we should always adhere to, if they think they need the records for a terrorist investigation, go to a court, go to a FISA court, go to a secret court. Use section 215 of the PATRIOT Act.

But we shouldn't allow the FBI to have access to private records without some showing in court of necessity of probable cause or something. That is why this amendment should pass.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, just one last point. We have no medical privacy in this country now. The health care and privacy act is nonexistent. It has no teeth in it. Your medical records can be found out from anybody anywhere.

They pass through a million different institutions as they get processed through transaction companies, insurance companies, financial companies. It is absolutely bogus.

We haven't even passed the genetic nondiscrimination act here in this place, which means, if you have genetic disposition to a particular illness, you are not protected. There is no privacy in our medical records. Let us just understand that from the get-go.

The American people are outraged by not having privacy, they have to get to their Members of Congress and request that we do more to strengthen the HIPAA law, the healthcare information and privacy act.

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

I agree with the gentleman from Rhode Island on the medical records' safety and privacy. I think the gentleman makes a valid point, but that is really not what we are talking about tonight. We are dealing with the FBI dealing with terrorism.

As I mentioned, a newly released book by a Pulitzer Prize winning author states that al Qaeda came within 45 days of attacking the New York subway system with lethal gas. We never completely know why they didn't move ahead, but within 45 days. If a National Security Letter would stop something like this, and they are still out there. Al Qaeda is still out there. They are still committed.

There is a book by Mary Habeck, Knowing the Enemy. They are still out there and committed to coming. So if a National Security Letter could stop what took place on 9/11 at the World Trade Center or at the Pentagon over in that area or in the bombing of the Khobar Towers, the USS *Cole* or the Marine barracks or places like that, we certainly would want to stop that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding. Let us be clear what we are talking about here. We are not talking about, generally speaking, about the question of the privacy of medical records. We are asking whether NSLs are an appropriate means with which to obtain information from health insurance companies as they are utilized or a similar process, that is administrative subpoenas that are not obtained by a court, are utilized to look at health care fraud.

One of the things that we got out of the 9/11 Commission was the fact that we had failed to not only connect dots but failed to adapt our criminal justice investigative procedures in the face of this new threat, which is terrorism. Some people would say, well, why would health records be relevant to such a case?

Well, in the instance of anthrax, for instance, it would be relevant if someone had sought medical attention that would, in fact, basically inoculate them if they came into contact with anthrax. It would be of some assistance if a group of people involved, that we had suspicion were involved with a terrorist group, were inoculated for smallpox. I mean, these are those sorts of things that help us connect the dots.

Mr. WOLF. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Yes.

Mr. WOLF. I appreciate what the gentleman said. Members should know in our bill our committee established

in the Justice Department an Office of Privacy and Civil Liberty for the very reason that Mr. SERRANO used to raise, and rightly, to protect to make sure something did not happen.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. If the gentleman will recall, the Judiciary Committee has been very aggressive in oversight of Justice Department actions with respect to the PATRIOT Act. Several of the changes made in the law that I referred to before give us a greater handle on that because it requires more reporting to the Congress on what has been done with respect to NSLs in this regard.

So as I said, the biggest difference between our consideration of the gentleman's amendment last year and this year is there are more protections built in to the use of NSLs by the Justice Department than there were before. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I submit the letter that I referenced earlier.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, June 28, 2006.

Hon. FRANK R. WOLF,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce and Related Agencies, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We have been advised that Congressman Nadler may offer an amendment to the pending Justice Appropriations bill that would restrict the use of National Security Letters (''NSLs'') relating to medical records. Congressman Nadler offered a very similar amendment last year. That amendment was defeated. We remain opposed to any such amendment.

NSLs are similar to subpoenas and may be used by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) to obtain from specified companies information relevant to authorized investigations of international terrorism and espionage. It is unwise to create carveouts from the scope of these important investigative tools, particularly since there has been no allegation of abuse regarding medical information, the subject of the proposed carveout. NSLs are generally used to obtain: (1) billing and transactional records maintained by telephone companies and Internet service providers; (2) credit reports and other consumer information maintained by consumer reporting agencies; and (3) financial information maintained by financial institutions. It would be an exceedingly rare circumstance in which an NSL issued to one of these institutions would capture medical records.

Moreover, the Congress addressed in a full and considered manner the concerns of critics of the use of NSLs when it passed the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act earlier this year. That bill included numerous changes to all the NSL statutes to clarify and improve the laws' privacy protections. Congress also mandated a comprehensive audit by the Department's Inspector General on the use and effectiveness of NSLs. The findings of that review are expected to be available early next year.

It is also interesting to note that Congress has already provided the FBI the authority to obtain health insurance records through the use of administrative subpoenas (without the approval of a judge) when investigating criminal health care fraud. NSLs and administrative subpoenas are very similar except for some of the additional civil liberty protections added to the NSL statutes during the debate to reauthorize the USA PATRIOT Act. It would be odd if the Congress were to make a different policy determination when, rather than a health care fraud matter, the investigation involved international terrorism.

NSLs are extremely valuable to investigations of international terrorism and espionage. Information obtained through NSLs has significantly advanced numerous sensitive terrorism and espionage investigations and has assisted the FBI in discovering links to previously unknown terrorist operatives. We see no justification for artificially restricting the reach of those investigative tools.

Thank you for this opportunity to express our concerns. The Office of Management and Budget has advised us that from the perspective of the Administration's program, there is no objection to this letter.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. MOSCHELLA,
Assistant Attorney General.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. MICA

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 13 offered by Mr. MICA:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a et seq.).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

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

This is a Buy America amendment. I usually don't offer these. I believe in free and open competition. But I am pleased that the committee is going to entertain this amendment. Just for the record, I want to enter into the record why I am here and why I think this is necessary.

For the record, the Department of Commerce has awarded for nearly two decades a contract which promotes United States products and goods overseas in European trade fairs to a Dutch firm. Now, this has gone on for some two decades.

Several years ago, I was contacted by a U.S. firm that was interested in competing back in 2004. They contacted me and said they wanted to compete, and there were problems in entering.

NOAA handles the contracting and solicitation for, again, for this civilian business and awards the contract. They issued a solicitation.

When I was contacted, this firm said, all we want to do is compete. This Dutch firm has had this for two decades. They made some moves toward considering others, but then they gave the contract to the European Dutch firm and excluded the U.S. They just continued the contract.

I told the American firm, well, maybe next year, we will try it again, a little late, see if you can't get fair competition. Then they opened it again this past year, and in fact, they put out a request for proposal. The American firm was allowed to compete, and then once this process and submissions had started, they ended the competition; they changed the rules. They changed the rules to favor the European firm, the Dutch firm, which has had the contract for 20 years.

Now, I think all that should be fair is that an American firm also gets the opportunity, and this is to put on an exposition of United States goods sponsored by the Department of Commerce and the U.S. taxpayers. All I want is a fair shot for Americans to compete in putting on exhibitions and compete in a fair and open manner. That is the purpose of this, and I want that as part of the record.

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

Mr. WOLF. We accept the amendment.

Mr. MICA. Thank you. Again, I am pleased, I appreciate the cooperation and want to make certain that hopefully this amendment corrects an unfair situation, unfair competition.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to strike the last word.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio for a colloquy with the chairman.

Mr. KUCINICH. I want to thank the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the chairman, Mr. WOLF, for his leadership in helping to keep our NASA centers healthy in the long term, a concern that I share and that requires extremely difficult decisions under tight funding caps.

At the same time, I am concerned with the bedrock of NASA's success, its world class workforce. The 2005 NASA Authorization Bill enacted a moratorium on involuntary reductions in force until March of 2007.

In addition, the act required 11.5 months between the submission of a complete workforce plan and the end of a ban on RIFs. However, NASA has thus far been unable to determine their existing skills mix and future skills mix demand. Any hasty action would cause NASA to lose irreplaceable intellectual capacity and institutional

memory and would harm its recruiting capabilities.

Any workforce reshaping should therefore only be implemented after clearly establishing the agency's current and future workforce needs and after exhausting all cost-effective voluntary means to maintain critical skills and to fill any gaps. This is especially true given that so much Constellation work on the horizon relies heavily on Apollo era and shuttle era design elements.

Mr. WOLF. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. I share the gentleman's concerns about NASA's high quality workforce, and I expect NASA to develop and move forward with a long-term strategy to replenish the skills of its aging workforce while also maintaining key institutional memory. I urge NASA to address and correct any imbalances through an aggressive campaign of retraining, work transfer across centers, judicious buyouts and carefully managed recruitment, all with a minimum of disruption to the workforce. The people really have to be treated fairly, fair in the sense that everyone will say it is fair.

I expect that NASA will respect the moratorium on reductions in force in the 2005 NASA Reauthorization Act and will not engage in any reduction in force until they have met the workforce planning requirements in that act and provide it sufficient time for congressional oversight. So I would be happy to continue to work with the gentlemen on these issues as the gentleman moves forward in conference.

Mr. KUCINICH. I want to thank the gentleman for his commitment and thank him for the outstanding work that he has done in the past in helping us on these matters.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and, thank you Mr. MOLLOHAN.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to support programs that target segments of the Muslim and Arab communities for national security investigations.

Mr. WOLF. I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia reserves a point of order.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I intend to ultimately withdraw this amendment, but I thank the chairman for allowing me to rise to discuss, I think, a very important element of our foreign policy.

First of all, I will like to acknowledge the U.S. Global Leadership Campaign that brought to my attention, after meeting with former Secretary Powell and former Secretary Albright, the very poor state of foreign aid in terms of dollars. Previously, we had some $35.1 billion, and now $32.28 billion.

Obviously, working under the constraints of the budget amendment passed by this administration and this Congress certainly misdirected or at least caused confusion among the population because they believe we spend too much on foreign aid; whereas it really shows it is only about 1.2 percent.

I say that because my amendment specifically talks about eliminating funds for supporting programs that target segments of the Muslim and Arab American communities for national security investigations.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as a Member of the Homeland Security Committee, I am not standing here in complete ignorance of the war on terror and of the importance of securing the homeland and ensuring that all of our law enforcement agencies are able to conduct the investigations necessary to secure the homeland.

□ 2115

In fact, I am a strong proponent, as a member of the Subcommittee on Intelligence of that Homeland Security Committee, of increasing intelligence, if you will, backed up by civil liberties and other necessary protections.

But it is well known that after 9/11 the Muslim community and the Arab community in America have been racially profiled. In fact, recently, at an Arab American Economic Summit just held in Houston this week, some of the diplomats, dignitaries, individuals with the appropriate paper, if you will, ambassadors that were traveling from the District of Columbia to Houston were, in fact, detained by our local airports and other authorities. And one would say that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure, if you will, and I have probably made that particular phrase up, but I do understand the cautiousness.

But what we are doing is we are discouraging the legitimate travel for business, cultural exchange, diplomacy and education. We are distracting focus and attention from the guilty to the innocent, and we are diverting scarce Federal law enforcement resources by utilizing them in a targeting fashion.

I hope that we will have an opportunity in this Congress to focus on the issues of intelligence so that we can target individuals who are truly here to harm us.

But I also hope that we can establish the fact that racial profiling for your last name, for your religious faith, is clearly un-American and that what we should be doing is encouraging travel from the Mideast of those who are here for cultural reasons, those who come for business and, yes, the many, many students who have been discouraged from coming to the United States because of the tough requirements on visas directing and their family sending them to European countries, as much for not being able to get visas as being fearful for their young people to be here, that they might be racially profiled.

This is a concern that I believe is necessary to express to this body, and I hope as the various initiatives of this particular appropriations through Justice, through the State Department, really become concerned with the unfair targeting of the Muslim American and Arab American community.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve my time.

Mr. WOLF, I intend to withdraw this amendment.

Mr. WOLF. That is what I was led to believe. I still reserve the point of order.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I accept the unfortunate aspect of legislating on an appropriations bill. But I do believe it is an important enough issue that I hope, as it is placed in the RECORD, we will know that it is important as we proceed with the appropriation.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SODREL

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SODREL:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the purpose of enforcing the final judgement of the Federal District Court for the Southern District of Indiana issued in Hinrichs v. Bosma.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SODREL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

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

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment today as a means to protect the rights of State legislatures and the speech, conscience and independence of State legislators from unelected and unaccountable judges serving for life. While my amendment is only half the solution, it is a step in the right direction which I hope this body will adopt until a broader solution can be enacted.

A Federal court in Indiana has imposed itself on the independence of State legislators. A Federal district court judge, David Hamilton, in the case of Hinrichs v. Bosma, has made a ruling to limit religious speech within the Indiana State Legislature and to impose this restriction on the legislators themselves. This decision threatens freedom of speech and imperils the separation of powers in the U.S. Constitution. If Federal courts can regulate any speech of the members of a legislative body, it follows that those courts can regulate all speech.

Our neighboring State, Kentucky, adopted what is known as the Kentucky Resolutions on November 10, 1798, when our republic was in its infancy. These resolutions were adopted as a protest against the Alien and Sedition Acts passed by Congress. This historic document protesting violations of the first amendment states in part, and I quote, ''Another and more special provision has been made by one of the amendments to the Constitution, which expressly declares that Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press: Thereby guarding in the same sentence, and under the same words, the freedom of religion or speech and of the press; insomuch, that whatever violated either, throws down the sanctuary which covers the others.'' End quote.

These words are not my own. They come from the pen of Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence and our third president, who wrote the Kentucky Resolution. They were adopted by the Kentucky Legislature and are a matter of historical record. Jefferson understood these rights were, and are, inseparable. A Federal judge is not above the law. A judge cannot amend the Constitution, nor should a judge be permitted to ignore the context of a constitutional right.

Mr. Chairman, the Indiana Legislature did not make any law. They didn't enact any statute. They didn't even pass a resolution. The legislature was only carrying out a 188-year tradition by beginning each session with a prayer just like the U.S. House of Representatives. Many other legislative bodies throughout the Nation practice this same tradition. But Judge Hamilton ruled the Indiana Legislature must not make any reference to Jesus Christ or to the Christian religion. In addition, the judge specified he would review the speech of the legislators to ensure that they also did not make reference to Christianity or Jesus Christ as Lord. The judge did not make any reference to other religions for any similar restrictions.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit the use of funds in this bill from being used to enforce Judge Hamilton's erroneous decision and send a message that Congress is serious about judges legislating from the bench. The Indiana State Legislature is appealing the Judge's decision in this case, but I believe Congress must exercise its right to protect the independence of State legislatures from overzealous judges.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this year, I introduced H.R. 4776 to limit the review of Federal courts over the content of speech in State legislatures. My amendment does not encompass all of H.R. 4776, but it does enough to send a signal to the judiciary that Congress will not tolerate legislating from the bench. Congress cannot permit the court system to rewrite our Constitution.

I have heard the argument that some were offended at hearing a Christian prayer, and that was the reason for the lawsuit. Mr. Chairman, I have searched the U.S. Constitution, and I have found no mention of the right that protects any citizen from being offended. Members of this body, in this Chamber, say things that offend me. But as the patriot Patrick Henry once said, ''I do not agree with what you say but I will defend to the death your right to say it.''

Mr. Chairman, some may question why this amendment is necessary. I would counter by saying what can be more necessary than upholding the U.S. Constitution? We all took an oath to do so. If Congress cannot correct the court when it has strayed from the letter and the intent of the U.S. Constitution, who can? If we don't, who will?

Right now, Indiana legislators must huddle in the back of the chamber, hidden from public view, to pray.

The courts are now going beyond interpreting laws and have begun inserting themselves in the legislative process. The U.S. Constitution prohibits the legislative branch from restricting the free exercise of religion. Why should the judicial branch be an exception?

Judge Hamilton's court is presuming to dictate what State legislators may or may not say and decide how they should represent their constituents. It violates the principles of separation of legislative and judicial powers and separate sovereignty between State and Federal power.

As Jefferson wrote 208 years ago, they are guarded in the same sentence and under the same words, the freedom of religion or speech and of the press. To fail to uphold any of these puts them all at risk.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to stand up for freedom of speech and the autonomy of the State legislators.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment can be very simply summed up simply by reading the one sentence of it. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the purpose of enforcing the final judgment of the Federal District Court for the Southern District of Indiana issued in Hinrichs v. Bosma.

I listened to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana as he told us why he disagrees with this, the judgment of the court, of the Federal court of Indiana and why he thinks the court is wrong. He is entitled to his opinion. But let the litigant appeal the decision. That is why we have courts.

The Soviet Union under Stalin in 1936 adopted a constitution. That constitution had a bill of rights, freedom of speech, freedom of association, freedom of the press, freedom of religious and anti-religious propaganda, as they quaintly put it. The problem, of course, was that if you tried to assert the rights they shot you instead of letting you go to court.

No rights are worth anything. There is a maxim in the law, there is no right without a remedy. No right is worth anything if you can't enforce that right. The way we enforce rights in this country is in courts. We tried it a different way once. We had a civil war.

Either Mao is right, that power comes out of the barrel of a gun, or we do it the way we do in this country. We obey court orders.

When a court says something unpopular, you shall not have Jim Crow segregated schools in the South, we obey the law. The President sends in the National Guard in Little Rock in 1957 if he has to. No matter how unpopular the court's decision is.

And here we have an amendment that says, because we disagree with a given decision of a local court, a Federal court in Indiana, no funds will be expended to enforce that decision. That way lies tyranny, Mr. Chairman.

If the gentleman from Indiana doesn't like the opinion, it should be appealed. And if he still doesn't like it, if he doesn't like the final judgments, let him bring an amendment to the Federal Constitution to this body. We can amend the Constitution.

But to say that when a court has decided on a matter of rights, the court has decided that something or other, I am not sure what this case was about, but something or other, some action that someone was taking violated some plaintiff's civil rights, that we should say that no funds will be expended to obey the court order to protect the civil rights of whoever the plaintiff was that the court found that somebody was violating; that some agency of government was violating someone's rights. The Court said that that is the case and, therefore, they should stop it; and we should say, no, no, no? No funds should be used to enforce the order of the court because the victim of the discrimination or the violation of civil rights is unpopular, unpopular with our constituents or unpopular on this floor?

The whole point of religious liberty is that it is not subject to a popularity contest. Minority religions have the right to be protected. Your liberty is protected because you are an American, because we value liberty, not because you can win a vote on the floor of the House or the Virginia Legislature or the Indiana Legislature.

It is absolutely destructive of the structure of our society, the structure of our government and of our guarantees of liberty to say, with regard to any court order, I am not going to defend this court order because I don't know much about it. But to say we will not allow the expenditure of the funds to enforce a court order, that is not our judgment.

If you want to destroy the Constitution, destroy the Constitution, destroy the Bill of Rights, vote for this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana's time has expired.

Mr. NADLER. I will take the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I will simply say again, it is extremely subversive of liberty, of civil rights, of civil liberties to vote for this bill. I cannot recall a worse bill. To say that we won't enforce a court order because we don't agree with the court, change the judges. You have got the President. Amend the Constitution if you think it is that bad. But don't say that we are going to usurp the function of the courts and let somebody who went to court, exercised his American right to go to court, won in court, and we are going to shaft him and say your rights are violated. The court found your rights are violated, but we, because you are unpopular, we won't let the court enforce your rights. We will take the money away. For shame.

Vote against this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SODREL).

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

Mr. SODREL. 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 Indiana will be postponed.

□ 2130

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BAIRD

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAIRD:

Page 110, after line 8, insert the following:

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to file a motion under section 3730(b)(3) of title 31, United States Code, for an extension of time of more than 6 months, or to file more than one motion under such section in any one case.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

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

My amendment is about something that we talk about a lot in this body, and that is reducing waste, fraud and abuse and the waste of U.S. taxpayer dollars. People are concerned about this in the Katrina area. They are concerned about it quite a bit in Iraq as well.

What this amendment would do is ensure that contractors are held accountable for any fraudulent claims they may make against the U.S. Government and the American taxpayers. The most pressing need for the amendment is in Iraq, where the Department of Defense reports spending $6 billion a month, a substantial portion of which currently goes to contractors.

Under present law, whistle blowers may sue contractors suspected of defrauding the government. The administration is then granted 60 days to decide if they will join the case or not. However, the administration can also continually request extensions and thereby delay making a decision, which keeps the cases sealed and unable to proceed through the courts, thereby effectively allowing any fraudulent practices to go uninterrupted and unpunished.

Since the cases are sealed, we can only estimate how many are actually pending in the value of the contracts. But one estimate that is well informed suggests that at least 50 cases are currently awaiting action.

The American taxpayers deserve their day in court. If contractors are being paid for services which they did not perform or when they did not fulfill contracted objectives, those dollars must be recovered on behalf of the American taxpayers.

My amendment would limit the Justice Department to one extension of 6 months. This mirrors a provision of the Stop Fraud in Iraq Act, H.R. 5290, which I introduced along with my colleague, Congresswoman LOFGREN of California. Once the 6-month period lapses, the administration would have to decide to either join the case or to let it proceed without administration participation. One way or another, the cases must be brought before a court and resolved.

Again, this is about ensuring the taxpayer dollars are managed better, and for too long we have seen these cases delayed.

I would urge a ''yes'' vote on the Baird-Lofgren amendment.

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

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

I am inclined to accept the amendment, but before doing so, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to address this issue. As a member of the Judiciary Committee, we do have concerns about our jurisdiction over this particular subject matter. But it is certainly true that there are whistle blower cases where multiple requests for extensions by the Department of Justice unnecessarily delay a final resolution of the case in the courts. But this amendment in its rigidity is not an appropriate solution, and I am concerned about this.

The courts currently make the decision as to whether an extension should be provided to the government in these cases. The government cannot singularly decide to stall the case, and the use of the False Claims Act has proven to be one of the most effective tools we have to go after fraud against the government, especially large-scale fraud.

But in those cases where a whistle blower has brought large acts of fraud to the attention of the government, the fraud is spread throughout a large enterprise. And in those cases, there may be a very real need to request multiple extensions in order to establish a viable prosecution on behalf of the government and therefore maximize the chances of recovery. In those cases, multiple extensions are to the benefit of both the government and the whistle blower.

I point out some issues that have to be dealt with by the Department of Justice in these cases, and that would be, first of all, that if the government has a tip, they will have a 5-year statute of limitations to bring a criminal charge, a 6-year statute of limitations to bring a civil charge. And when you look at all the things that a case has to do, first we should keep in mind, each case is different, and they cannot all fit in necessarily to a 6-month extension clause, but they might be stretched out across that. They might be less time than that. The whistle blower often agrees to those extensions, but it is the judge that has to decide.

And then, think in terms of the work that must be done by the Department of Justice. First of all, they have got to interview the whistle blower and document evidence and establish an investigative team and then to consider whether to conduct a criminal investigation and coordinate that with the agency. They may need also to issue subpoenas for documents, interview relevant witnesses and even perhaps defer a decision in case to case and also perhaps also include a grand jury. All of these things are things that have to be considered into this amendment that is offered by Mr. BAIRD.

So I would suggest also that, of these kinds of whistle blower cases, a list of some of the very high dollar cases that took extensions beyond what the limitation of this amendment would be, for example, these are the things that would not have happened if we had been limited to a 6-month extension: HCA, $1.7 billion claim; Serono, $700

million claim; GlaxoSmithKline, $140 million claim; TAP Pharmaceuticals, $875 million; Astra Zeneca, $354 million; and I hesitate to say this, King Pharmaceuticals, $124 million; Advanced PCS, $137 million; Schering-Plough, $345 million.

You get the understanding. That is about half of my list that I present here. I know there is a lot more discussion to take up. But all extensions must be approved by the judge, and I think it is worthy of deliberation.

I appreciate the gentleman for bringing the amendment, and I am hopeful that we can find a resolution that is constructive to the justice we all seek and the efficiency that we seek within the judicial branch of government and the Department of Justice.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RENZI

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RENZI:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by increasing the amount made available under title I for ''COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES'' and reducing the amount made available under title IV for ''INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS—CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS'', by $5,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

I thank the chairman for working with me on this amendment. My amendment increases the funding for tribal law enforcement through the COPS program by $5 million, while decreasing the funding for the United Nations.

I appreciate your help on this.

I represent the largest land mass of poverty in America. And many of my colleagues also represent areas in America as shown on the 2000 census that are poverty ridden. Some of you represent areas that have more concentrations of poverty than I do, but I represent an area the size of West Virginia that is the largest land mass of poverty in America.

You want to see children malnutritioned with extended bellies? You do not need to go to Africa. You can go to Kaibito in the Navajo Nation. You want to see children who have not seen a doctor in 30 days, whose jaws are so swollen shut, so infected with pus because they haven't seen an oral surgeon in 30 days, you can go to San Carlos Reservation. The map proves it and shows it.

And you lay on top of this poverty the fact that there is a lawlessness that has come back. The days of the Wild West are back, and they exist on tribal lands. They have no police officers, no equipment. They do not have the tools to bring back the rule of law. On the Navajo Nation, the size of West Virginia, there is one police officer per 4,000 residents. Do you know what the rest of us have in America? We get one police officer for every 800 residents in America.

I am really sorry to interrupt your conversation and bother you all back there. Not real funny.

The people of the San Carlos Reservation, 1.8 million acres, they have five police officers at any time patrolling the San Carlos, 13,000 residents, 20,000 offenses reported last year. Do you know that 25 percent of their babies are born testing positive to meth? Fifty percent of the babies born in the San Carlos test positive to drugs or alcohol. The gangs have taken over. It is a lawlessness.

If you are a felon in Los Angeles, do you know where you run to hide? Do you know a safe haven in America? The Navajo Nation. Safe haven. Do not tell me about terrorist safe havens. I got you a safe haven in America right here in our backyard. All of us share this responsibility.

Now, I realize this bill and the parameters of the bill and the fact that we needed to cut and eliminate pork and earmarks and Members' spending, and this bill is reduced $3 million from last year for tribal law enforcement. My amendment simply says, give back a little bit, one first step towards helping tribal law enforcement, those police agents out there in tough areas in the Wild West trying to pull back a whole generation of Native American youth who are losing their heritage, who are losing their culture, who have become so addicted that no one can even help pull them back. This is a first step.

I ask my colleagues, please, to help me and join with me. I beg on behalf of the Native Americans for $5 million from the U.N. Before you spend it overseas, let us spend it at home. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

I will certainly accept it, and I think the gentleman makes a very powerful case. I had an amendment several years ago which was defeated on this floor which would have set up a national commission to really go in and look at the conditions on the reservations. I used to work for former Congressman Jon Kyl, the father of now Senator JON KYL, who had really a great burden for many of the Indians, particularly in that area in Arizona. And it is a disgrace. And I really believe, not to make this too controversial, but I think this whole issue of gambling on reservations has almost made people say, well, now, they can have a gambling casino, so we are not going to put any money in.

Many of these reservations are in areas that are very difficult to access, very difficult to get there. Some are in very barren areas, and others are in very cold areas, so people aren't going to go there. So listening to the gentleman, at an appropriate time, I think maybe next year, I am going to offer this thing again. I think it got tied up in the whole gambling issue, which I think is corrupting this Nation, and unfortunately, this Congress and this administration have been too silent on the issue.

But the gentleman makes a very powerful case. So what I think I may do when we come up next year at the appropriate time is offer an amendment to set up a commission that doesn't get involved with the gambling issues but looks at crime. I read the New York Times series about 2 or 3 months ago, back in February, about some of the reservations where organized crime was coming in and the meth problem. And I want to see if we can put together some bold new way to really help the first Americans, the Native Americans.

So I accept the amendment. We will work hard to keep it in conference, too, not just to kind of get out of your hair, to accept it, but to really kind of keep it. And I think listening to you sensitizes me to next year offer this amendment to create this Blue Ribbon Panel of people who really care about the conditions on reservations and see what we can do to really make it concrete.

But I do accept the amendment.

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

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

Just to compliment the gentleman on his argument, I am very supportive of his amendment. I support the chairman's comments. And I invite the gentleman to testify before our subcommittee next year. He is obviously well versed on the issue, and the committee and the Congress need to be more sensitive to the concerns that the gentleman raises.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman for his passion in advocating on behalf of Native Americans. I salute him entirely in his efforts to represent his district but also all of Native American country.

Growing up, I had a picture in my house of my Uncle Robert Kennedy out in Pine Ridge Reservation, and the pictures were of like a developing country

that we would never think was here in our own country. And your description today of the conditions are no different than the descriptions that occurred 40 years ago when people were thinking what a tragedy it is, the way we are treating our Native Americans. And what is even more of a tragedy is that, over all of these years, we have done nothing to improve the conditions of Native Americans in this country who have absolutely been decimated in so many ways because the United States has failed to fulfill its very basic trust responsibility to our first Americans.

I cannot thank the gentleman enough for his passion and his advocacy, and I think he has done an admirable job laying out the statistics for the American people. I think if the American people only knew how bad these situations were, their conscience would be raised and we would be about trying to solve the problems that the gentleman talked about in his speech.

□ 2145

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. RENZI. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank all of you for helping me on this. It is something that is so big, it is something that is so severe, it is going to need all of our help.

PATRICK, you have come out and you have seen San Carlos. Your family has visited there. There is a school named after your uncle there, and that schoolyard is filled with gang leaders right now. So I need your help, and I need the ranking member's help and all of those who weighed in on this issue, and I am grateful for it.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you also for your understanding on this. This money doesn't go to Arizona or for me. It is for all of us. It is for the gentlelady from South Dakota. It is for the gentlemen from New Mexico and Arizona, everyone who represents our first Americans, who are watching them become addicted. They are watching the gangs take over. They are watching their whole culture be destroyed, be wiped out. Much like in the 1800s when they were wiped out by alcohol and smallpox, the same thing is occurring with methamphetamines. They are more susceptible to it.

I also want to want to say I also appreciate the view on the gaming issue. The Hopis and the Navajo don't engage in gaming. It is against their spiritual foundations. So there are no extra revenues to pull in, and I recognize the social ills tied to that.

But these are safe havens for drug dealers and for felons. When you have five police officers on the San Carlos Reservation, 13,000 people, there is lawlessness, there is no rule of law, and the gangs are running the show and the rats have taken over the ship. And I need help on this issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RENZI).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HINCHEY

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be read.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HINCHEY:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used in contravention of section 3109 of title 18, United States Code.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) and a Member opposed will each control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am introducing this amendment today with my good friend and colleague, RON PAUL. It is a bipartisan amendment.

This amendment simply states that none of the funds in this Act can be used to obtain evidence in contravention of the United States Code pertaining to the knock and announce policy.

The history of the knock and announce requirement can be traced back to common law. The rule requires officers with a warrant to knock and announce their presence before entering a private residence.

Earlier this month the Supreme Court ruled in a 5–4 decision in Hudson v. Michigan that evidence can still be obtained even if the officer or officers violated the knock and announce policy.

In that case, Justice Breyer gave a passionate dissent. Among his dissenting objections were these. He said, ''As a result of this decision, the Court destroys the strongest legal incentive to comply with the Constitution's knock and announce requirement, and the Court does so without significant support in precedent. At least I can find no such support in the many fourth amendment cases the Court has decided in the near century since it first set forth the exclusionary principle in Weeks v. The United States back in 1914.''

This ruling goes against the precedents set by the Supreme Court most recently in Wilson v. Arkansas, 1995. The court held that the fourth amendment's reasonable search and seizure clause requires police officers to knock and announce their presence before entering a private residence.

Just a couple of years ago, in United States v. Banks, 2003, the court held that officers must wait at least 15 to 20 seconds before breaking a door down, again reaffirming the knock and announce rule. This ruling by this activist Supreme Court will create a slippery slope unless we stop it.

Justice Breyer also mentioned in his dissenting opinion the slippery slope and in mentioning it stated that if a warrant specifies that you can search the home on Monday, can police officers arrive on Tuesday?

We have a very serious issue before us, and that is a Supreme Court which has taken it upon itself to enact new law, in contrary not just to existing law, but in contrary to the Constitution of the United States, and this particular decision against the knock and announce policy goes markedly against the fourth amendment to the Constitution.

It is something against which this Congress must stand up. We cannot have a Supreme Court which continues to infringe upon the rights and privileges of American citizens, a Supreme Court which continues to insist on violating the privacy rights of American citizens which are protected in the fourth amendment to the Constitution. That is why I am offering this amendment this evening.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, you are hearing history tonight. A member of the House Appropriations Committee is offering an amendment to repeal, overturn, a Supreme Court decision. I think that is unbelievable. At first, when I asked what the Hinchey amendment was, then I said, the Hudson case, was that the case 2 weeks ago on June 15? And they said it is.

The gentleman's amendment would overrule a Supreme Court decision through a funding limitation on an appropriations bill. If this ever passed, I think it would be just horrible.

This is not an appropriate way. There is much more I can say. I will just end, the Justice Department sent a letter up here, and we will submit it for the record, that says, ''The department also believes that it is inappropriate to hamstring law enforcement efforts that are permissible under the Constitution. If the Constitution does not require the application of the exclusionary rule to knock and announce searches that are subsequently deemed by a judge to have been conducted in an unreasonable manner, then Congress ought not force Federal law enforcement agents to play by rules not constitutionally required, especially when there is no way procedurally to comply with the amendment.''

We ought not on the floor of the House at 10 minutes before 10 overrule Supreme Court decisions, no matter what you think of the decision. I don't think this is the way to go.

If the gentleman wants to offer a constitutional amendment, go through the Judiciary Committee. But with 5 minutes on this side, 5 minutes on that side, 10 minutes, to overrule the Supreme Court of the United States I think would be a mistake.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to debate the Hinchey amendment, but I do want to make one observation: We have just been told by my good friend from Virginia that we should not overturn a Supreme Court decision. I don't disagree with that. But just a few minutes ago this House considered an amendment overturning another court decision or insisting that no money be allowed to enforce that decision, and a few weeks ago you had this House vote to deny funds to enforce another court decision on eminent domain.

Now, I happen to disagree with that court decision on eminent domain. Demagogues, when they attack me on that, will forget that fact. But I would just say it is interesting to me to see the selectivity with which we produce sudden concern about vacating court decisions.

I don't think this institution has any business trying to, by law, deny funds for the enforcement of any court decision, even if I disagree with those court decisions, because I respect the processes of law defined by the Constitution.

But if we are going to attack this amendment, then I would suggest we go back and take a look at the other amendments that this House has whooped through without a modicum of thought about what it means if politicians start arbitrarily refusing to support funding for any court decision. That crosses the line.

I attended a meeting at the Supreme Court, a luncheon called by the Supreme Court, where the previous majority leader, Mr. DeLay, informed Justice Scalia and Justice O'Connor, roughly this: You need to understand we are coming after you, and we are going, we are coming after you with your jurisdiction, and you need to listen to us because we are the only ones connected with public opinion. That is what Mr. DeLay said to Justice Scalia and Justice O'Connor.

So although I greatly respect the gentleman from Virginia, I don't think we need to hear any lectures suddenly expressing concern for this Congress trying to withhold support for court decisions. It is a little late, given the track record of the majority on that score.

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

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I would simply like to point out that this amendment differs fundamentally from the Sodrel amendment that we heard a few minutes ago. The Sodrel amendment is subject to the disparaging comments that the gentleman from Virginia just made, because the Sodrel amendment does say no funds herein appropriated shall be used to enforce the court decision in a certain case and says we are not going to enforce a court decision.

The Hinchey amendment doesn't do that. Nor does the Hinchey amendment, contrary to what we heard from the distinguished chairman, overturn a Supreme Court decision. The Supreme Court decision in this case said you may do something. You may execute a search warrant without knocking. What this amendment says is, because we may doesn't mean we should.

So what the gentleman's amendment is saying is, despite the fact that the Supreme Court gave us permission to do this, we will deny funding to do this because we don't think it is right. So the gentleman's amendment is not overturning an Supreme Court decision. It is saying, thank you for the permission; we choose not to exercise the permission you gave us.

It is very different from the Sodrel amendment, which says do not enforce the court order. Do not spend any money enforcing the court order. That is subversive of the Constitution. That is subversive of a liberty.

Mr. HINCHEY's amendment, whether you agree with it or not, does not subvert the court order, does not subvert what the court said, and simply says, what you gave us permission to do, we choose not to do.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would point out that the Supreme Court said that the actions that were taken were wrong. That is what the Court said. They just suggested there were other remedies.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

□ 2200

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, let's be clear about what we are talking about here. This is a case where the police officers had a warrant, and it was a legitimate warrant, and that is not in question. And then, when they approached the location to serve the warrant, they knocked, and within about 3 seconds, and they admit this, then they entered to conduct the search, there was the subject of the warrant.

And the question is, did the police officers then wait a reasonable time? Did they meet that reasonableness standard? And they agreed that they did not. But the issue really is, the warrant was there. It was a legitimate warrant. It was a warrant that, had it been served exactly according to the letter of the intent of previous case law and the Constitution, then that evidence would have been admissible in court, not excluded.

So the court ruled that simply because the officers were abrupt in their entry was not a reason to exclude the evidence from the court. That is the case here with Hudson v. Michigan. That is the kind of thing that the Hinchey amendment would seek to preclude.

Now, I do not know what the motivation is for that. I do not know why one would want to, because we had some maybe abrupt or rude police officers exclude evidence from a court, especially criminal court. I would think we would want to have that evidence available to the court, and then we would want to take a look at the kind of activities on the part of those officers, because there are other remedies that can be found.

Those other remedies are in the civil courts, the remedies are in police officer enforcement, and there is also a particular Federal statute that allows for that relief. So I would submit then, Mr. Chairman, that there is plenty of relief here to resolve this, and the Hinchey amendment goes the wrong way.

Furthermore, by the time, it would be impossible for Justice to comply with this amendment, because by the time the court ruled that they had not complied with the Hinchey language, they would have already served the warrant, already taken action on this, and already the funds would have been expended. So it would be impossible to comply with this particular amendment.

The effect of it would be to tie the hands. If they did, they would have to be very, very cautious about how they take care of these activities, and that would mean that there will be times when these criminal cases that would not be investigated, warrants that would not be appropriately served for fear that they would be in violation of this amendment, even though there is a not a way to avoid it.

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman.

Let me simply say, without getting into the merits of the Hinchey amendment, I would simply suggest that if arguments are going to be made on that side of the aisle, that they not be based on the question of whether we should be vacating court decisions, and the majority has already tried to do that on two separate occasions

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I do not believe that was my argument, was the practicality of how we comply with the Hinchey amendment, and the fact that it is impossible to comply with the Hinchey amendment, however impractical it is.

So I would submit that this does tend to circumvent Hudson v. Michigan, and I would ask for opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make it clear what we are doing here. The knock and announce policy is enshrined in the Constitution, in the context of the fourth amendment. It goes back at least to the 13th century. It is enshrined in common law. It is held up by numerous Supreme Court decisions over the last 100 years, going back at least to 1914, and several of them in recent years, late 1990s, one again in 2003.

Now, all of a sudden, we have this more activist Supreme Court coming to the fore and intruding itself on the law, a Supreme Court which believes it can make the law, not just interpret it. One of the most brilliant aspects of our Constitution is the separation of powers provision. Every law in this country can be made only by this Congress.

Now I know some of my friends on the other side want the President to make the law. But if they do so, they are violating the Constitution again. Every law in this country, according to the Constitution, can only be made by this Congress. Not by the President, not by the Supreme Court. The Courts can only interpret the law.

What this court has done is attempt to make the law and to intrude itself upon previous Supreme Court decisions and, by doing so, violate the fourth amendment to the Constitution and the knock and announce provision which has been in effect for many centuries.

It is up to this Congress to stop that. That is why this amendment is being offered.

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

Mr. Chairman, it is not appropriate, no matter what the gentleman from New York thinks, for a House Appropriations Committee to take this action tonight. I think it is wrong and therefore urge a defeat of the Hinchey amendment.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WOLF

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLF:

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

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by increasing the amount made available for the item ''COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES'', and by reducing the aggregate amount made available for ''Department of Justice, General Administration, Salaries and Expenses'', by $2,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 27, 2006, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief.

I am offering this amendment to add $2 million for prisoner reentry programs. I think that reentry programs help offenders to move back into their communities and be productive citizens.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for bringing this to my attention. I think the more we can help people, and there is a record number of people that are being released from prisons at this time, the more that we can do and help them as they reenter and become good citizens is good.

Mr. Chairman, so I offer that amendment.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF.)

The amendment was agreed to.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 21 by Mr. STEARNS of Florida.

Amendment by Mr. WEINER of New York.

Amendment No. 20 by Mr. STEARNS of Florida.

Amendment No. 16 by Mrs. MUSGRAVE of Colorado.

Amendment by Mr. NADLER of New York.

Amendment by Mr. SODREL of Indiana.

Amendment by Mr. HINCHEY of New York.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS OF FLORIDA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 254, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 340]

AYES—167

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bonilla
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Carter
Chocola
Coble
Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
Everett
Feeney
Foley
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Latham
Leach
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Otter
Paul
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rehberg
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryun (KS)
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Shaw
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Young (FL)

NOES—254

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bono
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson

Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Forbes
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Petri
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Sherman
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weller
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—11

Cannon
Davis (FL)
Evans
Ford
Gerlach
Holden
Holt
Hyde
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Sherwood

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 2232

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SWEENEY, and Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. CONAWAY, WELDON of Florida, TERRY, HUNTER, BACHUS, PORTER, SCHWARZ of Michigan, Ms. HARRIS, Messrs. ISSA, GILLMOR, and FOSSELLA changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WEINER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 236, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 341]

AYES—185

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bono
Boswell
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Butterfield
Camp (MI)
Capito
Capuano
Cardoza
Carson
Case
Chabot
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Gibbons
Gillmor
Green (WI)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hefley
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hooley
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson (IL)
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kuhl (NY)
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
McCollum (MN)
McHugh
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reichert
Renzi
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Shimkus
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Snyder
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velázquez
Walden (OR)
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Woolsey
Wynn

NOES—236

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Capps
Cardin
Carnahan
Carter
Castle
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (TN)
Davis, Tom
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
English (PA)
Etheridge
Everett
Feeney
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gilchrest
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Honda
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Keller
Kilpatrick (MI)
King (IA)
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Myrick
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Northup
Nunes
Ortiz
Osborne
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Pombo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Stearns
Strickland
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Udall (CO)
Van Hollen
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Cannon
Davis (FL)
Evans
Ford
Gerlach
Holden
Holt
Hyde
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Sherwood

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 2236

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 131, noes 288, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 342]

AYES—131

Aderholt
Akin
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Bradley (NH)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Capito
Chabot
Coble
Conaway
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
Doolittle
Drake
Duncan
Everett
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hostettler
Hunter
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
Kingston
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McMorris
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Neugebauer
Ney
Norwood
Otter
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Rehberg
Renzi
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Wu
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—288

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Bass
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Fortenberry
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reichert
Reyes
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn

NOT VOTING—13

Cannon
Davis (FL)
Evans
Ford
Gerlach
Holden
Holt
Hyde
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Reynolds
Sanders
Sherwood

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 2242

Mr. POMBO changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 342, had I been present, I would have voted ''no.''

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MRS. MUSGRAVE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 230, noes 191, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 343]

AYES—230

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boucher
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
Dent
Dingell
Doolittle
Drake
Duncan
Edwards
Emerson
English (PA)
Etheridge
Everett
Feeney
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Gene
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kind
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ross
Royce
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sullivan
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Upton
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)

NOES—191

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldwin

Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Castle
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Costa
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doggett
Doyle
Dreier
Ehlers
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gilchrest
Gonzalez
Granger
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
King (NY)
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Olver
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Price (NC)
Ramstad
Rangel
Reichert
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Stark
Sweeney
Tauscher
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Cannon
Davis (FL)
Evans
Ford
Gerlach
Holden
Holt
Hyde
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Sherwood

Mr. CONYERS and Mr. TOWNS changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. STRICKLAND, BACA, KUHL of New York, BILBRAY, GREEN of Wisconsin and Mrs. KELLY changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 2249

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. NADLER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 230, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 344]

AYES—189

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carnahan
Carson
Chandler
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Flake
Frank (MA)
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Petri
Poe
Pomeroy
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOES—230

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (AL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Bishop (UT)
Cannon
Davis (FL)
Evans
Ford
Gerlach
Holden
Holt
Hyde
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Marchant
Sherwood

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 2253

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SODREL

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 246, noes 174, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 345]

AYES—246

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boucher
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Doolittle
Drake
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hooley
Hostettler
Hunter
Issa
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Melancon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—174

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bono
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Castle
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Tom
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Doggett
Doyle
Dreier
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hinchey
Honda
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Petri
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shays
Sherman
Simmons
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Watt

NOT VOTING—11

Cannon
Davis (FL)
Evans
Ford
Gerlach
Holden
Holt
Hyde
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Sherwood

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised there is 1 minute left in this vote.

□ 2258

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HINCHEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 109, noes 310, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 346]

AYES—109

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Baldwin
Bartlett (MD)
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boucher
Brown, Corrine
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carson
Clay
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Engel
Eshoo
Farr
Filner
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Honda
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
McNulty
Meeks (NY)
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Oberstar
Olver
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Price (NC)
Rangel
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Slaughter
Solis
Stark
Thompson (CA)
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—310

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cantor
Capito
Cardin
Carnahan
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (AL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Delahunt
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
English (PA)
Etheridge
Everett
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth

Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hooley
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Oxley
Pascrell
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Saxton
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Souder
Spratt
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Cannon
Davis (FL)
Evans
Ford
Gerlach
Holden
Holt
Hyde
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Obey
Sherwood
Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members are advised that there is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 2304

Mr. MARKEY and Mr. BLUMENAUER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the fiscal year 2007 Science, State, Justice Commerce Appropriations bill. I am particularly pleased that Chairman. WOLF included language that directs the Bureau of Prisons (BOP) to renew agreements with local governments housing federal criminal aliens, as long as the facilities meet Bureau of Prisons' standards and a fair and reasonable price is offered.

This provision of the bill is notably important to Big Spring, Texas and Garza County, Texas, both of which are located in my district, because these communities currently house federal criminal aliens and operate under an intergovernmental agreement (IGA) with the BOP. Renewing IGA's in west Texas will ensure that the federal government can meet the increasing demand for the incarceration of criminal aliens and continue to build upon already strong relationships for the long term.

This language also proves that Congress is committed to fiscal discipline. Big Spring and Garza County offer secure facilities to house dangerous individuals, while providing the American taxpayers some of the lowest per diem rates in the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support for the fiscal year 2007 Science-State-Justice Commerce appropriations bill. The subcommittee has taken a difficult allocation and done an admirable job of funding important federal programs within these agencies. I am particularly grateful to the subcommittee for dedicating funding for Houston Community College's Public Safety Institute within the Department of Justice's accounts.

The Houston Community College has taken the steps to build a much-needed Public Safety Institute in Houston, Texas. PSI will be a state-of-the-art facility that will offer specialized training for area fire fighters, law enforcement, medical technicians and other first responders. While Houston-area first responders will be the first to benefit from PSI's training programs in bio-hazards, command and control, shipboard spills and swift water rescue, I have no doubt that first responders from across the state—if not the Nation—will soon be traveling to PSI for this high-tech training.

Houston is home to the country's fourth largest metropolitan area and the Nation's second largest port in terms of foreign tonnage. We are also home to the world's second largest petrochemical complex and the world's single largest petrochemical refinery. Given the critical nature of these assets, the PSI's training programs will help further not only our local law enforcement but also our homeland security.

Mr. Chairman, with great pride that we are working to secure federal funding for PSI, which will be located in our district. While no training scenario can fully simulate a true emergency, the offerings at PSI will be as close as technology will allow. First responders will benefit from PSI's ''skills village,'' which will house a number of structures that simulate a real-world training environment for participants. PSI will also house a 10,000 square foot burn building to create fire-fighting scenarios and a 10,000 square foot tower for fire and rescue training.

I appreciate the subcommittee's recognition that PSI is an important project worthy of federal investment. The Congress can be as proud as I am that this funding will further PSI's mission to provide comprehensive training to the firefighters and local law enforcement who serve as first responders to any threat the City of Houston, and the national security assets in our area.

Mr. WOLF. 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. MCCAUL of Texas) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, 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. 5672) making appropriations for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 5688

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 5688.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken tomorrow.

AMENDING SAFE, ACCOUNTABLE, FLEXIBLE, EFFICIENT TRANSPORTATION EQUITY ACT: A LEGACY FOR USERS

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5689) to amend the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users to make technical corrections, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5689

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SURFACE TRANSPORTATION TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) CORRECTION OF INTERNAL REFERENCES IN DISADVANTAGED BUSINESS ENTERPRISES.—Section 1101(b) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1156) is amended in each of paragraphs (3)(A) and (5) by striking ''(1)'' each place it appears and inserting ''(2)''.

(b) TECHNICAL CORRECTION OF DISTRIBUTION OF OBLIGATION AUTHORITY.—Section 1102(c)(5) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1158) is amended by striking ''among the States''.

(c) CORRECTION OF DESCRIPTION OF NATIONAL CORRIDOR INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT PROJECT.— Item number 1 of the table contained in section 1302(e) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1205) is amended by inserting ''LA,'' after ''TX,'' in the listing of States.

(d) CORRECTION OF INTERSTATE ROUTE 376 HIGH-PRIORITY DESIGNATION.—(1) Section 1105(c)(79) of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (105 Stat. 2032; 119 Stat. 1213) is amended by striking ''and on United States Route 422''.

(2) Section 1105(e)(5)(B)(i)(I) of such Act (105 Stat. 2033; 119 Stat. 1213) is amended by striking ''and United States Route 422''.

(e) CORRECTION OF AMENDMENT TO ADVANCE CONSTRUCTION.—Section 115 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

(f) CORRECTION OF AMENDMENT TO MOVE AND REDESIGNATE INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCE SECTION.—Section 1602(d)(1) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1247) is amended by striking ''through 189 as sections 601 through 609, respectively'' and inserting ''through 190 as sections 601 through 610, respectively''.

(g) CORRECTION TO ADD DEFINITION FOR TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS.—Section 101(a) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(39) TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'transportation systems management and operations' means an integrated program to optimize the performance of existing infrastructure through the implementation of multimodal and intermodal, cross-jurisdictional systems, services, and projects designed to preserve capacity and improve security, safety, and reliability of the transportation system.

''(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term 'transportation systems management and operations' includes—

''(i) regional operations collaboration and coordination activities between transportation and public safety agencies; and

''(ii) improvements to the transportation system such as traffic detection and surveillance, arterial management, freeway management, demand management, work zone management, emergency management, electronic toll collection, automated enforcement, traffic incident management, roadway weather management, traveler information services, commercial vehicle operations, traffic control, freight management, and coordination of highway, rail, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian operations.''.

(h) CORRECTIONS TO REFERENCE IN APPORTIONMENT OF HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FUNDS.—Section 104(b)(5)(A)(iii) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking ''the Federal-aid system'' each place it appears and inserting ''Federal-aid highways''.

(i) TRANSFER OF UNUSED PROTECTIVE-DEVICE FUNDS TO OTHER HIGHWAY SAFETY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PROJECTS.—Section 130(e)(2) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking ''purposes under this subsection'' and inserting ''highway safety improvement program purposes''.

(j) CORRECTION OF NATIONAL SCENIC BYWAYS PROGRAM COVERAGE.—Section 162 of title 23, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3)(B) by striking ''a National Scenic Byway under subparagraph (A)'' and inserting ''a National Scenic Byway, an All-American Road, or one of America's Byways under paragraph (1)''; and

(2) in subsection (c)(3) by striking ''or All-American Road'' each place it appears and inserting ''All-American Road, or one of America's Byways''.

(k) CORRECTION OF REFERENCE IN TOLL PROVISION.—Section 166(b)(5)(C) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking ''paragraph (3)'' and inserting ''paragraph (4)''.

(l) CORRECTION OF RECREATIONAL TRAILS PROGRAM APPORTIONMENT EXCEPTIONS.—Section 206(d)(3)(A) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking ''(B), (C), and (D)'' and inserting ''(B) and (C)''.

(m) CORRECTION OF MISCELLANEOUS TYPOGRAPHICAL ERRORS.—(1) Section 1401 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1226) is amended by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.

(2) Section 1404(f)(2)(A) of such Act (119 Stat. 1229) is amended—

(A) by striking the comma after ''training''; and

(B) by striking the comma after ''volunteers''.

SEC. 2. NONMOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION PILOT PROGRAM.

Section 1807(a)(3) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient, Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1460) is amended by striking ''Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minnesota'' and inserting ''Minneapolis, Minnesota''.

SEC. 3. GOING-TO-THE-SUN ROAD.

Section 1940 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1511) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking paragraphs (1) and (2);

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (5) as paragraphs (1) through (3), respectively; and

(C) by striking ''$10,000,000'' each place that it appears and inserting ''$16,666,666''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, funds authorized to be appropriated under this section shall be available for obligation in the same manner as if the funds were apportioned under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code.''.

SEC. 4. SURFACE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM.

Section 1108(f)(1) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (23 U.S.C. 133 note; 112 Stat. 140) is amended by striking ''2003'' and inserting ''2009''.

SEC. 5. MAGLEV.

(a) FUNDING.—Section 1101(a)(18) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1155) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting the following:

''(A) $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2007; and

''(B) $35,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2008 and 2009.''.

(b) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—Section 1307 of such Act (119 Stat. 1217) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—Funds authorized under section 1101(a)(18) of this Act shall be available for obligation in the same manner as if the funds were apportioned under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code; except that such funds shall not be transferable and shall remain available until expended, and the Federal share of the cost of a project under this section shall be determined in accordance with sections 120(b) and 120(c) of such title.''.

SEC. 6. DEFINITION OF REPEAT INTOXICATED DRIVER LAW.

Section 164(a)(5)(A) of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(A) receive (i) a driver's license suspension for not less than 1 year, or (ii) a combination of suspension of all driving privileges for the first 45 days of the suspension period followed by a reinstatement of limited driving privileges for the propose of getting to and from work, school, or an alcohol treatment program if an ignition interlock device is installed on each of the motor vehicles owned or operated, or both, by the individual;''.

SEC. 7. HIGHWAY SAFETY.

(a) STATE MINIMUM APPORTIONMENTS FOR HIGHWAY SAFETY PROGRAMS.—Section 402(c) of the title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking ''The annual apportionment to each State shall not be less than one-half of 1 per centum'' and inserting ''The annual apportionment to each State shall not be less than three-quarters of 1 percent''.

(b) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—

(1) Section 2002(b) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1521) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (2); and

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as (2) and (3), respectively.

(2) Section 2007(b)(1) of such Act (119 Stat. 1529) is amended—

(A) by inserting ''and'' after the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (A);

(B) by striking ''and'' at the end of subparagraph (B); and

(C) by striking subparagraph (C).

(3) Effective August 10, 2005, section 410(c)(7)(B) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking ''clause (i)'' and inserting ''clauses (i) and (ii)''.

(4) Section 411 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by redesignating the second subsection (c), relating to administration expenses, and subsection (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively.

SEC. 8. PROJECT AUTHORIZATIONS.

The table contained in section 1702 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1256) is amended—

(1) in item numbers 959 and 3327 by striking ''Northern Section,'';

(2) in item number 983 by striking the project description and inserting ''Land acquisition for Highway Mitigation in Cecil, Kent, Queen Annes, and Worcester Counties'';

(3) in item number 3410 by striking the project description and inserting ''Construct eligible sound walls on I–65 between Old Hickory Blvd. and Harding Place in Davidson County'';

(4) in item number 3631 by striking the project description and inserting ''Reconstruct or modify the existing 5th Street Bridge and railroad trestle to provide a 4-lane crossing of the Feather River between Yuba City and Marysville as well as providing improvements to connector roads from east and west'';

(5) in item number 3219 by striking ''Forest'' and inserting ''Warren'';

(6) in item number 770 by striking the project description and inserting ''Improve existing Horns Hill Road in North Newark, Ohio, from Waterworks Road to Licking Springs Road'';

(7) in item number 2698 by striking the project description and inserting ''I–95/Ellis Road and between Grant Road and Micco Road, Interchange Justification Reports, Brevard, FL'';

(8) in item number 2234 by striking the project description and inserting ''North Atherton Signal Coordination Project in Centre County, PA'';

(9) in item number 1852 by striking ''Milepost 9.3'' and inserting ''Milepost 24.3'';

(10) in item number 3397 by striking the project description and inserting ''Cathodic Bridge Protection, allow the Virginia Department of Transportation (VDOT) to select the bridge or bridges that VDOT considers appropriate for cathodic bridge protection modification'';

(11) in item number 1210 by striking the project description and inserting ''Town of New Windsor Riley Road and Shore Drive'';

(12) in item number 3673 by striking the project description and inserting ''Ketchikan: Improve marine dry-dock and facilities'';

(13) in item number 1575 by striking the project description and inserting ''Highway and road signage, and traffic signal synchronization and upgrades, in Shippensburg Boro, Shippensburg Township, and surrounding municipalities'';

(14) in item number 3255 by striking the project description and inserting ''Facility acquisition, road construction, and other transportation enhancement related improvements in the Northwest Triangle Redevelopment Area in the city of York, PA'';

(15) in item number 655 by inserting '', safety improvement construction,'' after ''Environmental studies'';

(16) in item numbers 1926 and 2893 by striking the project description and inserting ''Grading, paving, roads, and the transfer of rail-to-truck for the intermodal facility at Rickenbacker Airport, Columbus, Ohio'';

(17) by striking item number 2031;

(18) in item number 3327 by striking ''$1,600,000'' and inserting ''$2,400,000'';

(19) by striking item number 2800;

(20) in item number 1487 by striking ''$800,000'' and inserting ''$1,600,000'';

(21) by striking item number 61;

(22) in item number 128 by striking ''$2,400,000'' and inserting ''$4,800,000'';

(23) by striking item number 248;

(24) in item number 240 by striking ''$800,000'' and inserting ''$2,400,000'';

(25) in item number 34 by striking the project description and inserting ''Removal and Reconfiguration of Interstate Ramps—I–40, Memphis'';

(26) in item number 87 by striking the project description and inserting ''M–291 Highway Outer Road Improvement Project'';

(27) in item number 193 by striking the project description and inserting ''Improvements to or access to Route 108 to enhance access to the business park near Rumford'';

(28) in item number 259 by striking the project description and inserting ''Corridor study, EIS, and ROW acquisition for a bridge from east of the Crow Wing Highway 3 bridge crossing the Mississippi River in Brainerd to west of the Minnesota State Highway 6 bridge crossing the Mississippi River north of Crosby'';

(29) in item number 463 by striking ''Cookeville'' and inserting ''Putnam County'';

(30) in item number 590 by inserting '', including'' after ''Safety'';

(31) in item number 595 by striking ''Street Closure at'' and inserting ''Transportation Improvement Project near'';

(32) in item number 649 by striking the project description and inserting ''Construction and enhancement of the Fillmore Avenue Corridor, Buffalo'';

(33) in item number 881 by striking the project description and inserting ''Pedestrian Safety Improvements near North Atlantic Boulevard, Monterey Park'';

(34) in item number 1039 by striking the project description and inserting ''Widen State Route 98, including storm drain developments, from D. Navarro Avenue to State Route 111'';

(35) in item number 1124 by striking ''bridge over Stillwater River, Orono'' and by inserting ''routes'';

(36) in item number 1206 by striking ''Pleasantville'' and inserting ''Briarcliff Manor'';

(37) in item number 1281 by striking the project description and inserting ''Upgrade roads in Attala County District 4 (Roads 4211 and 4204), Kosciusko, Ward 2, and Ethel, Attala County'';

(38) in item number 1639 by striking the project description and inserting ''Operational and highway safety improvements on Hwy 94 between the 20 mile marker post in Jamul and Hwy 188 in Tecate'';

(39) in item number 1810 by striking the project description and inserting ''Design, engineering, ROW acquisition, construction, and construction engineering for the reconstruction of TH 95, from 12th Avenue to CSAH 13, including bridge and approaches, ramps, intersecting roadways, signals, turn lanes, and multi-use trail, North Branch'';

(40) in item number 1933 by striking the project description and by inserting ''Enhance Byzantine Latino Quarter transit plazas at Normandie and Pico, and Hoover and Pico, Los Angeles, by improving streetscapes, including expanding concrete and paving'';

(41) in item number 2375 by inserting '', including streets'' after ''Astoria'';

(42) in item number 2482 by striking ''Country'' and inserting ''County'';

(43) in item number 2663 by striking the project description and inserting ''Rosemead Boulevard safety enhancement and beautification, Temple City'';

(44) in item number 2826 by striking ''State Street and Cajon Boulevard'' and inserting ''Palm Avenue'';

(45) in item number 2931 by striking ''Frazho Road'' and inserting ''Martin Road'';

(46) in item number 3014 by inserting '', including'' after ''Safety'';

(47) in item number 3078 by striking the project description and inserting ''US 2/Sultan Basin Road Improvements in Sultan'';

(48) in item number 3174 by striking the project description and inserting ''Improving Outer Harbor access through planning, design, construction, and relocations of Southtowns Connector—NY Route 5, Fuhrmann Boulevard, and a bridge connecting the Outer Harbor to downtown Buffalo at the Inner Harbor'';

(49) in item number 3254 by striking the project description and inserting ''Reconstruct PA Route 274/34 Corridor, Perry County'';

(50) in item number 3456 by striking the project description and by inserting ''Phase II/part I project—Elizabeth Ave. in Coleraine to 0.2 Miles West of CSAH 15 (2.9 miles)'';

(51) in item number 3537 by inserting ''and the study of alternatives along the North South Corridor,'' after ''Valley'';

(52) in item number 3582 by striking the project description and inserting ''Improving Outer Harbor access through planning, design, construction, and relocations of Southtowns Connector—NY Route 5, Fuhrmann Boulevard, and a bridge connecting the Outer Harbor to downtown Buffalo at the Inner Harbor'';

(53) in item number 2015 by striking the project description and inserting ''Heidelberg Borough/Scott Township/Carnegie Borough for design, engineering, acquisition, and construction of streetscaping enhancements, paving, lighting and safety upgrades, and parking improvements'';

(54) in item number 154 by striking ''Virginia'' and inserting ''Eveleth'';

(55) in item number 277 by striking the project description and inserting ''Construct connector road from Rushing Drive North to Grand Ave., Williamson County'';

(56) in item number 314 by striking the project description and amount and inserting ''Streetscape/landscape enhancements, traffic calming, and improvements to traffic flow in the Las Olas Boulevard, Ft. Lauderdale'' and ''$610,000'', respectively;

(57) in item number 3632 by striking the State, project description, and amount and inserting ''FL'', ''Pine Island Road Pedestrian Overpass, City of Tamarac'', and ''$610,000'', respectively; and

(58) in item number 3634 by striking the State, project description, and amount and inserting ''FL'', ''West Avenue Bridge, City of Miami Beach'', and ''$620,000'', respectively.

SEC. 9. BUY AMERICA.

Section 1928 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1484) is amended—

(1) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) the Federal Highway Administration's current application of the Buy America test is only applied to components or parts of a bridge project and not the entire bridge project and this is inconsistent with this sense of Congress;''; and

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5) as (3), (4), (5), and (6), respectively.

SEC. 10. CORRECTION OF INTERSTATE AND NHS DESIGNATIONS.

(a) TREATMENT.—Section 1908(a) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1469) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(b) NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM.—Section 1908(b) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1470) is amended by striking ''from the Arkansas State line'' and inserting ''from Interstate Route 540''.

SEC. 11. TRANSIT TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) SECTION 5302.—Section 5302(a)(10) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''charter,'' and inserting ''charter, sightseeing,''.

(b) SECTION 5307.—Section 5307(b) of such title is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(A) by striking ''mass transportation'' and inserting ''public transportation''; and

(2) in paragraph (3) by striking ''section 5305(a)'' and inserting ''section 5303(k)''.

(c) SECTION 5309.—Section 5309(m) of such title is amended—

(1) in the heading for paragraph (2)(A) by striking ''MAJOR CAPITAL'' and inserting ''CAPITAL''; and

(2) in paragraph (7)(B) by striking ''section 3039'' and inserting ''section 3045''.

(d) SECTION 5311.—Section 5311 of such title is amended—

(1) in subsection (g)(1)(A) by striking ''for any purpose other than operating assistance'' and inserting ''for a capital project''; and

(2) in subsection (i)(1) by striking ''Sections 5323(a)(1)(D) and 5333(b) of this title apply'' and inserting ''Section 5333(b) applies''.

(e) SECTION 5312.—The heading for section 5312(c) of such title is amended by striking ''MASS TRANSPORTATION'' and inserting ''PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION''.

(f) SECTION 5314.—Section 5314(a)(3) is amended by striking ''section 5323(a)(1)(D)'' and inserting ''section 5333(b)''.

(g) SECTION 5319.—Section 5319 of such title is amended by striking ''section 5307(k)'' and inserting ''section 5307(d)(1)(K)''.

(h) SECTION 5320.—Section 5320(a)(1)(A) of such title is amended by striking ''intra—agency'' and inserting ''intraagency''.

(i) SECTION 5323.—Section 5323(n) of such title is amended by striking ''section 5336(e)(2)'' and inserting ''section 5336(d)(2)''.

(j) SECTION 5336.—

(1) APPORTIONMENTS OF FORMULA GRANTS.—Section 5336 of such title is amended—

(A) in subsection (a) by striking ''Of the amount'' and all that follows before paragraph (1) and inserting ''Of the amount apportioned under subsection (i)(2) to carry out section 5307—'';

(B) in subsection (d)(1) by striking ''subsections (a) and (h)(2) of section 5338'' and inserting ''subsections (a)(1)(C)(vi) and (b)(2)(B) of section 5338''; and

(C) by redesignating subsection (c), as added by section 3034(c) of Public Law 109–59 (119 Stat. 1628), as subsection (k).

(2) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Effective August 10, 2005, section 3034(d)(2) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient, Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1629), is amended by striking ''paragraph (2)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)(2)''.

(k) SECTION 5337.—Section 5337(a) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2003'' and inserting ''for each of fiscal years 2005 through 2009''.

(l) SECTION 5338.—Section 5338(d)(1)(B) of such title is amended by striking ''section 5315(a)(16)'' and inserting ''section 5315(b)(2)(P)''.

(m) SAFETEA–LU.—

(1) Section 3040.—Section 3040(4) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient, Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1639) is amended by striking ''$7,871,895,000'' and inserting ''$7,872,893,000''.

(2) Section 3043.—Section 3043(c)(217) of such Act (119 Stat.1648) is amended by striking ''San Diego'' and inserting ''San Diego Transit''.

(3) Section 3044.—

(A) PROJECTS.—The table contained in section 3044(a) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1652) is amended—

(i) in item number 36 by striking the project description and inserting ''36. Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority (LACMTA) for bus and bus-related facilities in the LACMTA's service area'';

(ii) in item number 94 by striking the project description and inserting ''94. Pacific Transit, WA Vehicle Replacement'';

(iii) in item number 361 by striking ''Roanoke Railway and Link Passenger facility'' and inserting ''Intermodal Facility''; and

(iv) in item number 416 by striking ''Improve marine intermodal'' and inserting ''Improve marine dry-dock and''.

(B) SPECIAL RULE.—Section 3044(c) of such Act (119 Stat. 1705) is amended—

(i) by inserting '', or other entity,'' after ''State or local government authority''; and

(ii) by striking ''projects numbered 258 and 347'' and inserting ''projects numbered 258, 347, and 411''.

(4) Section 3046.—Section 3046(a)(7) of such Act (119 Stat. 1708) is amended—

(A) by striking ''hydrogen fuel cell vehicles'' and inserting ''hydrogen fueled vehicles'';

(B) by striking ''hydrogen fuel cell employee shuttle vans'' and inserting ''hydrogen fueled employee shuttle vans''; and

(C) by striking ''in Allentown, Pennsylvania'' and inserting ''to the DaVinci Center in Allentown, Pennsylvania''.

SEC. 12. TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS.

Item number 436 of the table contained in section 1934(c) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1485) is amended by inserting '', Saole, '' after ''Sua''.

SEC. 13. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS RELATING TO MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY.

(a) CONFORMING AMENDMENT RELATING TO HIGH-PRIORITY ACTIVITIES.—Section 31104(f) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking the designation and heading for paragraph (1) and by striking paragraph (2).

(b) NEW ENTRANT AUDITS.—

(1) CORRECTIONS OF REFERENCES.—Section 4107(b) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1720) is amended—

(A) by striking ''Section 31104'' and inserting ''Section 31144''; and

(B) in paragraph (2) by inserting ''(c)'' after ''the second subsection''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 7112 of such Act (119 Stat. 1899) is amended by striking subsection (c).

(c) PROHIBITED TRANSPORTATION.—Section 4114(c)(1) of the such Act (119 Stat. 1726) is amended by striking ''the second subsection (c)'' and inserting ''(f)''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE RELATING TO MEDICAL EXAMINERS.—Section 4116(f) of such Act (119 Stat. 1728) is amended by striking ''amendment made by subsection (a)'' and inserting ''amendments made by subsections (a) and (b)''.

(e) ROADABILITY TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 31151(a)(3)(E)(ii) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Act'' and inserting ''section''.

(f) CORRECTION OF SUBSECTION REFERENCE.—Section 4121 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1734) is amended by striking ''31139(f)(5)'' and inserting ''31139(g)(5)''.

(g) CDL LEARNER'S PERMIT PROGRAM TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 4122(2)(A) of such Act (119 Stat. 1734) is amended by striking ''license'' and inserting ''licenses''.

(h) CDL INFORMATION SYSTEM FUNDING REFERENCE.—Section 31309(f) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''31318'' and inserting ''31313''.

(i) CLARIFICATION OF REFERENCE.—Section 229(a)(1) of the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act of 1999 (49 U.S.C. 31136 note; 119 Stat. 1743) is amended by inserting ''of title 49, United States Code,'' after ''31502''.

(j) REGISTRATION OF BROKERS.—Section 4142(c)(2) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1747) is amended by inserting ''each place it appears'' before the semicolon.

(k) REDESIGNATION OF SECTION.—The second section 39 of chapter 2 of title 18, United States Code, relating to commercial motor vehicles required to stop for inspections, and the item relating to such section in the analysis for such chapter, are redesignated as section 40.

(l) OFFICE OF INTERMODALISM.—Section 5503 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (f)(2) by striking ''Surface Transportation Safety Improvement Act of 2005'', and inserting ''Motor Carrier Safety Reauthorization Act of 2005''; and

(2) by redesignating the first subsection (h), relating to authorization of appropriations, as subsection (i) and moving it after the second subsection (h).

(m) USE OF FEES FOR UNIFIED CARRIER REGISTRATION SYSTEM.—Section 13908 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f) and by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

''(e) USE OF FEES FOR UNIFIED CARRIER REGISTRATION SYSTEM.—Fees collected under this section may be credited to the Department of Transportation appropriations account for purposes for which such fees are collected and shall be available for expenditure for such purposes until expended.''.

(n) COMMERCIAL MOTOR VEHICLE DEFINITION.—Section 14504a(a)(1)(B) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''a motor carrier required to make any filing or pay any fee to a State with respect to the motor carrier's authority or insurance related to operation within such State, the motor carrier'' and inserting ''determining the size of a motor carrier or motor private carrier's fleet in calculating the fee to be paid by a motor carrier or motor private carrier pursuant to subsection (f)(1), the motor carrier or motor private carrier''.

(o) CLARIFICATION OF UNREASONABLE BURDEN.—Section 14504a(c)(2) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''interstate'' the last place it appears and inserting ''intrastate''.

(p) CONTENTS OF AGREEMENT TYPO.—Section 14504a(f)(1)(A)(ii) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''or'' the last place it appears.

(q) OTHER UNIFIED CARRIER REGISTRATION SYSTEM TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—Section 14504a of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(1)(B) by striking ''the a'' and inserting ''a''; and

(2) in subsection (f)(1)(i) by striking ''in connection with the filing of proof of financial responsibility''.

SEC. 14. HIGHWAY RESEARCH FUNDING.

(a) F-SHRP FUNDING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2009, whenever an apportionment is made of the sums authorized to be appropriated for the surface transportation program, the congestion mitigation and air quality improvement program, the National Highway System, the Interstate maintenance program, the bridge program, and the highway safety improvement program, the Secretary of Transportation shall deduct from each of such sums an amount not to exceed 0.205 percent of each such sum and shall transfer the amount so deducted, and make such amount available, to carry out section 510 of title 23, United States Code.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 5101(a)(1) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1179) is amended by striking ''509, and 510'' and inserting ''and 509''.

(2) Section 5210 of such Act (119 Stat. 1804) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (c); and

(B) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c).

(c) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—Funds made available under this section shall be available for obligation in the same manner as if such funds were apportioned under chapter 1 of such title, except that the Federal share shall be determined under section 510(f) of title 23, United States Code.

(d) APPLICABILITY OF OBLIGATION LIMITATION.—Funds made available under this section shall be subject to any limitation on obligations for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs in section 1102 the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (23 U.S.C. 104 note; 119 Stat. 1157) or any other Act.

(e) EQUITY BONUS FORMULA.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in allocating funds for the equity bonus program under section 105 of title 23, United States Code, for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2009, the Secretary of Transportation shall make the required calculations under such section as if this section had not been enacted.

(f) FUNDING FOR RESEARCH ACTIVITIES.—Of the amount made available by section 5101(a)(1) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1779), at least $1,000,000 shall be made available for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2009 to carry out section 502(h) of title 23, United States Code, and at least $4,900,000 shall be made available for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2009 to carry out section 502(i) of such title.

(g) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1) Section 502 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking the first subsection (h), relating to infrastructure investment needs reports beginning with the report for January 31, 1999.

(2) Section 5512(a)(2) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1829) is amended by striking ''PROGRAM APPRECIATION.—'' and inserting ''PROGRAM APPLICATION.—''.

SEC. 15. RESEARCH TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.

(a) UNIVERSITY TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH GRANTS.—Section 5506(e)(5)(C) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''$2,225,000''and inserting ''$2,250,000''.

(b) UNIVERSITY TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH FUNDING.—Section 5101(a)(4) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1779) is amended by striking ''$69,700,000'' and all that follows through ''2009'' and inserting ''$40,400,000 for fiscal year 2005, $76,400,000 for each of fiscal years 2006 through 2008, and $78,900,000 for fiscal year 2009''.

SEC. 16. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS RELATING TO HAZARDOUS MATERIALS TRANSPORTATION.

(a) DEFINITION OF HAZMAT EMPLOYEES.—Section 7102(2) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1982) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(3)(A)'' and inserting ''(3)'';

(2) in subparagraph (A) by striking ''clause (i)'' and inserting ''clause (i) of subparagraph (A)''; and

(3) in subparagraph (B) by striking ''clause (ii)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (A)(ii)''.

(b) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 5103a(g)(1)(B)(ii) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Act'' and inserting ''subsection''.

(c) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS.—Section 7124(3) of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1908) is amended by inserting ''the first place it appears'' before ''and inserting''.

(d) SECTION HEADING.—Section 5128 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking the section designation and heading and inserting the following:

''§ 5128. Authorization of appropriations''.

(e) CHAPTER ANALYSIS.—The analysis for chapter 57 of title 49, United States Code, is amended in the item relating to section 5701 by striking ''Transportation'' and inserting ''transportation''.

(f) NORMAN Y. MINETA RESEARCH AND SPECIAL PROGRAMS IMPROVEMENT ACT.—Section 5(b) of the Norman Y. Mineta Research and Special Programs Improvement Act (49 U.S.C. 108 note; 118 Stat. 2427) is amended by inserting ''(including delegations by the Secretary of Transportation)'' after ''All orders''.

SEC. 17. RESCISSION.

Section 10212 of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (119 Stat. 1937) is amended by striking ''$8,543,000,000'' each place it appears and inserting ''$8,713,000,000''.

SEC. 18. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act; except that the amendments made by this Act (other than sections 8, 11(m), and 12) to the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (Public Law 109–59) and the amendment made by section 13(a) of this Act shall take effect simultaneously with the enactment of the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users. For purposes of all Federal laws, the amendments made by this Act (other than sections 8, 11(m), and 12) to the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users shall be treated as being included in the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users at the time of the enactment of such Act, and the provisions of such Act (including the amendments made by such Act) (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act) that are amended by this Act (other than sections 8, 11(m), and 12) shall be treated as not being enacted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 5689.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5689 amends the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Act: A Legacy for Users, or SAFETEA-LU, to make technical corrections. This bill was introduced by myself, Mr. JIM OBERSTAR of Minnesota, Mr. PETER DEFAZIO of Oregon and Mr. PETRI from Wisconsin, who worked together on the development and passage of SAFETEA-LU authorization bill last year.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is necessary because the technical corrections included in this bill have been identified by the Department of Transportation and are mostly of a conforming nature, or correct drafting errors. The most important correction we are making is the strengthening of the Federal highway research program by ensuring the continuation of legacy research programs carried out by the Department of Transportation. This bill has been scored by CBO and has no budgetary impact.

Mr. Speaker, I support this legislation and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This legislation simply corrects a number of oversights and drafting errors, technical mistakes made in the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users.

It does a number of things, clarifying the sense of Congress concerning Buy America requirements and the Federal aid bridge program. It addresses errors made in the research program funding calculations, the Future Strategic Highway Research Program, University Transportation Center Program and the biennial Conditions and Performance Report, and it modifies the Repeat Intoxicated Driver Law to allow for use of ignition interlock devices.

These are technical matters that we have both agreed on, need to be adjusted. They do not result in any increase of cost over the original bill as passed.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank the ranking member. I thank the chairman for bringing this bill forward with such dispatch.

The bill, as the chairman has stated, has no budgetary impact. It makes other technical corrections, particularly going to those where we research the future needs and the condition of our interstate system, which will be vital for future transportation initiatives.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5689.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRATULATING THE NATIONAL HOCKEY LEAGUE CHAMPIONS, THE CAROLINA HURRICANES, ON THEIR VICTORY IN THE 2006 STANLEY CUP FINALS

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 881) congratulating the National Hockey League Champions, the Carolina Hurricanes, on their victory in the 2006 Stanley Cup Finals.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Res. 881

Whereas on Monday, June 19, 2006, in Raleigh, North Carolina, the Carolina Hurricanes won the National Hockey League (NHL) Stanley Cup with a 3–1 victory over the Edmonton Oilers in the decisive seventh game of the championship series;

Whereas the Edmonton Oilers proved worthy opponents and should be congratulated for a hard-fought Stanley Cup series;

Whereas the Hurricanes' win marked their first Stanley Cup title in franchise history;

Whereas the Hurricanes' win marked the first major professional sports championship won by a team from the State of North Carolina;

Whereas owner Peter Karmanos and general manager Jim Rutherford have created a model franchise, assembling a team that rose

from last place three years ago to the pinnacle of its sport today;

Whereas the Hurricanes were ably led by head coach Peter Laviolette, also the head coach of the 2006 United States Olympic team, and assistant coaches Kevin McCarthy, Jeff Daniels, and Greg Stefan;

Whereas Hurricanes team members Craig Adams, Kevyn Adams, Anton Babchuk, Rod Brind'Amour, Erik Cole, Mike Commodore, Matt Cullen, Martin Gerber, Bret Hedican, Andrew Hutchinson, Frantisek Kaberle, Andrew Ladd, Chad LaRose, Mark Recchi, Eric Staal, Cory Stillman, Oleg Tverdovsky, Josef Vasicek, Niclas Wallin, Aaron Ward, Cam Ward, Doug Weight, Glen Wesley, Ray Whitney, and Justin Williams are all worthy of praise and admiration for their contributions to the resilient championship team;

Whereas Cam Ward, the Hurricanes' goalkeeper and a 22-year-old rookie, was awarded the Conn Smythe Trophy as the most valuable player of the NHL post-season;

Whereas the Hurricanes' championship run and intense Stanley Cup series have reinvigorated professional hockey following the 2004–2005 lockout and lost season;

Whereas the Carolina Hurricanes represent a new future for the NHL, introducing hockey to additional regions of the country and creating new fans of the sport's high level of athleticism and competition;

Whereas the entire Hurricanes organization has contributed considerably to the community it represents, generously donating time and resources to a variety of charitable and educational programs for children throughout the State of North Carolina; and

Whereas Raleigh, the Triangle region, and all of North Carolina are proud of the accomplishment and dedication of the Carolina Hurricanes' team, organization, and fans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives congratulates the National Hockey League Champions, the Carolina Hurricanes, on their victory in the 2006 Stanley Cup Finals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he needs on this resolution to the gentleman from the State of North Carolina (Mr. COBLE).

Mr. COBLE. I thank the gentlelady from Ohio for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I inevitably and innocently likely will omit some cities. But when I think hockey I think Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Washington, Pittsburgh, Detroit, Chicago, and, of course, the entire country of Canada.

So how do we explain the success of the Carolina Hurricanes?

Two weeks ago, I asked my good friend, Congressman ED MARKEY, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, his thoughts about our Hurricanes. In this tone of voice, he replied, ''unbelievable.''

But I say to ED and all others who reside beyond the confines of Tobacco Road, very believable today as the revered Stanley cup is proudly displayed in North Carolina.

And what an exciting Stanley cup series. The Edmonton Oilers regular season record was not that impressive. But the Oilers play-off record was impressive indeed. And the final seven games, Mr. Speaker, were exercises in international diplomacy as the Oiler fans and the Hurricane fans enthusiastically sang Oh Canada and the Star Spangled Banner with obvious pride prior to the commencement of each match.

Carolina hockey came to be known as redneck hockey, and our fans were superb.

I know virtually knowing nothing about hockey, Mr. Speaker, but I have become a full-fledged hockey fan. Strike that. I have become a full-fledged redneck hockey fan.

□ 2315

Last evening and today I met with Canadian friends who were visiting Washington, and Mr. PRICE, I say to you that they said for us not to become too comfortable with that Stanley Cup. My Canadian friends said that cup is destined to go north.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I failed to acknowledge that the Hurricanes' outstanding goalie is an Edmontonian. So it is all in the family. I may drive 95 miles next year, Mr. Speaker, just to see a match or a game, whatever it is called, but meanwhile, best wishes and congratulations to the Carolina Hurricanes 2006 Stanley Cup champions.

And I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to one of the proud sons of North Carolina and a sponsor of this legislation, Representative David Price.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise to honor the Carolina Hurricanes, the proud winners of an outstanding seven-game Stanley Cup series with the Edmonton Oilers.

You know, the skeptics said that hockey would never work in North Carolina. Who would ever watch this northern sport in a southern city? Even if some small crowd showed up, could they even follow the rules of the game? Some doubted we could put ice to any purpose beyond cooling sweet tea.

Well, I stand here this evening to report that those early skeptics were wrong. Hockey has found a welcome home along Tobacco Road. Although I represent a constituency that I have to admit is more familiar with Tar Heels and Blue Devils, and the Wolfpack, we North Carolinians have found another winter sport in which to place our pride. We are proud of the Hurricanes and the Stanley Cup they have brought to our State.

We are proud of Cam Ward, the 22-year-old rookie goalkeeper who was recognized as the post-season most valuable player. Also veterans like Rod Brind'Amour, Glen Wesley, and Bret Hedican, who played a combined 49 NHL seasons before winning the Stanley Cup. We celebrate every team member as well as Coach Peter Laviolette and the rest of the Hurricanes' management and staff.

We are proud of the newfound energy and excitement that the Hurricanes have brought to their sport following that 2004–2005 lockout and the lost season. The thrilling championship run gave fans everywhere a chance and a reason to celebrate hockey again while also introducing many to the sport for the first time.

We are proud of how this team gives back to the community, generously donating time and resources to several charitable organizations across the State. The Hurricanes' Kids 'n Community Foundation serves my district by funding scholarships and youth sports and the arts and educational and children's health programs.

And of course, we are proud of the first major professional sports championship won by a team from North Carolina. This team's outstanding achievement and the dedication of their loyal fans have electrified Raleigh and the Triangle and our entire State.

So as the proud Representative of their home district, I offer my congratulations to the Carolina Hurricanes, winner of the Stanley Cup and the 2006 National Hockey League Champions. Go Canes.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 881, offered by the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE), congratulates the National Hockey League Champions, the Carolina Hurricanes, on their victory in the 2006 Stanley Cup Finals.

On their way to their second Stanley Cup appearance in four seasons, the Hurricanes notched an impressive 55–22–8 regular season record, second best in the Eastern Conference. Carolina boasted the best home record in the league, experiencing record crowds at the RBC Center, the loudest house in the NHL. Four Carolina players recorded 30 goal seasons, led by emerging superstar Eric Staal, who finished seventh in the NHL with 100 points. As for the team's last line of defense, Martin Gerber set a franchise record for goaltender wins in a season.

The team's depth was instrumental as well as their success was a testament to the character of its players and the ''whatever it takes'' mentality that permeated the locker room. Rookies and all-stars lined up side by side, playing key roles in the Hurricanes' run to respectability. Through the myriad of injuries, General Manager Jim Rutherford and Head Coach Peter Laviolette mixed and matched players as well as lines and pairings, shocking the Hockey Nation as Carolina stayed atop the Southeast Division standings. Knocking off the Montreal Canadiens, the New Jersey Devils, and Buffalo Sabres along the way, the Hurricanes returned home to beat the Edmonton Oilers with a score of 3–1 and claimed the

first NHL championship in their franchise history.

I urge all Members to come together and commend the hard work and perseverance of the Carolina Hurricanes by adopting House Resolution 881.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to another favorite son of North Carolina, who probably didn't play much hockey but who in all likelihood delighted many North Carolinians on the basketball court, Representative BOB ETHERIDGE.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues from North Carolina in congratulating the Carolina Hurricanes on winning the Stanley Cup.

And, yes, Mr. DAVIS, I did not play any hockey and know very little about the rules. I played with a much bigger ball, one that bounced a little bit rather than one that slides.

As has already been stated, in an exciting seven-game series, the Carolina Hurricanes defeated the Edmonton Oilers to win the Stanley Cup. And as has been stated, the win is truly unprecedented for North Carolina. Not only is it the first time the Hurricanes have won the Stanley Cup, but it really is the first time that any professional sports team from North Carolina has won a championship.

North Carolinians are not only proud of how well the Canes played on the ice, we are proud of their sportsmanship that they displayed throughout the playoffs and really throughout the season. The Canes truly are a class act, and North Carolinians are proud to call them our own.

They give back to the community. It is amazing on Saturdays to see the number of young children grabbing their hockey sticks and going out to practice, and the Canes help with that.

Mr. Speaker, let the record show that hockey is here to stay in North Carolina. In less than a decade, in 1997, when the Hartford Whalers relocated to North Carolina, many of our northern friends questioned whether our fine southern State could support a hockey team. Well, Mr. Speaker, we sure proved that we could. Not only did the Carolina Hurricanes win the Stanley Cup, but we sold out every single game of the playoffs. Hockey is right up there with barbecue and beach music in terms of popularity in the Old North State. North Carolinians are proud of our Hurricanes, and as you have already heard, we cannot wait until next season.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 3 minutes to another son of North Carolina, Representative MIKE MCINTYRE.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 881, legislation congratulating the new National Hockey League Champions, the Carolina Hurricanes. Many thanks to my colleague, Mr. PRICE, for introducing this bill.

The 2006 Stanley Cup champions exemplify the qualities of a true team: dedication, determination, perseverance and professionalism; dedication to the pursuit of victory, determination to get the job done, perseverance never to stop, and the professionalism to play fairly and with honor and dignity.

Both the Hurricanes and their worthy opponents, the Edmonton Oilers, displayed in these Stanley Cup Finals exactly what hockey should be: energy and enthusiasm and excellence. The veteran leadership of Rod Brind'Amour, the youth and vigor of Erik Staal, the unexpected return of Eric Cole, and the rising talent of Cam Ward led the Hurricanes to capturing their first title in history.

And what a thrilling series in the Stanley Cup Finals. From the dramatic come-from-behind victory in the opening game through the final moments of a tense thriller in the last game. This was not just a win for the Hurricanes but also a great victory for all of North Carolina. Our State's first major league sports championship came in an unexpected form in a region known for its basketball. Hockey has found a home in the south, and the Carolina Hurricanes are here to stay. And their charity is also exemplified by Mike Commodore, who allowed his curly hair and beard to be clipped and shaved by fans who gave almost $15,000 for cancer research, which was done through the Jimmy V Celebrity Junior Golf Classic.

Throughout the years, the Stanley Cup has had the names of many of hockey's greats etched into its history, and today the U.S. House of Representatives congratulates the Carolina Hurricanes for joining this elite group.

This newspaper headline from a special edition of the Raleigh News & Observer says it all, that the ''Canes Reign.'' And, indeed, it has been a season of memories and one for the history books and one that we all look forward to having many more moments of Hurricane success. I say congratulations to the Carolina Hurricanes.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to close.

I had the good fortune on this past Saturday night to run into and spend some time with Dr. John Hope Franklin, one of the legendary historians of our time. And, of course, he, too, was talking about hockey, I think, which sort of is an indication of how widespread interest there is and it has become relative to North Carolina's winning the Stanley Cup.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the Stanley Cup is a trophy awarded to the winners of the annual National Hockey League playoffs. It is one of the most recognized symbols in North American sports, and it is at the center of several legends and superstitions. The Stanley Cup is treated like royalty, attended to by full-time chaperones who wear white gloves to carry it.

Unlike the trophies awarded by the other three major professional sports leagues of North America, the Stanley Cup is never kept. The Stanley Cup winners keep it for only 1 year unless they repeat as league champions. It is also the only trophy in professional sports that has the name of every member of the winning team engraved upon it.

The Carolina Hurricanes, based in Raleigh, North Carolina, will have the honor of keeping the Stanley Cup for the next year. The franchise won its first Stanley Cup title in its 26 years in existence using grit, togetherness and a rookie goalie who unexpectedly carried his team on the ride of their lives. The Carolina Hurricanes did what most deemed impossible when the season started; they won the Stanley Cup in a game seven showdown against Canadian hockey royalty. The Hurricanes worked hard for home ice all season, and it paid off when 22-year-old Cam Ward turned back the Edmonton Oilers 3–1 to win the Conn Smythe trophy as the post-season's most valuable player.

□ 2330

The Carolina Hurricanes are the second consecutive Southeast Division team to defeat a Northwest Division team in post-season play. The Tampa Bay Lightning during the 2003–2004 season, like the Hurricanes, defeated a team from the Northwest Division.

Congratulations to the players, coaches and North Carolina for winning the Stanley Cup. I know that Representative BRAD MILLER had intended to be here to also add his congratulations, so on his behalf, and not only on behalf of all North Carolinians, but on behalf of all of us in America, we congratulate this outstanding franchise for a job well done.

I urge passage.

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

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the hometown pride has been well received with the Hurricanes. At the beginning of the season, they dreamed the impossible dream, and they captured it. I believe that we as this body deserve no less than to recognize them for their effort.

I urge all Members to support the adoption of House Resolution 881.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the winners of this year's National Hockey League Championship—the Carolina Hurricanes.

The team's Stanley Cup victory last Monday night ended a seven-game championship series versus the Edmonton Oilers, and wrapped up a fantastic season with North Carolina's first major professional sports title.

I congratulate Hurricanes owner Peter Karmanos, general manager Jim Rutherford,

coach Peter Laviolette, team captain Rod Brind'Amour and all of the team's players, veterans and rookies alike, on their hard-earned success.

The team's 3–1 win in Game 7 of this year's Stanley Cup finals was proof that hard work pays off.

After years of losses and the trials involved in the team's move to North Carolina, the Hurricanes have conquered the world of hockey by winning the most famous trophy in the world of sports.

Despite hockey's short history in our region and sparse crowds in the team's early years on the ice, I have been amazed at how lovingly the people of North Carolina have embraced the former Hartford Whalers once they became the Hurricanes and owner Peter Karmanos moved the team to our state in 1997.

I am amazed that so many people in eastern North Carolina, who, like me, were not familiar with the sport of hockey, have grown to love the sport because of the Hurricanes.

Even in the town where I live, 68 miles East of Raleigh, I see countless cars flying the Hurricanes flag throughout the hockey season.

North Carolina residents, well-known fans of college basketball and NASCAR, have warmly embraced the sport of hockey by catching Hurricanes fever.

These athletes have become an integral part of their communities by actively involving themselves in the communities where they live.

For this, they have gained the respect and admiration of their North Carolina neighbors and fans.

When I go to a game, I am always so impressed by how many families I see cheering together for the Hurricanes, who we have welcomed into our communities and into the North Carolina family.

Their hard work, talent, and teamwork have been an incredible gift to loyal fans across the state.

There is a saying that a successful team beats with one heart.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with the team's Stanley Cup victory, it is without a doubt that the Carolina Hurricanes beat with one heart—the heart of a champion.

I am proud that the Hurricanes call North Carolina home and I congratulate their hard-earned success.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 883.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. SCHMIDT. 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 the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

BENEDICT ARNOLD PRESS?

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, we are fighting a war on terror, and now we are being told we are battling the press as well. The United States has rooted out terror on a global scale. They have also gotten unprecedented help from other countries and international banking institutions to seek out accounts used for al Qaeda money laundering, because without a supply of money, the terrorists have no fuse to light.

Now the New York Times has apparently detailed that security program to the entire world, and we find ourselves pondering what to do when the press willingly reveals national security secrets to terrorists.

Prior to World War II, the United States had broken the Japanese military communications codes. A journalist published a book revealing this classified information, so right before the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor, the Japanese changed their codes so the United States was unaware of this invasion.

In 1950, a law was passed making releasing such classified information a crime. If the New York Times has violated this law by becoming the Benedict Arnold press, they need to be held accountable. Not even a journalist from the Times has the right to violate the law just to get a byline.

And that's just the way it is.

REAUTHORIZE THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT NOW

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand partly the continued reasoning for the reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and I encourage my colleagues from Georgia and Texas to recognize that the vestiges of discrimination still require this particular initiative to be authorized and do so immediately.

This is a Supreme Court decision in the League of United Latin American Citizens versus the Governor of Texas. Specifically it says against this background, the Latinos' diminishing electoral support indicates their belief that the person was unresponsive to the particularized needs of the members of the minority group. In essence, the State took away the Latino's opportunity because Latinos were about to exercise it. This bears the mark of intentional discrimination that could give rise to an Equal Protection violation. The Voting Rights Act protects those from discrimination and protects their right to vote.

Although this opinion gives a reckless aspect to midterm redistricting, which I hope we can correct legislatively, it does reaffirm the value, the importance and the sanctity of the Voting Rights Act in encouraging and protecting all Americans' rights to vote.

I ask my colleagues to read this opinion for a better understanding of why the Voting Rights Act is an effective civil rights initiative that should be reauthorized.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. POE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HOUSE RECYCLING CAUCUS

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of Mr. DEFAZIO.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend Members of the other body, Mrs. SNOWE of Maine and Mr. CARPER of Delaware, for forming the Senate Recycling Caucus. Their effort compliments the prior formation of the House Recycling Caucus, which I was proud to establish with the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. GILLMOR.

I would suggest that the House and Senate Recycling Caucuses work together on issues facing the recycling industry in the United States. I would also like to urge my colleagues here in the House to join our respective caucuses.

When most of us think of recycling, we think either of the bright blue bins in our offices, or of collecting cans, bottles and newspapers at home. As important as municipal recycling is to our country, however, it represents just the tip of the iceberg of the $30 billion-plus manufacturing industry that employs over 1.1 million Americans.

Most of us are probably also unaware that recyclables is one of our country's largest export commodities and are

also one of the bright stars in our country's balance of trade.

Many like myself see recycling as an important environmental issue facing our country, but there are a whole host of other issues that face, and possibly inhibit, recycling in the United States, far beyond just getting people to throw cans in the proper receptacle. That is why we created the Recycling Caucus, so we can focus our efforts on this important sector and address not only environmental issues, but also issues of trade, energy and commerce.

Chief among those issues is the very simple statement that should guide any legislative efforts that impact this industry. Recyclables are not just waste and recycling is not just disposal. In fact, recycling is the opposite of both. By thinking of recycling as waste and recycling as a disposal activity like trash or garbage collection, we risk encouraging unintended consequences that can and do inhibit recycling.

We need to avoid inhibiting recycling efforts because the benefits are tremendous. For example, recycling kept over 140 million tons of material out of landfills last year. In addition, manufacturing products from recycled materials save energy. For example, using recycled aluminum can save as much as 95 percent of the energy used when producing products from virgin ore. Recycling also reduces eight major categories of water pollutants and ten major categories of air pollutants, including greenhouse gas emissions, compared with manufacturing from scratch.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank my caucus cochair, Mr. GILLMOR of Ohio, and our other colleagues who have already joined us on the House Recycling Caucus. I also want to thank the members and staff of the Institute of Scrap Recycling Industries for their assistance over the past 2 years in helping us make the idea of the caucus into a reality.

The Recycling Caucus is a broad-based caucus that will address all facets of recycling, with input from a wide range of associations, industry groups, experts, environmental organizations and other stakeholders.

Again I want to wish Mrs. SNOWE and Mr. CARPER much success in the other body. I look forward to working with them to promote all aspects of recycling in the United States.

STRAIGHT FACTS ABOUT IRAQ

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my 5-minute Special Order out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the President likes to say as the Iraqi people stand up, the U.S. will stand down. He has changed the mission from finding weapons of mass destruction to removing a dictator and bringing democracy to Iraq, saying the Iraqi people would decide what is best for their country. The President essentially likes to point to the recent formation of a new Iraq government as vindication of his policies and a turning point in bringing peace to a troubled land.

Last week, Iraqi Prime Minister Maliki announced a 24 point reconciliation to stabilize the country, his government's first major independent initiative. Within hours, we learned the U.S. had been deeply involved in watering down what the administration did not like about the Iraqi reconciliation plan, including two key elements, an offer of amnesty for insurgents and calling for a timetable for U.S. troop withdrawal.

Well, Mr. Speaker, you can't have it both ways. U.S. troops will never be able to leave Iraq as long as we stay the course of allowing the Iraqi government to make decisions only so long as we agree with.

After all the sacrifices made by the American people, after all the American soldiers lost in combat, wounded and psychologically scarred in combat, the President's Iraq strategy is evolving into a corporate subsidy strategy. Influential leaders at home and abroad are beginning to raise questions about the President's intentions.

Mr. Speaker, I will enter into the record three recent articles from the mainstream influential news media in the Mideast and the U.S. ''Sovereignty is just a word on paper until Iraq is allowed to run its own affairs,'' is the title of an editorial published in the Daily Star, a distinguished newspaper in Lebanon.

On the same day, the Daily Star reprinted a commentary originally published in the Los Angeles Times entitled: An Iraq Amnesty Will Split the Insurgency. The Arab News published a commentary entitled Reconciliation in Iraq: If Only Maliki Had Freedom of Action.

Thoughtful people are raising troubling questions. This is the conclusion of the Daily Star's editorial: ''The Iraqis need the space to make hard decisions that will help them restore stability in their country. But they will never find this space so long as the U.S. officials continue to micromanage the Iraqi government according to their own plan. What the Iraqis really need most now is what the Americans promised them long ago, freedom. And that ought to include the freedom to govern their own country in a way that would benefit the Iraqi people.''

The President keeps telling Congress and the American people that it is stated policy to let Iraq stand up. If that is the case, then the President cannot instruct the administration to hold the Iraqi government down. Otherwise, we are installing a U.S. government, run by Iraqis, and that is one of the worst fears of the Middle East.

If the President is going to follow his own policy, then Iraqi leaders may make decisions we don't like. If the President is calling the shots behind the scenes, then the new Iraqi government will have no credibility. Without credibility an Iraqi government is living on borrowed time, and we know it.

This Nation has some history with attempts to install or prop up governments around the world beholden to the United States, and the record is dismal. How many times have we thrown billions at so-called friends, only to see these leaders ousted or ignored because they are seen as puppets of the United States?

The Arab News commentary says, ''If left to his own devices Iraq's new Prime Minister Maliki has a good chance of uniting his fractured country and stamping out the violence. But there is just one problem. U.S. internal politics appear to be thwarting his efforts.''

Running Iraq from behind the scenes cannot be the President's definition of stay the course, or the U.S. will stay in Iraq indefinitely. The Iraq war has divided this Nation, and the Iraq government's decisions on difficult issues like amnesty for insurgents will divide America even more.

The President said he wanted a free and independent Iraq. Well, perhaps he got what he wanted. Now what is he going to do about it?

□ 2345

Finding a way to end the war can be as difficult as finding a way to start a war. It will be impossible unless the President starts talking straight to the American people and to the Iraqi people. You cannot install a puppet government and think that that is going to fool the Iraqis. They will continue to attack, which will keep our troops there and keep the death going.

We must be honest about what our policy in Iraq really is.

[From the Arab News, June 27, 2006]

RECONCILIATION IN IRAQ: IF ONLY MALIKI HAD FREEDOM OF ACTION

(By Linda Heard)

If left to his own devices Iraq's new Prime Minister Nuri Al-Maliki has a good chance of uniting his fractured country and stamping out the violence. But there is just one problem. U.S. internal politics appear to be thwarting his efforts.

On Sunday, Al-Maliki presented his Parliament with a 24-point national reconciliation plan that was backed by Sunni opposition figures. This included amnesty for insurgents without blood on their hands, further prisoner releases, and a timetable for Iraqis to takeover all aspects of their country's security.

Des Browne, Britain's defense secretary, applauded the moves saying, ''There is no conflict in the world that has been resolved without dealing with the issue of reconciliation. Reconciliation requires risks, whether it is in South Africa, Northern Ireland or the Balkans . . .''

These are undoubtedly good steps on the road to cementing various factions but earlier press releases suggest Al-Maliki's initial grand design has been considerably watered-down.

According to a report in last Friday's Times newspaper titled ''Peace deal offers

Iraq insurgents an amnesty'' Al-Maliki was set to ''promise a finite, U.N.-approved timeline for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Iraq; a halt to U.S. operations against insurgent strongholds'' and an amnesty to insurgents responsible for the deaths of American forces.

In the event, the above crucial points were excluded from the prime minister's proposals.

In light of the turnaround, it is almost certain that U.S. officials have been busy whispering in his ear. On Thursday, Democratic senators proposed a vote to begin the drawdown of U.S. troops but were rebuffed by mostly Republican opponents, who believe an earl pullout would empower terrorists, weaken the U.S.-sponsored Iraqi government and endanger the security of the U.S.

In reality, most Bush supporters perceive the argument in terms of America winning or losing the war placing concerns about Iraq's stability secondary. For them an imminent withdrawal would be tantamount to an admission of failure or, worse, surrender that they fear will affect the outcome of next November's midterm elections.

The idea that insurgents could be forgiven for the killing of U.S. military personnel has also failed to sit well with either members of the U.S. administration or Congress, who predict public outrage.

An article by Lincoln Lease, a U.S. Army specialist serving in Baghdad, published on insidebayarea.com illustrates how some Americans might view that move.

Lease writes: ''I take personal offense to Al-Maliki's proposition to grant any kind of amnesty—limited or unlimited—to any insurgent who has been involved in terrorism against the United States. It seems to me that Al-Maliki has slapped all the families of wounded or dead soldiers in the face.''

The idea that the Iraqi leader is intent on humiliating the families of American soldiers or bent on offending Lincoln Lease and his ilk is entirely preposterous.

Al-Maliki faces not only the daunting task of quelling a bloody insurgency; he must also rid his country of foreign fighters, gain control over sectarian militias and commence the rebuilding process.

To do this he must bring his people together in a process of forgiveness and reconciliation, a process that cannot be effective as long as Iraqi insurgents are being labeled ''terrorists'' for their attempts to oust invading armies that from the standpoint of most Iraqis entered the country under false pretences in the first place.

In his article Lease asks Al-Maliki ''How can you even consider the possibility of granting any kind of reprieve for any insurgent? How can you view these terrorists as patriots defending their country? How can you justify the murder of U.S. soldiers on your streets? We came here to rebuild Iraq, not to occupy it.''

Poor Lincoln Lease has patently fallen hook, line and sinker for the official line. He says, ''we came here to rebuild Iraq'' while every one knows the reason given for the invasion was Iraq's stockpiles of WMD which turned out to be nonexistent.

He might also be reminded that billions of dollars slated for reconstruction have been channeled elsewhere or simply disappeared into the ether. Moreover, his government's construction of up to five permanent military bases and the largest and most fortified embassy in the world indicates Americans plan to stay in Iraq for the long haul.

While it is tragic that 2,500 U.S. soldiers have lost their lives since the 2003 invasion, new official figures point to the deaths of 50,000 Iraqi civilians during the same period; 20,000 more than George W. Bush's recent estimate.

If Lease, who began his rant by expressing his ''rage and contempt'' was sincere in his concern for military families, he would be backing an imminent military pullout rather than focusing on his own ego-led sensibilities.

A growing number of specialist think-tanks and Middle East pundits are now of the opinion that the very presence of foreign troops serves to fuel the insurgency, while evidence points to the fact that far from bettering the lives of Iraqis the occupation has thrust their war-torn land into an abyss of desperation and despair.

Should Lease care to relinquish his rose-colored spectacles for a moment, he might care to read the recently leaked memo from the U.S. Ambassador to Iraq Zalmay Khalilzad to the U.S. State Department that reveals a country in turmoil, run by armed militias, its people traumatized by fear.

Dated June 6 and published by the Washington Post, the memo highlights negative experiences encountered by nine members of the U.S. Embassy's staff afraid to tell even family members that they work for the Americans.

It's been three years and three months since ''Shock and Awe''. The Bush administration has surely had its chance to bring some semblance of normality to Iraq and has failed dismally. There is only one thing left for it to do and that is to back off and allow Al-Maliki a free hand.

Former U.S. Secretary of State Colin Powell was famously reported as telling Bush ''if you break it, you'll own it'' with reference to Iraq. That may be true but the only ones who can give that country back together are the Iraqis themselves. It's time they were given that chance.

[From the Daily Star, June 28, 2006]

AN IRAQ AMNESTY WILL SPLIT THE INSURGENCY

(By Henri J. Barkey)

The new Iraqi government is considering giving amnesty to some insurgents, including those who committed attacks against the United States, other coalition forces and the Iraqi military. It's understandable that many U.S. soldiers and other Americans would find the idea offensive. Nevertheless, it is critical for the Bush administration to quietly back the proposal behind the scenes.

The details of the amnesty haven't been announced, and the details are crucial. It would be a grave mistake to offer amnesty to the foreign fighters who have poured into Iraq to help with—or foment—the insurgency. But amnesty for former Baathists and other Sunni rejectionists could help divide them from their Al-Qaeda comrades, to the benefit of Iraq and the U.S. However distasteful, some sort of amnesty is a prerequisite for Iraqi reconciliation. American troops will leave one day, and the Iraqis will have to find a way to live together. If the U.S. wants to succeed in Iraq, it must put Iraqi interests first.

The killing of the Al-Qaeda leader in Iraq, Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, has created an unprecedented opportunity for the new Iraqi government. Zarqawi triggered resentment not just because he slaughtered civilians indiscriminately but because he hogged international attention, eclipsing his homegrown jihadist competitors.

Moreover, although he controlled only a segment of the Iraqi insurgency, Zarqawi had an aura of invincibility. His death gives the Iraqi government a chance to divide and co-opt the insurgents, exploiting whatever intelligence was gained in the Zarqawi raids and whatever disarray his death has created to score more military gains.

The government of Prime Minister Nuri al-Maliki enjoys more legitimacy than its predecessors, and for the first time it includes bona fide Sunni representatives. But it needs to change the pessimistic mood in Iraq while retaining the goodwill of its American backers. As a sovereign government, Iraq has every right to set the terms of the amnesty, but it should proceed with caution.

An amnesty aimed only at insurgents not affiliated with Al-Qaeda would deepen the divide between the foreign and Iraqi fighters. On the other hand, an amnesty for those who perpetrated the hideous and indiscriminate bombings of mosques and marketplaces would both condone terror and validate the insurgents' cause. Anyone involved in recruiting suicide bombers, or planning or helping execute bombing attacks, should not qualify for amnesty.

Americans will find it repugnant that those who blew up our soldiers may get off scot-free. But ironically, that outcome is in our best interests. An Iraqi government that insists, in the face of American objections, on implementing an amnesty would demonstrate to its people, especially the Sunnis, that it is not a stooge of Washington, that it is capable of acting independently of the Bush administration. And the stronger and more independent the Iraqi government is, the more likely that U.S. soldiers can come home.

Amnesties have succeeded in ending insurgencies in many other countries because they bring the rebels in from the cold and undermine their support structure. Algeria, which experienced some of the most violent civil strife of the modern era, offered repeated amnesties, and today its nightmare appears to be ending. Turkey, which has refused even to consider a meaningful amnesty for its Kurdish rebels, is engaged in a seemingly unending low-intensity conflict.

Amnesties alone are not a panacea. There will always be die-hards for whom the cause is too sacred or for whom violence is a raison d'etre. Still, every militant has an extended family network. These relatives are unwittingly drafted into the conflict; they are likely to worry about their sons' or brothers' fates, to be extremely antagonistic toward the authority pursuing them and to help fighters evade their pursuers. A meaningful amnesty, accompanied by a counter-insurgency campaign, can turn these relatives into allies. They will, often for their own sakes, put pressure on fighters to take advantage of such an offer.

In Iraq, the jihadists Zarqawi trained will not lay down their arms, but their Iraqi brethren may do so—and betray the foreigners to save their own skins. Even a few such victories would give the counter-insurgency momentum and the Maliki government breathing space. A decisive victory against the Iraqi insurgency could take a decade or more. But Washington and Baghdad have demonstrated that they can be allies for the long haul. Washington can best demonstrate its commitment to the new government accepting an Iraqi amnesty that allows Maliki to give his foes a reason to lay down their arms.

[From the Daily Star, June 27, 2006]

SOVEREIGNTY IS JUST A WORD ON PAPER UNTIL IRAQ IS ALLOWED TO RUN ITS OWN AFFAIRS

Back in June 2004, the U.S. administrator in Iraq, L. Paul Bremer, handed a leather-bound document to then-interim Prime Minister Iyad Allawi, and with this symbolic gesture pronounced Iraq a free and sovereign state. One could easily challenge the fantasy that the Americans ever really owned Iraq's sovereignty and could return it or withhold it as they pleased. But in addition, one could easily challenge the idea that the Iraqis have been ''granted'' any sovereignty at all.

Although sovereignty was long ago transferred, the Iraqis remain on the receiving end of a 9,996-kilometer screwdriver that officials in Washington still wield in their effort to shape the future of Iraq. The most recent example of U.S. tutelage at work was the amending of an amnesty plan put forth by Premier Nuri al-Maliki on Sunday. An earlier version offered to pardon Iraqi insurgents who have attacked U.S. troops. But after a series of closed-door talks between U.S. and Iraqi officials, Maliki announced a watered-down version of the amnesty, one which is unlikely to lure any of the major insurgent groups that aren't already participating in the political process.

It is understandable that U.S. officials would react with outrage to the idea of forgiving insurgents with American blood on their hands. As Senator Carl Levin said, ''the idea that they should even consider talking about amnesty for people who have killed people who liberated their country is unconscionable.'' But Senator Levin and others like him seem to forget that liberating something means setting it free.

The Iraqis need the space to make hard decisions that will help them restore stability in their country. But they will never find this space so long as U.S. officials continue to micro-manage the Iraqi government according to their own plan. What the Iraqis really need most now is what the Americans promised them long ago: freedom. And that ought to include the freedom to govern their own country in a way that will benefit the Iraqi people.

REINTEGRATING EX-OFFENDERS BACK INTO NORMAL LIFE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the problem of successfully reintegrating ex-offenders back into normal life is one of the major issues facing especially low-income and minority communities throughout the Nation.

This problem continues to fester throughout the United States of America. It is indeed a social as well as a public safety problem. Nearly 650,000 people are being released from Federal and State prisons this year. There are over 3,200 jails throughout the United States, the vast majority of which are operated by county governments. Each year these jails will release in excess of 10,000 people back into communities throughout the Nation. We will continue to have these massive releases over the next several years. The massive increase in incarceration in the United States that occurred during the past 25 years now must turn public attention toward the consequences of incarceration without providing meaningful rehabilitation measures and access to reentry programs and opportunities.

As we know, the large numbers of ex-offenders being released from prison will cause enormous public safety problems for many communities, especially where large numbers of ex-offenders will return and live in the same neighborhoods.

The Justice Department reported that the cost of crime to victims is approximately $450 billion a year. Therefore, these communities will absorb the high cost of further victimization as a result of the presence of such a high number of ex-offenders.

The Congressional Black Caucus is concerned about the administration not requesting or adequately funding the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program, Residential Substance Abuse Treatment Program, Gang Prevention Program, Juvenile Accountability Block Grant, Juvenile Delinquency Block Grants and other programs.

The Congressional Black Caucus recommended increasing the funding level up to $3.1 billion for Justice programs and to expand the re-entry programs for nonviolent ex-offenders to facilitate their transition from prison to normal community life.

The CBC wants to ensure that specific programs are receiving adequate funding to prevent crime, increase public safety, and reduce recidivism. We, of course, can do that by passing the Second Chance Reentry Bill that now has more than 100 sponsors in the House, 22 sponsors in the Senate, is actually awaiting markup in the Judiciary Committee. And I would urge all of my colleagues to sign on, join up, help rehabilitate and prepare the individuals who are coming home from jail and prison. Support the Second Chance Reentry Bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURGESS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. OSBORNE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BILIRAKIS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GOHMERT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TRIBUTE TO THE DAHL FAMILY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Dahl family of Viroqua, Wisconsin. With their operation of the Dahl Pharmacy for more than 100 years and four generations, the Dahls wove themselves into the fabric of their community. Their pharmacy has been one of the pillars of Viroqua's downtown buisness district for over a century. From medication to a soda fountain, prescriptions to snacks, all sorts of services have been available to old and young alike since the early 1900s.

Chuck and Karen Dahl are good friends of mine who owned and operated the pharmacy for many years. Decent, principled people, the Dahls worked hard to grow a successful small buisness that would be attentive to local concerns. They have been actively involved in their community, displaying their belief in the responsibility to give back to the people who allowed their business to prosper. The Dahls' leadership has made the city of Viroqua and Vernon County better places to live, work, and raise children. In 2001, Chuck and Karen passed the Dahl Pharmacy along to another generation by selling it to Chuck's daughter, Katherine Dahl.

The Dahl Pharmacy, like many providers throughout the Nation, is facing a myriad of complications with the new Medicare Prescription Drug Plan. I commend Dahl and all the other pharmacies which have been on the frontlines of this new program. They have tirelessly served seniors uncertain about the new Medicare Part D regulations.

The Dahl family business will close its doors for the last time on June, 28 but leave behind a lasting legacy by having been a focal point in Viroqua for generations. The people of Viroqua have countless wonderful memories linked with the Dahl Pharmacy. Generations of residents have grown up with the pharmacy as a fixture in their childhood and a mainstay in their community. Known for their friendly, fast, and precise service, the Dahls established personal connections with their customers that went beyond the normal owner-client relationship.

I Want to thank the Dahl family for their many years of service to the Viroqua community. While the Dahl Pharmacy will be missed, I wish the family the best of luck in their future endeavors.

[From the Vernon County Broadcaster]

DAHL PHARMACY TO CLOSE JUNE 28

(By Tim Hundt)

Dahl Pharmacy in Viroqua will shut its doors for good on June 28 due to a buyout by national competitor Walgreens.

The business has been in Viroqua for more than 100 years and has been owned by four generations of the Dahl family.

Dahl Pharmacy owner Katherine Dahl said she informed employees on Sunday that she had reached a deal with Walgreens and would be closing the doors. She said all employees would be first in line for positions at the new Walgreens store that will open in Viroqua the following day, June 29.

''I thought about this for a long, long, long time,'' Dahl said. ''I discussed it a lot with friends. I finally decided this was something I should do.''

Dahl said she was concerned about the business and her employees with two new pharmacies set to open in June that would directly compete with her operation.

''The hospital will be opening its new pharmacy and Walgreens was also opening,'' Dahl said. ''My concern was for the employees and to have continuity for them.''

Dahl said as a part of the deal she reached with Walgreens executives, she will work for the company as a pharmacist for at least a year and all Dahl employees will be given first opportunity for employment at the new store.

''They were very interested in our employees because they know the people and they know the medical community here,'' Dahl said.

Dahl said the deal includes the prescription files of the pharmacy as well as the store's inventory of prescription and over-the-counter medication. Dahl said her store will close the evening of the June 28, the inventory and staff will move to the new store and Walgreens will open the morning of June 29.

Dahl said Walgreens emphasis on customers also sold her on the deal.

''I researched their company literature and they are really focused on the pharmacy aspect of the business,'' Dahl said. ''All of their store managers are pharmacists.''

As for closing a business that has been one of the pillars of Viroqua's downtown business community, Dahl said it has been difficult.

''Every employee reacts differently, but there have been a few tears,'' Dahl said.

Steve Felix of Felix's Men's and Women's Wear, which is the second oldest business in Viroqua, was concerned about the development.

''The big guys will come,'' Felix said. ''People have to make choice about where they want to shop and if they don't support downtown businesses they won't be here. Just because a business is 100 years old doesn't necessarily mean they will be 101.''

Karen Dahl, wife of Chuck Dahl, who was the third generation Dahl to own the pharmacy before it was sold to Katherine in 2001, said her husband was saddened by the news.

''He is sad because it is an end of era,'' Karen Dahl said. ''The timing is good for employees and clients that will have a smooth transition to the new store, but it is sad for the community.''

Karen Dahl said she is concerned about other small businesses in the community.

''We pay an enormous amount of property tax, as does any small business, but I think granting TIF district tax deferment to a major corporation heavily weighs things against local business owners,'' Dahl said.

Last year the city of Viroqua granted about $600,000 to the developer of the Walgreens site. A group of citizens protested the use of TIF district funding for the Walgreens project, but city officials said that without the incentives, the project would not have gone forward.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MCHENRY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

STATUS REPORT ON CURRENT SPENDING LEVELS OF ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FY 2007 AND THE 5-YEAR PERIOD FY 2007 THROUGH FY 2011

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I am transmitting a status report on the current levels of on-budget spending and revenues for fiscal year 2007 and for the five-year period of fiscal years 2007 through 2011. This report is necessary to facilitate the application of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act and sections 401 and 501 of H. Con. Res. 376, which is currently in effect as a concurrent resolution on the budget in the House under H. Res. 818. This status report is current through June 23, 2006.

The term ''current level'' refers to the amounts of spending and revenues estimated for each fiscal year based on laws enacted or awaiting the President's signature.

The first table in the report compares the current levels of total budget authority, outlays, and revenues with the aggregate levels set by H. Con. Res. 376. This comparison is needed to enforce section 311(a) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the budget resolution's aggregate levels. The table does not show budget authority and outlays for years after fiscal year 2007 because appropriations for those years have not yet been considered.

The second table compares the current levels of budget authority and outlays for discretionary action by each authorizing committee with the ''section 302(a)'' allocations made under H. Con. Res. 376 for fiscal year 2007 and fiscal years 2007 through 2011. ''Discretionary action'' refers to legislation enacted after the adoption of the budget resolution. This comparison is needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which creates a point of order against measures that would breach the section 302(a) discretionary action allocation of new budget authority for the committee that reported the measure. It is also needed to implement section 311(b), which exempts committees that comply with their allocations from the point of order under section 311(a).

The third table compares the current levels of discretionary appropriations for fiscal year 2007 with the ''section 302(b)'' suballocations of discretionary budget authority and outlays among Appropriations subcommittees. The comparison is also needed to enforce section 302(f) of the Budget Act because the point of order under that section equally applies to measures that would breach the applicable section 302(b) suballocation.

The fourth table gives the current level for 2008 of accounts identified for advance appropriations under section 401 of H. Con. Res. 376. This list is needed to enforce section 401 of the budget resolution, which creates a point of order against appropriation bills that contain advance appropriations that are: (i) not identified in the statement of managers or (ii) would cause the aggregate amount of such appropriations to exceed the level specified in the resolution.

The fifth table provides the current level of the nondefense reserve fund for emergencies established by section 501 of H. Con. Res 376. The table is required by section 505 of the budget resolution, and is needed to determine whether an increase in the reserve fund, allocations and aggregates will be necessary for any pending legislation that contains emergency-designated discretionary budget authority.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET—STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2007 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 376

[Reflecting Action Completed as of June 23, 2006—On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal years—	
	2007	2007–2011
Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	2,283,029	n.a.
Outlays	2,325,998	n.a.
Revenues	1,780,666	10,039,909
Current Level:		
Budget Authority	1,376,961	n.a.
Outlays	1,712,391	n.a.
Revenues	1,787,094	10,189,839
Current Level over (+) / under (−) Appropriate Level:		
Budget Authority	−906,068	n.a.
Outlays	−613,607	n.a.
Revenues	6,428	149,930

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations Acts for fiscal years 2008 through 2011 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Enactment of measures providing new budget authority for FY 2007 in excess of $906,068,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2007 budget authority to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 376.

OUTLAYS

Enactment of measures providing new outlays for FY 2007 in excess of $613,607,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause FY 2007 outlays to exceed the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 376.

REVENUES

Enactment of measures that would reduce revenue for FY 2007 in excess of $6,428,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate level set by H. Con. Res. 376.

Enactment of measures resulting in revenue reduction for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2011 in excess of $149,930,000,000 (if not already included in the current level estimate) would cause revenues to fall below the appropriate levels set by H. Con. Res. 376.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE 302(A) ALLOCATIONS FOR DISCRETIONARY ACTION, REFLECTING ACTION COMPLETED AS OF JUNE 23, 2006

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	2007		2007–2011 Total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Agriculture:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Armed Services:				
Allocation	45	45	45	45
Current level	0	0	0	0
Difference	−45	−45	−45	−45
Education and the Workforce:				
Allocation	0	1	0	30
Current level	1	0	5	4
Difference	1	−1	5	−26
Energy and Commerce:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Financial Services:				
Allocation	0	0	2	2
Current level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	−2	−2
Government Reform:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
House Administration:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
International Relations:				
Allocation	1	1	5	5
Current level	0	0	0	0
Difference	−1	−1	−5	−5
Judiciary:				
Allocation	19	16	116	113
Current level	0	0	0	0
Difference	−19	−16	−116	−113
Resources:				
Allocation	0	0	6	6
Current level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	−6	−6
Science:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Small Business:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0
Transportation and Infrastructure:				
Allocation	13	13	22	22
Current level	0	0	0	0
Difference	−13	−13	−22	−22
Veterans' Affairs:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current level	−3	−3	0	0
Difference	−3	−3	0	0
Ways and Means:				
Allocation	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0
Difference	0	0	0	0

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2007—COMPARISON OF CURRENT LEVEL WITH APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE 302(a) ALLOCATION AND APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE 302(b) SUBALLOCATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

Appropriations Subcommittee	302(b) suballocations as of June 6, 2006 (H.Rpt. 109–488)		Current level reflecting action completed as of June 23, 2006		Current level minus suballocations	
	BA	OT	BA	OT	BA	OT
Agriculture, Rural Development, FDA	17,812	19,497	7	5,827	−17,805	−13,670
Defense	377,357	393,165	42	142,855	−377,315	−250,310
Energy & Water Development	30,017	31,411	0	12,624	−30,017	−18,787
Foreign Operations	21,300	23,441	0	14,607	−21,300	−8,834
Homeland Security	32,080	38,711	0	19,234	−32,080	−19,477
Interior-Environment	25,889	26,902	0	10,660	−25,889	−16,242
Labor, HHS & Education	141,930	145,631	19,168	100,082	−122,762	−45,549
Legislative Branch	4,030	4,013	0	622	−4,030	−3,391
Military Quality of Life-Veterans Affairs	94,705	88,728	−2,329	18,768	−97,034	−69,960
Science-State-Justice-Commerce	59,839	62,143	0	23,536	−59,839	−38,607
Transportation-Treasury-HUD-Judiciary-DC	67,819	130,069	4,273	75,894	−63,546	−54,175
Unassigned	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total (Section 302(a) Allocation)	872,778	963,711	21,161	424,709	−851,617	−539,002

Statement of FY2008 advance appropriations under section 401 of H. Con. Res. 376, reflecting action completed as of June 23, 2006

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget Authority
Appropriate Level	23,565
Current Level:	
Elk Hills	0
Corporation for Public Broadcasting	0
Employment and Training Administration	0
Education for the Disadvantaged	0
School Improvement	0
Children and Family Services (Head Start)	0
Special Education	0
Vocational and Adult Education	0
Transportation (highways, transit, Farley Building)	0
Payment to Postal Service	0
Section 8 Renewals	0
Total	0
Current Level over (+) / under (−) Appropriate Level	−23,565

Statement of nondefense reserve fund for emergencies under section 501 of H. Con. Res. 376, discretionary budget authority for FY2007, reflecting action completed as of June 23, 2006

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget Authority
Appropriate Level	6,450
Current Level	0
Current Level over (+) / under (−) Appropriate Level	−6,450

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, June 28, 2006.

Hon. JIM NUSSLE,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2007 budget and is current through June 23, 2006. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 376, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2007, as approved by the House of Representatives. Although the House and the Senate have not reached agreement on a concurrent budget resolution for 2007, H. Con. Res. 376 has the force and effect in the House for all purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as though adopted by the Congress pursuant to House Resolution 818.

Pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the enclosed current level report excludes these amounts (see footnote 1 of the report). This is my first report for fiscal year 2007.

Sincerely,

DONALD B. MARRON,
Acting Director.

Enclosure.

FISCAL YEAR 2007 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF JUNE 23, 2006

[In Millions of Dollars]

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Enacted in previous sessions: [1]			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	1,819,599

FISCAL YEAR 2007 HOUSE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT AS OF JUNE 23, 2006—Continued

[In Millions of Dollars]

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,355,241	1,303,587	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	409,185	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	−549,710	−549,710	n.a.
Total, enacted in previous sessions:	805,531	1,163,062	1,819,599
Enacted this session:			
An act to make available funds included in the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program for fiscal year 2006, and for other purposes (P.L. 109–204)	−1,000	−520	0
Native American Technical Corrections Act of 2006 (P.L. 109–221)	11	11	0
Tax Increase Prevention and Reconciliation Act of 2005 (P.L. 109–222)	0	0	32,674
Heroes Earned Retirement Opportunities Act (P.L. 109–227)	0	0	−4
Veterans' Housing Opportunity and Benefits Improvement Act of 2006 (P.L. 109–233)	−3	−3	0
Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006 (P.L. 109–234) [2]	0	388	168
Broadcast Decency Enforcement Act of 2005 (P.L. 109–235)	0	0	1
Mine Improvement and New Emergency Response Act of 2006 (P.L. 109–236)	1	0	1
Total, enacted this session:	−991	−124	−32,508
Entitlements and mandatories:			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs not yet enacted	572,421	549,453	n.a.
Total Current Level [2,3]	1,376,961	1,712,391	1,787,091
Total Budget Resolution	2,283,029	2,325,998	1,780,666
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	6,428
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	906,068	613,607	n.a.
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2007–2011:			
House Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	10,189,840
House Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	10,039,909
Current Level Over Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	149,931
Current Level Under Budget Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

1. The effects of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (P.L. 109–171) and the Federal Deposit Insurance Reform Conforming Amendments Act of 2005 (P.L. 109–173) are included in this section of the table, consistent with the budget resolution assumptions.

2. Pursuant to section 402 of H. Con. Res. 95, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2006, provisions designated as emergency requirements are exempt from enforcement of the budget resolution. As a result, the current level totals exclude $48 million in budget authority and $39,461 million in outlays from the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for Defense, the Global War on Terror, and Hurricane Recovery, 2006 (P.L. 109–234).

3. Excludes administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.
Notes: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

PRIVATE SECTOR MANDATE ANALYSIS FOR H.R. 4761

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, I am filing in the House a copy of the private sector mandate analysis for H.R. 4761, the Deep Ocean Energy Resources Act of 2006. This analysis was not included in the cost estimate prepared for the Committee on Resources' report on the bill.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, June 28, 2006.

Hon. RICHARD W. POMBO,
Chairman, Committee on Resources, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed estimate of the impacts of private-sector mandates in H.R. 4761, the Deep Ocean Energy Resources Act of 2006. CBO's analysis of the federal costs and intergovernmental impact of H.R. 4761 was transmitted on June 26, 2006.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Tyler Kruzich.

Sincerely,

DONALD B. MARRON,
Acting Director.

H.R. 4761—Deep Ocean Energy Resources Act of 2006

Summary: H.R. 4761 would make several changes to programs related to the development of federally-owned resources, particularly oil and natural gas production on the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS). The bill would impose new ''conservation of resources'' fees on oil and natural gas production on certain deep-water acreage, as well as on all deep-water acreage that is not in production. At the same time, the bill would make additional areas of the OCS available for lease for oil and natural gas production. It also would change some of the terms of existing leases to the benefit of the lessees.

CBO estimates that, if the bill were enacted, private entities would make additional payments to the government totaling about $12.5 billion over the 2007–2016 period. It is unclear whether those payments would be the result of new mandates as defined in the Unfunded Reform Mandates Act (UMRA).

Private-sector mandates contained in the bill: H.R. 4761 would establish a set of ''conservation of resources'' fees for certain leaseholders. Section 6 would amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to require that the Department of the Interior issue regulations establishing a ''conservation of resources'' fee set at $9 per barrel for oil and $1.25 per million Btu for natural gas on production from certain leased acreage. This fee would effectively apply to certain deep-water leases entered into in 1998 and 1999 that provided royalty relief regardless of the market price of oil or gas. Those leaseholders could avoid the fee, though, if they request that the Secretary of the Interior renegotiate the royalty relief provisions of their original leases so that they would pay royalties on oil and gas production when prices exceed $40.50 per barrel of oil and $6.75 per million Btu of natural gas (both prices in 2006 dollars). The Department of the Interior also would be required to issue regulations establishing a ''conservation of resources'' fee on all acreage that is not in production for both new and existing leases. The bill would direct the Secretary to set that fee at no less than $1 per acre and no more than $4 per acre. Both fees would apply retroactively to volumes produced since October 1, 2005.

CBO estimates that leaseholders affected by the fee on wells currently in production would pay an additional $11.4 billion over the next 10 years. assuming most leaseholders opt to pay royalties under a renegotiated lease instead of the proposed fee. The ''conservation of resources'' fee on leased acreage that is not in production would cost the private sector an estimated $1.1 billion over the

next 10 years. These costs to the private sector are equal to the fees that would be collected by the federal government, as reported in CBO's federal cost estimate of H.R. 4761 released on June 26, 2006.

It is, however, unclear whether these fees are mandates as defined in UMRA. The fees would apply to existing deep-water leases that include a standard provision providing that they are subject to ''all regulations issued pursuant to [the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act] in the future which provide for the prevention of waste and conservation of the natural resources of the Outer Continental Shelf and the protection of correlative rights therein.'' Excluded from UMRA's definition of ''federal private-sector mandate'' are duties ''arising from participation in a voluntary federal program.'' Therefore, CBO considers any requirements that are imposed pursuant to a voluntary contract with the federal government, such as a deep-water lease, not to be private-sector mandates. It is unclear whether the imposition of ''conservation of resources'' fees is so clearly contemplated by the existing lease agreements that it can be said to have been voluntarily accepted by the leaseholders and therefore is not a mandate under UMRA. If the fees do not constitute pre-existing duties under the leases, they would represent new enforceable duties imposed by H.R. 4761 and would be mandates under UMRA.

The bill contains other changes in the financial terms of oil and gas leases that would benefit the private sector. Under the bill, the Secretary of the Interior would offer some OCS areas for leasing that otherwise may not be leased over the next 10 years under current policies. Section 17 would direct the Secretary of the Interior to repurchase and cancel certain federal leases and to compensate the lessee for the amount that the lessee would receive in a restitution case for material breach of contract. Also, some terms of existing leases would be changed to the benefit of leaseholders.

Previous CBO estimate: CBO's analysis of the federal costs and intergovernmental impact of H.R. 4761 was transmitted on June 26, 2006.

Estimate Prepared by: Tyler Kruzich.

Estimate approved by: Joseph Kile, Assistant Director for Microeconomic Studies.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0025

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. CAPITO) at 12 o'clock and 25 minutes a.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 895, SUPPORTING INTELLIGENCE AND LAW ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMS TO TRACK TERRORISTS AND TERRORIST FINANCES

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109–539) on the resolution (H. Res. 896) providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 895) supporting intelligence and law enforcement programs to track terrorists and terrorist finances conducted consistent with Federal law and with appropriate Congressional consultation and specifically condemning the disclosure and publication of classified information that impairs the international fight against terrorism and needlessly exposes Americans to the threat of further terror attacks by revealing a crucial method by which terrorists are traced through their finances, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4761, DEEP OCEAN ENERGY RESOURCES ACT OF 2006

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109–540) on the resolution (H. Res. 897) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4761) to provide for exploration, development, and production activities for mineral resources on the outer Continental Shelf, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HOLDEN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of floods in the district.

Mr. KANJORSKI (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of business in the district.

Mr. ORTIZ (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today until 5:00 p.m. on account of important business in the district.

Mr. POE (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of speaking to a convention of police officers in San Antonio, Texas.

Mr. GERLACH (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today after 3:00 p.m. on account of flooding problems within the district.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KIND, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. NUSSLE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POMBO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, June 29.

Mr. TIAHRT, for 5 minutes, June 30.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2650. An act to designate the Federal courthouse to be constructed in Greenville, South Carolina, as the ''Carroll A. Campbell, Jr. Federal Courthouse''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mrs. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5403. An act to improve protections for children and to hold States accountable for the safe and timely placement of children across State lines, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 27 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until today, Thursday, June 29, 2006, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8327. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research Projects and Centers Program; Disability Rehabilitation Research Projects (DRRPs) received June 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8328. A letter from the Acting Legal Advisor to the Bureau Chief, WTB, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amdt. of Pt. 1, 21, 73, 74 & 101 of the Commission's Rules [WT Dkt. No. 03-66; RM-10586]; Pt. 1 of the Commission's Rules [WT Dkt. No. 03-67]; Amdt. of Pt. 21 & 74 [MM Dkt. No. 97-217]; Amdt. of Pt. 21 & 74 [WT Dkt. No. 02-68; RM-9718]; Promoting Efficient Use Of Spectrum Through Elimination of Barriers to the Dev. of Sec. Mrkts. [WT Dkt. No. 00-230]; Rev. of the Spectrum Sharing Plan Among Non-Geostationary Satellite Orbit Mobile Satellite Serv. [IB Dkt. No. 02-365]; Amdt. of Pt. 2 of the Commission's Rules to Allocate Spectrum Below 3 GHz for Mobile and Fixed Serv.

[ET Dkt. No. 00-258] Received June 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8329. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Revisions to Record Retention Requirements for Unbundled Sales Service, Persons Holding Blanket Marketing Certificates, and Public Utility Market-Based Rate Authorization Holders [Docket No. RM06-14-000; Order No. 677) received June 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8330. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Submission of Annual Financial Reports: Elimination of Requirement (RIN: 3150-AH39) received June 6, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

8331. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting Transmittal No. 06-09, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on International Relations.

8332. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Implementation of Unilateral Chemical/Biological (CB) Controls on Certain Biological Agents and Toxins; Clarification of Controls on Medical Products Containing Certain Toxins on the Australia Group (AG) Common Control Lists; Additions to the List of States Parties to the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) [Docket No. 060228055-6055-01] (RIN: 0694-AD62) received June 9, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 5061. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey Paint Bank National Fish Hatchery and Wytheville National Fish Hatchery to the State of Virginia (Rept. 109–533). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 413. A bill to establish the Bleeding Kansas and the Enduring Struggle for Freedom National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 109–534). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARTON of Texas: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 5534. A bill to establish a grant program whereby moneys collected from violations of the corporate average fuel economy program are used to expand infrastructure necessary to increase the availability of alternative fuels (Rept. 109–535). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARTON of Texas: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 5611. A bill to provide for the establishment of a partnership between the Secretary of Energy and appropriate industry groups for the creation of a transportation fuel conservation education campaign, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 109–536). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARTON of Texas: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 5632. A bill to amend Chapter 301 of title 49, United States Code, to establish a national tire fuel efficiency consumer information program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 109–537). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BARTON of Texas: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 5646. A bill to study and promote the use of energy efficient computer servers in the United States (Rept. 109–538). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Filed on June 29 (legislative day of June 28), 2006]

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 896. Resolution providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 895) supporting intelligence and law enforcement programs to track terrorists and terrorists finances conducted consistent with Federal law and appropriate Congressional consultation and specifically condemning the disclosure and publication of classified information that impairs the international fight against terrorism and needlessly exposes Americans to the threat of further terror attacks by revealing a crucial method by which terrorists are traced through their finances (Rep. 109–539). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. CAPITO: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 897. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4761) to provide for exploration, development, and production activities for mineral resources on the outer Continental Shelf, and for other purposes (Rep. 109–540). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. HAYES:

H.R. 5693. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income mileage reimbursements to volunteer emergency medical responders and volunteer firefighters and to increase the mileage allowance for charitable contributions for the benefit of volunteer fire departments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARROW:

H.R. 5694. A bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to require child care providers to provide to parents information regarding whether such providers carry current liability insurance; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. LINDER, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SIMMONS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. FOSSELLA):

H.R. 5695. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for the regulation of certain chemical facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. OSBORNE):

H.R. 5696. A bill to respond to the unreasonable and unnecessary Japanese prohibition on the importation of United States beef by prohibiting importation of Japanese beef into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POMBO (for himself and Mr. PORTER):

H.R. 5697. A bill to provide for the appropriate designation of certain Federal positions involved in wildland fire suppression activities; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mrs. BONO (for herself, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WAMP, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 5698. A bill to establish grants to provide health services for improved nutrition, increased physical activity, obesity and eating disorder prevention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. OBEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. LEE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. SOLIS):

H.R. 5699. A bill to provide Federal contracting preferences for, and a reduction in the rate of income tax imposed on, Patriot corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. AKIN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 5700. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to provide for a reduction in the number of boutique fuels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KNOLLENBERG:

H.R. 5701. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the annual contribution limit to Coverdell education savings accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDER:

H.R. 5702. A bill to suspend the excise tax on fuel used in commercial aviation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 5703. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for the purchase of qualified flexible fuel motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. BASS, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. HALL, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ROSS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. DENT, Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. WELLER, Mr. BOYD, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. JEFFERSON):

H.R. 5704. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a budget-neutral two-year moratorium on certain Medicare physician payment reductions for imaging services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REHBERG:

H.R. 5705. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct studies to determine the feasibility and environmental impact of rehabilitating the St. Mary Diversion and Conveyance Works and the Milk River Project, to authorize the rehabilitation and improvement of the St. Mary Diversion and Conveyance Works, to develop an emergency response plan for use in the case of catastrophic failure of the St. Mary Diversion and Conveyance Works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (for himself and Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin):

H.R. 5706. A bill to amend part D of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide for the pass through of all child support collected on behalf of families receiving assistance under the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHAYS (for himself and Mrs. MALONEY):

H.R. 5707. A bill to require the owner of a cruise ship that calls at a port in the United States to report to the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating crimes that occur on the cruise ship in which a citizen of the United States was a victim, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SWEENEY (for himself, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. KUHL of New York, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 5708. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2951 New York Highway 43 in Averill Park, New York, as the ''Major George Quamo Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 5709. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. Con. Res. 439. Concurrent resolution calling on the President to order the flag to be flown at half-staff upon the death of any member of the Armed Forces dying from an injury or illness incurred in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OXLEY:

H. Res. 895. A resolution supporting intelligence and law enforcement programs to track terrorists and terrorist finances conducted consistent with Federal law and with appropriate Congressional consultation and specifically condemning the disclosure and publication of classified information that impairs the international fight against terrorism and needlessly exposes Americans to the threat of further terror attacks by revealing a crucial method by which terrorists are traced through their finances; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. HOOLEY (for herself, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. WU):

H. Res. 898. A resolution congratulating the Oregon State University Beavers baseball team for winning the 2006 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I College World Series; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky:

H. Res. 899. A resolution congratulating Kentucky on being selected to host the 2010 Federation Equestre Internationale (FEI) Games; to the Committee on International Relations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

379. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Illinois, relative to Senate Resolution No. 740 memorializing the Congress of the United States to extend critical provisions of the Voting Rights Act of 1965; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

380. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Illinois, relative to Senate Resolution No. 523 encouraging the Congress of the United States to take action on federal immigration reform; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

381. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of The Mariana Islands, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 15-2 supporting the passage of S. 1954, the Insular Passessions Act of 2005; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

382. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 2021 urging the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to permit emergency workers and equipment to cross the international border with Mexico to address emergencies that threaten both sides of the border; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and International Relations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 47: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
H.R. 97: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. WYNN.
H.R. 156: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 503: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. CHANDLER.
H.R. 515: Mr. MCNULTY.
H.R. 533: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 550: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 558: Mr. ISTOOK.
H.R. 713: Miss MCMORRIS and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 807: Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 808: Mrs. EMERSON and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 968: Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota and Mr. ISTOOK.
H.R. 1070: Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 1106: Mr. GERLACH.
H.R. 1175: Mr. MURTHA.
H.R. 1227: Mr. WELLER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OXLEY, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 1384: Mr. PUTNAM.
H.R. 1441: Mr. WYNN.
H.R. 1548: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 1578: Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 1649: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 1687: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1876: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 1951: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2103: Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 2112: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Miss MCMORRIS, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. WAMP, Mr. GOODE, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Ms. FOXX, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. AKIN, and Mr. LINDER.
H.R. 2121: Mr. CHOCOLA.
H.R. 2184: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2421: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 2428: Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mrs. KELLY.
H.R. 2567: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 2631: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 2662: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 2716: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 2808: Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. GONZALEZ, MR. STARK, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. GRAVES, and Ms. HERSETH.
H.R. 3145: Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 3336: Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey.
H.R. 3584: Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 3760: Mr. WU.
H.R. 3762: Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 3795: Mr. CASTLE, Mr. CARTER, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. RAHALL.
H.R. 3950: Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 4188: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 4197: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 4217: Mr. SODREL.
H.R. 4264: Mr. CASE.
H.R. 4547: Mr. PUTNAM.
H.R. 4560: Mr. ENGLISH OF PENNSYLVANIA, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 4736: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
H.R. 4772: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 4773: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 4808: Mr. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 4873: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H.R. 4896: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 4914: Ms. CARSON.
H.R. 4927: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4942: Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 4953: Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 4987: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MCHUGH, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, and Mrs. CAPITO.
H.R. 5005: Mr. MCCRERY and Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 5092: Mr. ROSS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. OTTER, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. PUTNAM.
H.R. 5134: Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 5139: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 5145: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 5148: Ms. DELAURO and Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 5149: Mrs. BONO.
H.R. 5161: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 5182: Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BOYD, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 5201: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 5206: Mr. LAHOOD and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
H.R. 5236: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 5249: Mr. CONAWAY and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 5291: Mrs. DRAKE.
H.R. 5300: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 5317: Mr. TERRY and Ms. CARSON.
H.R. 5319: Mrs. DRAKE.
H.R. 5321: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 5333: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 5351: Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 5369: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 5371: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 5416: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 5444: Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 5453: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina and Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 5457: Mr. ROYCE and Mr. SODREL.

H.R. 5468: Mr. KOLBE.
H.R. 5496: Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 5513: Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 5515: Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 5538: Mr. BASS.
H.R. 5551: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 5556: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 5558: Mr. FEENEY and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 5562: Mr. WALSH.
H.R. 5587: Mr. FOLEY.
H.R. 5588: Ms. LEE, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. HOLT, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. DAVIS of Florida.
H.R. 5602: Mr. SIMMONS and Mr. OXLEY.
H.R. 5615: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 5640: Mr. CAMP of Michigan, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. Doggett, and Mr. EMANUEL.
H.R. 5653: Mr. PICKERING.
H.R. 5669: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Ms. WATSON.
H.R. 5680: Mr. ISSA and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 5682: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 5685: Mr. WALSH and Mr. SWEENEY.
H. Con. Res. 410: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
H. Con. Res. 434: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H. Con. Res. 435: Mr. GORDON.
H. Res. 189: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BAKER, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. FOSSELLA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. DENT, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H. Res. 222: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H. Res. 490: Mr. GORDON.
H. Res. 498: Mr. INSLEE and Mr. DENT.
H. Res. 526: Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 723: Mr. CARNAHAN.
H. Res. 760: Ms. HARMAN.
H. Res. 790: Mr. ROSS, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. KIND, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. GORDON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. HOYER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. WATT, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HERSETH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BERMAN, and Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan.
H. Res. 800: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H. Res. 823: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. HAYES, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
H. Res. 838: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H. Res. 871: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SOUDER, Ms. CARSON, and Ms. KAPTUR.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 5688: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

123. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Miami-Dade County Board of County Commissioners, Florida, relative to Resolution No. R-475-06 urging the Legislature of the State of Florida to enact House Bill 1363 commonly known as the Community Workforce Housing Innovation Program or similar legislation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 5672

OFFERED BY: MS. DEGETTE

AMENDMENT NO. 33: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by increasing the amount made available for ''OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS—JUSTICE ASSISTANCE'' and reducing the amount made available for ''DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—GENERAL ADMINISTRATION—SALARIES AND EXPENSES'', by $3,000,000.