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

NAYS—358

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

NOT VOTING—47

Abercrombie	Grijalva	Owens
Boehlert	Holden	Oxley
Bono	Hyde	Pascrell
Cannon	Istook	Pence
Cantor	Jindal	Peterson (PA)
Capuano	Johnson (IL)	Poe
Cardoza	Johnson, E. B.	Pombo
Carson	Johnson, Sam	Rangel
Cubin	Kanjorski	Sabo
Culberson	Matsui	Schakowsky
Davis (FL)	McCrery	Sherwood
Edwards	McKinney	Simpson
Engel	Melancon	Smith (NJ)
Evans	Millender-McDonald	Taylor (MS)
Fattah	Ortiz	Watson
Gingrey		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 $lB 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 co-author. 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 addtition 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
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 (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	Gingrey	Myrick
Akin	Gohmert	Neugebauer
Alexander	Goode	Ney
Bachus	Goodlatte	Northup
Baker	Granger	Norwood
Barrett (SC)	Graves	Nussle
Barrow	Gutknecht	Otter
Bartlett (MD)	Hall	Paul
Barton (TX)	Harris	Peterson (MN)
Bass	Hart	Peterson (PA)
Beauprez	Hayes	Pickering
Bilbray	Hayworth	Pitts
Bilirakis	Hefley	Platts
Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Poe
Blackburn	Herger	Pombo
Bonilla	Hobson	Porter
Bonner	Hoekstra	Price (GA)
Boozman	Hostettler	Pryce (OH)
Boustany	Hulshof	Putnam
Bradley (NH)	Hunter	Radanovich
Brady (TX)	Inglis (SC)	Rehberg
Brown (SC)	Issa	Reynolds
Brown-Waite, Ginny	Istook	Rogers (AL)
	Jenkins	Rogers (KY)
Burgess	Jindal	Rogers (MI)
Burton (IN)	Johnson (CT)	Rohrabacher
Buyer	Johnson (IL)	Royce
Camp (MI)	Jones (NC)	Ryun (KS)
Campbell (CA)	Keller	Schmidt
Cantor	Kelly	Schwarz (MI)
Carter	Kennedy (MN)	Shaw
Chocola	King (IA)	Shimkus
Coble	King (NY)	Shuster
Conaway	Kingston	Smith (TX)
Crenshaw	Kline	Sodrel
Cubin	Latham	Souder
Culberson	Leach	Stearns
Davis (KY)	Lewis (KY)	Sullivan
Davis, Jo Ann	Linder	Tancredo
Deal (GA)	Lucas	Taylor (MS)
Doolittle	Mack	Taylor (NC)
Drake	Manzullo	Terry
Dreier	Marchant	Thornberry
Duncan	McCotter	Tiahrt
Emerson	McCrery	Tiberi
Everett	McHenry	Turner
Feeney	McHugh	Upton
Foley	McKeon	Walden (OR)
Fortenberry	McMorris	Wamp
Fossella	Mica	Weldon (FL)
Foxx	Miller (FL)	Weldon (PA)
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Westmoreland
Gallegly	Miller, Gary	Whitfield
Garrett (NJ)	Moran (KS)	Wicker
Gibbons	Murphy	Wilson (SC)
Gillmor	Musgrave	Young (FL)

NOES—254

Abercrombie	Brown, Corrine	Davis (AL)
Ackerman	Butterfield	Davis (CA)
Allen	Calvert	Davis (IL)
Andrews	Capito	Davis (TN)
Baca	Capps	Davis, Tom
Baird	Capuano	DeFazio
Baldwin	Cardin	DeGette
Bean	Cardoza	Delahunt
Becerra	Carnahan	DeLauro
Berkley	Carson	Dent
Berman	Case	Diaz-Balart, L.
Berry	Castle	Diaz-Balart, M.
Biggert	Chabot	Dicks
Bishop (GA)	Chandler	Dingell
Bishop (NY)	Clay	Doggett
Blumenauer	Cleaver	Doyle
Blunt	Clyburn	Edwards
Boehlert	Cole (OK)	Ehlers
Boehner	Conyers	Emanuel
Bono	Cooper	Engel
Boren	Costa	English (PA)
Boswell	Costello	Eshoo
Boucher	Cramer	Etheridge
Boyd	Crowley	Farr
Brady (PA)	Cuellar	Fattah
Brown (OH)	Cummings	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	McMorris	Ryan (WI)
Hensarling	Meehan	Ryun (KS)
Herger	Meek (FL)	Salazar
Herseth	Melancon	Saxton
Higgins	Mica	Schiff
Hinojosa	Michaud	Schmidt
Hobson	Miller (FL)	Schwartz (PA)
Hoekstra	Miller (MI)	Schwarz (MI)
Hooley	Miller (NC)	Sensenbrenner
Hostettler	Miller, Gary	Sessions
Hulshof	Moran (KS)	Shadegg
Hunter	Murphy	Shaw
Inglis (SC)	Murtha	Shays
Issa	Musgrave	Shimkus
Istook	Myrick	Shuster
Jenkins	Neal (MA)	Simmons
Jindal	Neugebauer	Simpson
Johnson (CT)	Ney	Skelton
Jones (NC)	Northup	Smith (NJ)
Kaptur	Norwood	Smith (TX)
Keller	Nunes	Smith (WA)
Kelly	Nussle	Snyder
Kennedy (MN)	Ortiz	Sodrel
Kind	Osborne	Souder
King (IA)	Oxley	Spratt
King (NY)	Pascrell	Stearns
Kingston	Pearce	Strickland
Kirk	Pence	Stupak
Kline	Peterson (MN)	Sweeney
Knollenberg	Peterson (PA)	Tancredo
Kolbe	Petri	Tanner
Kuhl (NY)	Pickering	Tauscher
LaHood	Pitts	Taylor (MS)
Lantos	Platts	Taylor (NC)
Latham	Poe	Terry
LaTourette	Pombo	Thomas
Leach	Pomeroy	Thompson (MS)
Levin	Porter	Thornberry
Lewis (CA)	Price (GA)	Tiahrt
Lewis (KY)	Pryce (OH)	Tiberi
Linder	Putnam	Tierney
Lipinski	Radanovich	Turner
LoBiondo	Rahall	Upton
Lofgren, Zoe	Ramstad	Van Hollen
Lucas	Regula	Walden (OR)
Lungren, Daniel E.	Rehberg	Walsh
	Reichert	Wamp
Mack	Renzi	Waxman
Manzullo	Reyes	Weiner
Marchant	Reynolds	Weldon (FL)
Marshall	Rogers (AL)	Weldon (PA)
Matheson	Rogers (KY)	Weller
McCaul (TX)	Rogers (MI)	Westmoreland
McCollum (MN)	Rohrabacher	Whitfield
McCotter	Ros-Lehtinen	Wicker
McCrery	Ross	Wilson (NM)
McHenry	Royce	Wilson (SC)
McHugh	Ruppersberger	Wolf
McIntyre	Rush	Young (AK)
McKeon	Ryan (OH)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Cannon	Holden	Obey
Davis (FL)	Holt	Sherwood
Evans	Hyde	Sullivan
Ford	Johnson, Sam	
Gerlach	Kanjorski	

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
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.

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE *109th* CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

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

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable SAM BROWNBACK, a Senator from the State of Kansas.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Our Father, the architect of the universe, in spite of our doubts and fears, we come to You. We lean upon Your might because You sustain us through the seasons.

As our lawmakers face today's challenges, guide them with Your providence. Strengthen them to persevere toward their goals, knowing that a bountiful harvest is certain if they endure to the end. May their works make a difference for Your kingdom.

Again, we pray for our military men and women. Give them wisdom and courage and protect them from harm.

We pray in the Name of Emmanuel. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable SAM BROWNBACK 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS).

The legislative clerk read as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 28, 2006.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable SAM BROWNBACK, a Senator from the State of Kansas, to perform the duties of the Chair.

TED STEVENS,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BROWNBACK thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, this morning, we have set aside the first 2 hours of the session for a period of morning business. The first hour is under the control of the minority, and the second hour is under the control of the majority.

At the conclusion of morning business or shortly thereafter, we hope to turn to the Oman free-trade agreement. The Finance Committee is meeting this morning and expects to report out that measure. It is privileged and will be considered under the 20-hour statutory time limit. I don't expect that we will need all of the time, but some debate will be required. Senators can, therefore, expect a vote later today once we reach an understanding as to the time required on that bill.

This week, we will also consider the Paulson nomination to be Secretary of the Treasury, and we may also clear an appropriations bill for action.

Having said that, we will alert all Members as to the timing of the votes as we reach agreements on any of the legislative and executive items I just mentioned.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with the first hour under the control of the minority and the second hour under the control of the majority.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The minority leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I will use my leader time so the time will not go against the Democratic morning business time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada is recognized under his leader time.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as you know, outside these doors to my left is a beautiful room called the President's Room, or the Red Room. We call it the President's Room because for many decades, this was the place where Presidents came to sign legislation. During the past century, the 20th century, it wasn't used often at all. Rarely was it used for Presidents to come and sign legislation. But on August 6, 1965, it was used. The last time the Red Room, or the President's Room, was used for signing a bill into law was on a hot summer day of 1965. It had been a very hot summer. The purpose of President Lyndon Johnson coming to the Capitol to sign the bill here, rather than in the White House, was because it was the Voting Rights Act. The reason I say it was a very hot summer, it had been a hot couple of years.

I would direct everyone's attention to a wonderful book written by Taylor Branch, a relatively new book, published recently, called ''At Canaan's Edge.'' This book tells the story of a number of things, but one is how the Voting Rights Act became law. People

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

sacrificed their lives to allow this movement to go forward and, ultimately, to have this legislation passed.

So if we look back historically, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is one of the most magnificent pieces of legislation ever passed by Congress because what it did is jump forward 100 years following the Civil War and give African Americans the ability to register to vote. Counties and various States in the South that were basically all African American had no African-American voters. The Voting Rights Act changed that. And now African Americans all over this country, but especially in the South, have had their lives changed by not having to feel the crash of a baseball bat on their head like Reverend Reeb, who came to peacefully demonstrate to allow people to have the right to vote and was killed with the smash of a baseball bat on the side of his head. Lives were lost, I repeat, and many people were injured. Many were seriously injured in an attempt to exercise the basic right of voting in America.

Why do I bring this to the Senate's attention today? The reason I bring it to the Senate's attention today is, it was a short time ago, early May, and it was very hot in Washington, and we went to the east front on the House side to have a press conference. There were dozens of Members of Congress there. Cameras were there, and people were shoving for position so the camera could see them. Everybody was there to talk about the need to reauthorize the Voting Rights Act. The press event took a long time. We had a number of speakers there, and they all talked about how important it was that we reauthorize the Voting Rights Act. I was there, Senator FRIST was there, House leaders were there, chairman and ranking members of the Judiciary Committees were there, civil rights leaders were there to announce their support for the reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act. We stood together that day on the steps of the Capitol and announced a bipartisan, bicameral introduction of that bill.

I thought that day held great promise for the Congress and the Nation. The old days of the early 1960s were put behind us, and this would just go through here very quickly. I thought the legislation would be reauthorized and we would move down the road. I thought it showed great possibilities that leaders of both parties recognized that protecting the right to vote is not a partisan issue, it is an American issue and one we would join to support without qualification.

While finding common ground seems increasingly beyond our reach on many debates in the Senate, our joint support for the Voting Rights Act stood as a sign that we could still readily stand together to protect the rights upon which this Nation was founded.

In the weeks that followed, some progress was made in moving the bill forward in the House and the Senate. In both Chambers, an exhaustive record was built, demonstrating without question the continued need for the Voting Rights Act protections.

I am sorry to report that progress has stalled. It has really stalled. Last week, House leaders failed to follow through on their commitment to move this reauthorization in that body. It is now not clear when or even if the House will act. We urge them to do so quickly. But the fact that the House hasn't acted doesn't mean we cannot act in the Senate. The commitment we all made in May on the east front of the Capitol is a commitment that the American people are going to hold us to. As I have said, we need not wait for the House. I am told the Senate Judiciary Committee is going to complete a markup of this important legislation in July. I hope so. As we know, the original timetable was May.

Mr. President, I stand ready to work with my friend, the distinguished majority leader, to move this matter forward in the Senate, and let the House do what they feel they need to do. We need to have the Judiciary Committee complete its work, bring this to the Senate floor in July, and spend time on it, talking about how important this legislation has been and how that President's Room back there could be used by President Bush to come and sign the reauthorization of this bill. Hopefully he can do it this summer.

I don't stand alone in the pursuit of passing the reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act. More than 40 Democratic and Republican Senators have signed as cosponsors of this legislation. I really believe that together we can fulfill the commitment we made in May to support the voting rights of all Americans, without equivocation, by calling this bill up in July and moving forward with its swift passage.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDING pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHECKLIST FOR CHANGE

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, last week, the Democratic women of the Senate, led by our dean, Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI, held an event at the Sewall Belmont House, which I am very proud to say put forth what we are calling the checklist for change. We came together around the importance of an agenda in Congress that meets the needs of all of the American people.

We have been given an hour this morning to discuss these issues. Our first speaker, our leader, is the Senator from Maryland, who has paved the way for women not only in the Senate but in our country on so many issues. I am, with great pride, yielding to the Senator from Maryland.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York, as well as all of my colleagues, the nine Democratic women from the U.S. Senate.

We are united today. We, the Democratic women of the Senate, rise in a united way to launch something we are calling the Democratic Women for Change. We want to change the agenda that is going through the Senate. We want to change the tone in the Senate for one of more civility, and we want to change the schedule to get things done.

The Senate has only been in session about 75 days, less time than most State legislatures. And what have we debated? Divisive constitutional amendments and tax breaks for zillionaires.

I regret that the Republican leadership has squandered time, squandered opportunity, and squandered taxpayers' money. We spent time with bills focused on reelecting Republicans instead of helping American families. It is time we bring real issues to the floor. We have only 50 days left before this Senate adjourns. This is why we have done our checklist.

We have a must-do list for change. It is specific, it is immediate, it is realizable, and it is also affordable.

We women know about checklists. We remember all the important things that we need to get done by having a checklist. It is what we use to keep our families on track, and now we bring a checklist to the Senate to get America on track.

These are the challenges that we can meet right now by the time Congress adjourns for the fall elections. Each and every one of us has a specific issue we want to see done, and we want to check that off.

I am advocating for reliable pensions. I want to talk about retirement security and giving help to those people who practice self-help all of their lives. In the United States of America, everyone should retire with financial security.

Honoring your father and your mother is not only a good commandment to live by, it is a very good policy by which to govern. That is why we the Democratic women of the Senate fought to stop the privatization of Social Security, and we were successful. Now we stand sentry on the Senate floor to make sure Social Security is never ever privatized.

We believe that Social Security should be a guaranteed benefit, not a guaranteed gamble. We want to make sure Social Security is reliable, undeniable, and inflation proof.

But as we stand sentry, we are alarmed to see that a budget bill will come soon to the Senate floor that

could be a backdoor way of privatizing Social Security. The so-called budget reform bill will create a commission on entitlements, fast-track authority, but it is really a backdoor way to privatize Social Security.

Under the guise of empowering an unelected commission, they would have the authority to cut benefits, to turn it over to Wall Street where seniors would have to rely on the bull of political promises or the bear of a market. We, your Democratic women, are standing sentry, and we will not let this happen.

But we also want to support the private sector, the good guys in America's entrepreneurial and business community who provide pensions. So we are fighting for pensions that workers can count on and so that good-guy businesses would have clear rules coming out of the legislative framework on which they could depend. And we want to protect taxpayers from a bailout of companies dumping their programs on a government program.

Where are we now? A pension bill has been languishing. We are stalled, we are sputtering, we are dithering. It has been 180 days since the House and the Senate passed each bill on pensions, and 110 days since conferees were named—110 days.

After all is said and done, more is being said than gets done. Time is running out. We must pass this bill. But most of all, time is running out on this Congress. The American people are running out of patience. That is why we bring to the Senate our economic list for change, and we ask that we adopt this checklist and let's bring about change that will make a difference for our constituents.

I now yield the floor to my wonderful colleague from New York, Mrs. CLINTON, and thank her for all of the extra work she is doing in standing up for New York and standing up for America.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I applaud my friend and colleague, Senator MIKULSKI, who is speaking out eloquently and strongly about the importance of pension and retirement security and pointing out the dangers of the legislation—coming out on a totally party-line vote—coming out of the Budget Committee that we believe would once again raise the specter of Social Security privatization.

So we are sounding the alarm, and we are making clear that the Democratic women of the Senate will stand sentry, as Senator MIKULSKI said, and we will stand firmly to protect Social Security because we know how many women depend on Social Security.

Part of our effort is to in very simple terms put forth this checklist for change. We know we have to secure our economy in a more competitive world and secure our energy supplies in that competitive world.

Our current energy policy is weakening our national security, hurting our pocketbooks, violating our common values, and threatening our children's futures. Right now, instead of our national security dictating our energy policy, our failed energy policy dictates our national security. We want and need a fundamental change in direction to secure our Nation's energy future.

I believe a strong, balanced national energy policy is a key to strong economic and environmental policies as well.

It is time we decide do we allow our economic security and our national security to be weighed down by a failed energy policy or do we choose a new path? We think, the Democratic women of the Senate, that we need a new path.

Here is a concrete goal. Let's reduce our dependence on foreign oil by at least 50 percent by 2025. How will we get there? It starts by getting back our American can-do attitude and a new commitment, such as the Apollo project that sent a man to the Moon. We know how to do this. Americans are better at setting goals and solving problems than any people in the history of the world, but we are acting as though we can't control our own destiny when it comes to energy, that we can't possibly do what needs to be done to break our addiction to foreign oil.

I have introduced legislation to create a strategic energy fund, to commit our Nation wholly to a new energy future, to invest in alternatives and efficiency, to create jobs, to strengthen our economy, and to free our hands fully to protect our Nation in the world. I don't want to see one more year go by where we are not doing what it takes to prevent us from being blackmailed and extorted by oil regimes that have us literally over a barrel.

The strategic energy fund will invest in renewable energy, such as wind and solar, transform America's vehicles by expanding consumer tax credits, and making sure we have more hybrids and other advanced clean diesel automobiles and trucks.

We will accelerate home-grown biofuels by investing in research and loan guarantees for cellulosic ethanol production.

We will speed fuel infrastructure by pairing increased tax incentives for installation of E–85 pumps with a mandate to have them at 50 percent of our gas stations within 10 years.

And we will unleash American ingenuity by investing $9 billion in a new energy research agency modeled on DARPA, which was created in the Defense Department after Sputnik went up and has given us so much, including the Internet.

We challenge the Republican Congress to make energy independence a priority by passing meaningful energy legislation, such as a strategic energy fund, this session.

I am so proud to stand with my Democratic women colleagues and put forth this checklist for change. It will make a difference in America's future. Let's get about doing the business of America.

I yield the floor for my distinguished colleague from California, Senator BOXER.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank Senator CLINTON. I am also very proud to be on the floor of this great body with my Democratic women Senate colleagues.

We held a press conference in which we challenged the Republican leadership to bring up issues on this floor that are meaningful to our families. Here is our checklist for change. Each of us has taken one of these issues. Mine happens to be protecting our air, land, and water.

The message we are here today to convey is that the Republicans run the Senate, the White House, and the House of Representatives. They control what issues come to the floor of the Congress for debate. We spent yesterday debating an amendment to the Constitution to ban flag burning. We also debated a bipartisan proposal by Senators BENNETT and CLINTON to ban flag burning via a statute.

Every one of us in this body voted to ban flag burning, be it by a statute or by an amendment. But one has to ask the question: Is that debate, which we have had four times, more important than the issues that are on our checklist for change?

There have been four reports of flag burnings this year. That is four too many, but they were four. Yet there are 44 million Americans whose pensions are at risk while this Congress fails to act to protect those pensions.

Four flags burned versus 7.5 million Americans who have been denied an increase in the minimum wage. And this Congress, under the Republicans, sees nothing wrong with giving themselves a pay raise, but they can't raise the minimum wage, and it has been flat for 9 years, which means it has gone down in value and people cannot make it on $5.15 an hour.

Four flags have been burned—four too many—versus 170,000 talented college-ready students each year who stay home because they can't afford tuition.

Four flags burned—four too many—yet 30,000-plus veterans have waited in 2006 for their first medical appointment, an issue that will be taken up by Senator MURRAY.

Four flags burned versus 200,000 people in New Orleans living in trailers, unfinished houses, or tents in the front yards of their Katrina-ravaged homes.

Four flags burned this year—four too many—versus $2.89 a gallon for regular gas. By the way, that is the national price. In California, we are looking at well over $3 a gallon.

Four flags burned—four too many—versus 46 million Americans with no health insurance, and Senator LINCOLN will talk about that.

Four flags burned—four too many—versus over 500,000 Americans who have lost their lives while we wait for this Republican Congress to take action on stem cell legislation, an issue that has been championed by many of us in this Senate and on this checklist carried by Senator FEINSTEIN.

And, finally, four flags burned—four too many—versus 75 million Americans living near our most polluted toxic waste Superfund sites.

In conclusion, because my checkpoint is protect our air, land, and water, I call on this Republican Congress to address two pressing environmental crises: global warming and Superfund cleanup.

It is easy to put global warming on the back burner as long as our everyday lives are not affected, but some people think their everyday lives are beginning to be affected. The best scientists in the world warn us that we are near the tipping point on global warming.

Just the other day, the U.S. National Academy of Sciences, along with the national academy of science for 10 other nations, agreed that climate change is real and it has to be addressed. So we call on this Republican Congress to do something about it. Don't sit back and say this doesn't exist because you are ignoring science.

I am proud to say that in the State of California, they are listening. This week a historic global warming bill cleared the first hurdle and passed the California Senate Environmental Quality Committee. California has been a leader in the environment, and Senator FEINSTEIN and I want to make sure that we can bring some of that action right here to the Senate.

Last point: We need to clean up these Superfund sites that are hurting our families and hurting our communities. Under the Clinton administration, we cleaned up 80 of these sites a year. Now it is down to 40 sites a year. We owe our children a clean and healthy environment.

Mr. President, it is time for you and the Members of the Republican Congress to call on the Republican leadership to take up our checklist for change. We are very proud to be talking about this all together this morning on the Senate floor.

I am proud to yield now for Senator PATTY MURRAY of Washington.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am very proud to be here this morning with the other Democratic women of the Senate in urging the leadership to talk about the issues that are the true priorities of the American people. The issue I am talking about today is so important, and that is the treatment of our Nation's veterans. Our military men and women and their families are sacrificing every day for all of us. It should be our duty to honor that sacrifice, whether it is with jobs or training, support or health care. But on this issue, the Republican leadership has failed miserably.

Today, the Department of Veterans Affairs continues to be overwhelmed and underfunded. Listen to what we know. The VA is currently seeing 38 percent more Iraq war veterans than they budgeted for—38 percent more. In fact, in fiscal year 2006, the VA expected to provide medical care to 110,000, but that number is now closer to 170,000, and those veterans are waiting over a year to get the specialty care they need and deserve.

In Seattle, we have VA medical centers with over 2,000 veterans on waiting lists to get an initial doctor's appointment. Veterans around the country are waiting 18 months just to get their benefits. On Monday it was reported in the New York Times that veterans' spouses are being faced with an impenetrable wall of bureaucracy as they try to collect their survivor benefits.

To me, and to my women colleagues, that is simply intolerable. We are also woefully unprepared for the rising toll of post-traumatic stress disorder and other battlefield-related mental illnesses that are hitting our troops. Right now, it is estimated that one-third—one-third—of the 1.3 million Americans who have served in Iraq and Afghanistan are facing mental health challenges when they get home. The Department of Veterans Affairs recently revealed to us that it is on a pace to see nearly 20,000 new cases of postcombat stress this fiscal year among troops. Guess how many they estimated to see: 2,900. So they thought they would have 2,900, but they are on a pace to see 20,000. A VA Under Secretary noted that some of our VA clinics don't provide mental health care, or if they do, she said, waiting lists render that care virtually inaccessible. Our service men and women, veterans, and their families deserve more than virtually inaccessible care. We have to do more.

On top of that, we have to be working to pass Federal legislation that addresses the employment needs of veterans who are coming back home from the battle front. Do my colleagues know that among 20- to 24-year-olds, unemployment for veterans is double that of nonveterans, and it is three times the national average? That is unacceptable. Iraq war veterans are coming home, they are losing their jobs, they are not getting medical care, they are having a hard time accessing benefits, and they are struggling to just get by.

We have a job to do in this Senate, and that is why the Democratic women are here today to talk about our checklist for change and focusing on our veterans. Last week, I successfully amended the fiscal year 2007 Agriculture appropriations bill to include $160 million to deal with the data theft of 26.5 million veterans. We have to make sure that our veterans don't have the double whammy of losing their data and then losing their health care to pay for it.

Our service men and women deserve a new direction. So today we challenge the Republican leadership to include the real cost of care for our veterans when they submit their budget and to do right by our veterans and our military families by holding hearings on the holes in transition assistance, mental health care, and health care that our veterans and families need.

Caring for our veterans is not a Republican or Democratic issue, it is an American issue. We call on this Congress to right now do the most patriotic thing we can do, and that is to fulfill our promise to our Nation's veterans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter to Senator FRIST from all of the Democratic women outlining our checklist for change and our call for action.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATIC WOMEN FOR CHANGE,
June 21, 2006.

Hon. WILLIAM H. FRIST,
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR FRIST, We, the Democratic women of the Senate, are writing to challenge you to change direction, change the tone, and change the agenda to match the priorities of the American people.

There are approximately 50 days left in this legislative session—still plenty of time to change direction and focus instead on meeting the challenges that affect the American people in their daily lives.

To that end, we present you with our ''Checklist for Change''—nine challenges that Congress can meet right now. We ask that these goals be considered during the remainder of this session of Congress:

Safeguard America's Pensions: Americans deserve to retire with dignity and financial security. We will continue to oppose any plan to privitize social security, because seniors deserve a guarantee rather than a gamble. Recent corporate corruption and mismanagement has shown us that we must also protect employee pension plans. The Republican Congress has stalled these efforts. For the good of all American workers, we challenge the Republican Congress to pass a clean pension reform bill.

Keep Good Jobs in America: We need a jobs agenda that fights for American workers and businesses. The flight of American jobs overseas must be reversed. Currency manipulation and the free flow of counterfeit goods from countries like China have put American workers at an unfair disadvantage for too long. We challenge the Republican Congress to enact tax policies that Stop the outsourcing of American jobs, to level the international playing field by enforcing our trade agreements, and to raise the minimum wage.

Make College Affordable for All: The best guarantee of a good job is a quality education. In America, 170,000 college-ready students don't attend college each year because the cost is too high. Yet the Bush Administration has taken $12 billion from student aid programs to pay for tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans. We cballenge the Republican Congress to increase the maximum Pell Grant, make the college tuition tax credit permanent, and cut student loan interest rates.

Protect America and our Military Families: It is our duty to care for the brave men

and women who defend our nation at home and abroad. Yet the Bush Administration consistently shortchanges healthcare and other benefits for veterans, leaving many soldiers waiting a year or more treatment. We challenge the Republic Congress to provide benefits funding for veterans and to hold hearings on mental health care and transition assistance for those coming back from war abroad.

Prepare for Future Disasters: Nearly five years after September 11th and ten months after Hurricane Katrina, the Federal Government is still woefully unprepared to deal with potential future disasters. We challenge the Republican Congress to restore disaster to cabinet-level status; to implement the recommendations of the September 11th Commission; to develop safe evacuation plans; and to reform the Stafford Act to better manage large catastrophes.

Make America Energy Independent: America's lack of a coherent energy policy is weakening national security, hurting our pocketbooks, violating our common values and threatening our children's future. The Strategic Energy Fund bill will cut our dependence on foreign oil in half by 2025, invest in efficient energy alternatives and create good American jobs. We challenge the Republican Congress to pass the Strategic Energy Fund bill.

Make Small Business Healthcare Affordable: More than 46 million Americans are uninsured. Small businesses create two out of every three new jobs in America and account for nearly half of America's overall employment, yet just 26% of businesses with 50 or fewer employees provide health insurance. The Small Employers Health Benefits Program will create affordable, private health insurance for small businesses and give parents the comfort of knowing that their children are protected. We challenge the Republican Congress to pass this crucial legislation.

Invest in Life Saving Science: Stem cell research provides real hope for cures to many of the world's deadliest diseases. Against the wishes of the American people, the Bush Administration and the Republican Congress have blocked efforts to expand stem cell research so that scientists and doctors have every tool at their disposal to keep us healthy and safe. As a result, America trails the rest of the world in research. We challenge the Republican Congress to pass stem cell legislation this summer.

Protect our Air, land and Water: The Bush Administration has been negligent in protecting Americans from environmental hazards. They have ignored the consensus of the best scientists in the world when it comes to the threat of global warming, and they have recklessly reduced clean ups of toxic waste at Superfund sites. We challenge the Republican Congress to pass a comprehensive science-based bill to reduce greenhouse gases and to restore funding for Superfund clean-up.

We hope that you will put these bedrock issues on the agenda, because the American people are counting on us to fight for them. We can and must do better.

Sincerely,

Barbara Mikulski, Barbara Boxer, Maria Cantwell, Hillary Rodham Clinton, Diane Feinstein, Mary Landrieu, Blanche Lincoln, Patty Murray, Debbie Stabenow.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am proud to yield the floor for my colleague from Washington State, Senator CANTWELL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COLEMAN). The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I thank my colleague, Senator MURRAY from Washington, for her eloquent statement about the state of veterans affairs in our country and to make sure that those who patriotically served our country are taken care of in their time of need.

Many of my colleagues are here—and I appreciate being with my women Senate Democratic colleagues—to talk about our checklist for change and talk about the important issues we believe Congress and the Senate should be focusing on. But I know that people all across my State are wondering what we are doing here in the few days left before our Fourth of July recess.

In fact, one of the newspapers in my State basically said: If Members don't have better things to do than some of the proposals they have been bringing up to amend the Constitution, then we should just go home. Or, as one newspaper said: The checklists that we have been dealing with are full of political gimmicks and not national needs.

I would like to say that these are the national needs that we ought to be dealing with, and making college education affordable for all is a huge priority. As we have spoken out on this issue as a group of women Senators talking about the checklist for change, I am now hearing from students all over America who are feeling the same pinch.

A student from Central Washington University said: Like many others, I am feeling the cuts that affect financial aid.

Even students from outside the State of Washington are e-mailing me. One student from the University of Florida basically said they were coming here to Capitol Hill soon with their full group of presidents and vice presidents and student vice presidents. They reminded me that:

> We are the future of America, and we must ensure that future by making sure students, regardless of wealth or other socioeconomic factors, have access to a good college education.

Mr. President, I couldn't agree with that student from the University of Florida more, and I look forward to seeing them in their efforts here on Capitol Hill to be successful.

But we are here this morning because we all know the best way to secure a good job is a quality education, and we know that the doors to educational opportunity are slamming shut for many Americans. This is something that is very personal to me as somebody who went to school on financial aid, and I can literally say I don't think I would be in the Senate or have been a successful executive at a business enterprise if I didn't have access to that good college education.

We can't let college education become a privilege for just a few of the wealthy, and we have to make sure that families and students can afford college, regardless of their financial resources.

Let me just lay out a few facts. Since 2001, the cost of a public higher education has increased by a staggering 46 percent. In Washington State alone, tuition costs at 4-year public schools have spiked, an increase of 63 percent since the fall of 2000. Tuition costs are skyrocketing, but family income, particularly of those with college-age students, has only risen about 3.4 percent between 2000 and 2003. So the challenge is we haven't seen income opportunities go up, but yet the cost of education has gone up. So while those costs have soared, almost 350,000 Washington students have basically had their Federal financial aid slashed. And families have to tell their children they can't afford to send them to college this year or next.

Well, I can tell you, Mr. President, that is unacceptable. We need to do better to make sure that we make college education affordable.

What have we been doing? Last January, we had the largest raid on student financial aid I have ever seen. The legislation that was passed by this body cut $12.7 billion straight from student loan programs, the biggest single cut in the history of the Federal student loan program. That was coming on top of the President's budget, which basically also proposed a $2.2 billion cut in the Education Department budget, which is the largest cut in the Education Department in 26 years of history.

So we are here this morning, and this Senator is here, because we believe we need a new direction. Today we are standing here to challenge Congress to act now in the best interests of American students, America's families, and certainly for the competitiveness of America's future economy. We challenge this Congress to make college education more affordable now, to help families save for college education.

Specifically, we are asking the leadership to make a priority legislation that would increase the Coverdell education savings account contribution to $5,000 and let families make that tax deduction contribution to help them pay for that increase in college education; secondly, to make the college tuition tax deduction permanent, making it possible for families to put money into education and not feel the pinch; third, to pass my ''GI Bill for Life'' legislation that gives those returning from Iraq and Afghanistan who served in our military the opportunity to complete their college education and get the financial support, as they have supported our country, no matter how long it takes for them to complete that course in education.

It is time that we invest in the future of America and provide Americans the next opportunity of leadership in our economy by giving them access to a good education. We can act now and we can pass these legislative issues before Congress adjourns this year. We hope this checklist for change will be a priority—not some of the issues we have

been focusing on, but a real checklist to get busy with the priorities and needs of American families.

Now I would like to yield the floor for my colleague, Senator LINCOLN, who is going to talk about the affordability of health care in America.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Washington for her incredible focus on educating our children and making sure our families can afford higher education, and certainly focusing on energy independence, which is critically important to all of our households.

I am proud to be here today with all of my Democratic women colleagues to talk about the things that are so important to America's families, the working families who are the fabric of this Nation, who make us strong, who make us proud as Americans to look at the Nation and see what the foundation of our country is really all about.

Mr. President, I know that you and many of our other colleagues probably think this is just a honey-do list. Well, we all have our honey-do lists. For myself, as a mother of twin 10-year-olds and certainly a wife who wants to be supportive and caring for my husband, and as a daughter who is looking at aging parents and in-laws, and all of the many responsibilities in my life, I know that keeping a list to make sure I am actually accomplishing the things that are important to the people I love is critically important so that I know I am doing what I need to do.

I have a list on my refrigerator. I have a list on my desk. I carry a list in my car and in my purse to make sure that I can keep up with the things that are important, the responsibilities I have as a person not only for the things I want to do not just for my family but for my neighbors and for all of the people I report to and am responsible to. At home, my husband and I have a honey-do list that we share the responsibility for. Just last night, we were making sure we changed the air filters and the batteries in our smoke detectors which are critically important to the safety of our children and our home. We were making sure that we adjusted our budget to deal with the unbelievable increase in energy costs. Don't think that every household is not looking at how important that is. Or making sure that our children get their health checkup and that they are up to date on their immunizations.

How blessed I felt when I walked into that pediatrician's office to know that through the Federal employees, I have insurance that will cover that. But it is important to make sure the things on my list get done so that the people in this world whom I love so dearly are as safe and as healthy as they possibly can be.

On that list is also setting aside dollars each year and every quarter in order to know that when my children become college age, they are going to have at least some kind of a nest egg, perhaps not enough to cover all that they need in order to get that education that I know is so critically important to their success and to the success of this country. These are the things that we want to challenge and to encourage our colleagues in the Senate to take up. These are the issues that American families see on their checklist every single day. These are things that we can do—we know that we can do. These are issues that affect every American family.

My good friend and colleague from California, Senator FEINSTEIN, is going to talk about a humane and moral solution to stem cell research, on which she has worked for over 8 years now. There was a wonderful event in Arkansas for the Diabetes Association where I met a young woman with a daughter who talked about the transition, the complete change in life for their family in order to deal with a disease like diabetes in a child who is only 12 years old.

Mr. President, we plead with you, take a look at this list. Look at the reasonable items we are talking about that mean so much to the American families of this country.

I am here to talk about the keen awareness that we have of the challenges that are faced by working families who want nothing more than the security that health insurance offers. We, as Federal employees, enjoy a tremendous security. For over 40 years, the Federal Government has figured out that if it pools all 8 million of the Federal employees across this great country, it can provide greater choice at a lower cost.

We, too, can do that for the small businesses of this country. If we look around, we realize that nearly 46 million Americans lack health insurance, including 456,000 of my own Arkansans. Small businesses are the No. 1 source of jobs in Arkansas and in most parts of our country. Yet only 26 percent of businesses with fewer than 50 employees offer health insurance coverage today. Workers at these businesses are most likely to be uninsured. Yet they are the engine of our economy. They are the jobs that are not going to go offshore. They are the companies and the businesses in our communities that support our Little League and that sponsor our scouting events. These are the fabric of our country. Yet fewer than 26 percent are insured.

Small businesses need innovative ways to offer affordable, accessible health care to their employees. Recognizing that need for a new direction, Senator DURBIN and I proposed the Small Employers Health Benefit Program. It is a comprehensive solution to our small business insurance crisis. It is based on 40 years of success with the Federal Employees Health Benefit Plan. It will create affordable private health insurance choices for small employers, and it will give working families the security and the comfort of mind that they need.

We challenge—we encourage—we plead with our Republican Congress and leadership to pass the Small Employers Health Benefit Program this session. It is something we can do that will make a tremendous difference in the lives of Americans.

We are going to keep fighting because we believe that working families should have the comfort of knowing that they can take their children to the doctor—whether it is for just a common cold or a broken arm or, heaven forbid, something much more serious—and be able to afford and access the care that they need.

We believe that expanding coverage for small businesses will go a long way toward making sure that the millions of Americans should and would have access to medical care. We believe that providing that kind of security is worth fighting for, and that is why we have joined together today to point out to the American people, particularly to our colleagues, the list that we carry around every single day in our pocketbooks, on our desks, and on our refrigerators at home. It is no different than the list that we present to you, and it is no different than the list that every American family has in their home.

We ask you, Mr. President, take a look at what we propose. Look at the time that we have remaining and know that we can make a difference in the fabric of this country by looking at the list of what America's working families need the most in their households.

I am proud to yield for my good friend and colleague from California, Senator FEINSTEIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Arkansas for her remarks. I don't think anyone speaks more eloquently about the needs of American families than BLANCHE LINCOLN. It is always real and it is always practical. I am just delighted to be a colleague of hers.

I rise today to say why stem cell research should be part of this Democratic Women's Checklist for Change. The reason is very simple, and that is because stem cell research offers the promise of historic advances in the treatment of catastrophic disease. It is that simple.

The potential for this research was in the news again last week, as scientists at Johns Hopkins announced that they used embryonic stem cells to regenerate damaged nerves in paralyzed rats. That is something that no one ever thought could be done. After being treated with cells harvested from mouse embryos, most of the rats regained enough strength to walk and bear weight on their previously paralyzed hind legs.

Just imagine what this discovery could one day mean for patients with spinal cord injuries, multiple sclerosis or ALS. It could be revolutionary because one thing science believed was that the spinal cord, once severed,

could never be regenerated. Now, for the first time in history, we see there may be a solution to that and it rests with stem cell research.

Translating this discovery into treatment of human patients will likely take several years, and it will likely not see fruition without Federal research dollars. Here is the rub. Our researchers face a major roadblock imposed by the President in August of 2001, when he limited Federal funding to 22 lines of stem cells. All of these available lines are now contaminated with mouse feeder cells, so virtually there is no Federal ongoing research.

Thirteen months ago, the House approved a bipartisan bill by Mr. CASTLE and Ms. DEGETTE, a bill that would remove this roadblock. It would permit promising research to go forward. It would offer new hope to millions of Americans suffering from disability, diseases, and spinal cord injuries. The Castle-DeGette bill essentially says that it would be possible to use embryos that are rejected in IVF clinics; that is, in vitro fertilization clinics. All of us know that tens of thousands, if not millions, of these embryos are rejected and they are destroyed. Those embryos could be taken to form new stem cell lines under this bill.

The votes are here to pass this bill today, but the President has vowed a veto, and the Republican leadership refuses to bring it to the floor. In the year that we have waited for Senate action, millions more are now waiting for cures that one day could come from stem cell research. In the last year, consider this: 1.4 million Americans were diagnosed with cancer; 60,000 Americans were diagnosed with Parkinson's disease; 11,000 Americans suffered spinal cord injuries; and 1.5 million adults were diagnosed with diabetes.

These are just new diagnoses. Think of all the Americans who continue to suffer cancer, heart disease, Alzheimer's, Parkinson's, spinal cord injuries, and catastrophic diseases which could potentially be helped by embryonic stem cell research.

The administration's policies have left our researchers far behind the rest of the world. In fact, other countries are, today, laying the foundation for groundbreaking cures, while U.S. scientists are not able to gain Federal funding for research. Evidence that the United States is no longer the world leader in embryonic stem cell research is mounting. Scientists around the world have created 128 new embryonic stem cell lines since President Bush announced his policy. Only 34 of these new lines were created in our country. The proportion of embryonic stem cell papers published by U.S. research groups has fallen dramatically in the past 2 years. At least 10 other nations—Germany, Finland, France, Sweden, the United Kingdom, South Korea, Singapore, Israel, China, Australia—are investing substantial sums of government money in embryonic stem cell research. That is totaling hundreds of millions of dollars. Other nations are constructing facilities, they are attracting our American researchers who should be here at home doing this research, and they are learning more every day.

The United States, on the other hand, remains at the starting line. I don't think we can afford to watch other nations move ahead. Eight years ago, I introduced one of the first bills addressing stem cell research, so we have waited this long—8 years—for action. Time and time again, we have pressed for action on the floor of the Senate. We pressed for it privately. We pressed for it by letter. We pressed for it by press conference with groups of sufferers of catastrophic diseases. All of this has been to no avail. I can't believe it. I can't believe this kind of recalcitrance. And all of this is despite the fact that every poll shows a dominant majority of Americans support stem cell research.

It is time the Senate place the health of Americans ahead of the views of a limited number of people whose views are apart from the mainstream of America. We owe it to the 110 million Americans suffering daily from debilitating and catastrophic disease. Every day that we wait, more people develop diseases that could one day be cured. Every day we wait, other nations move further ahead.

I urge the Republican leadership to bring the Castle-DeGette stem cell bill to the floor and allow Federal research to move forward. A Democratic Senate would listen to the American people. A Democratic Senate would make the promotion of this promising research a reality. This Senate is in Republican control. The Republican-controlled House has passed this bill. A dominant majority of the American people say enact this bill. Yet this Senate, Republican controlled, becomes the roadblock.

I urge the Republican leadership to reconsider and bring the Castle-DeGette bill to the floor of the Senate for a vote.

Mr. President, I would like to yield for my colleague, the distinguished Senator from the great State that harbors the great city of New Orleans, LA. She will speak about making Americans upwardly economically mobile in the American workplace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California for her remarks and her passion and her focus on the issue of stem cell research. One day when millions of Americans have been cured of diseases that afflict us today because the research is just not there, we can thank Senator FEINSTEIN for staying on point, every month, every year—staying on point on stem cell research. It is something the vast number of Americans support. They understand the importance of pressing forward on this science to find real cures for real people, for real families. That will not only relieve the pain and suffering that comes with disease but also promote the general economic well-being of a nation based on a free enterprise system that works much better when people are healthy than it does when they are sick.

I stand in awe of Senator FEINSTEIN's focus on this issue, and I support her wholeheartedly.

It is my opportunity to speak about one of the very important aspects on this checklist. We talked about safeguarding America's pensions, and we have talked about good jobs in America. Senator CANTWELL talked about college affordability for all Americans, about being the first person from her family to graduate from college, and as she has shared with us, going on to create a multimillion-dollar software business that, of course, helped her personally and her immediate family. But think of all the other people it helped because she received a great education from our system—protecting America and our military families and making America energy independent, as Senator CLINTON was so clearly stating, and small business health care as Senator LINCOLN spoke to this morning.

I am going to focus my attention on preparing for future disasters. It is, unfortunately, something that we in Louisiana have become somewhat experts on lately, having lived through and still trying to live and survive after the greatest natural disaster to hit our country in some time.

I begin by saying that if there was ever a wonder why our country was created, you can find the answer in the Preamble of the Constitution, one of the greatest documents ever written. It talks about providing for the common defense, promoting the general welfare, and securing the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity. Our Federal Government, which was established over 220 years ago, has established institutions, large and small, to meet the promise of the Preamble of the Constitution.

We established the Department of Defense to support and provide for the common defense. It was called the War Department. Now it is called the Department of Defense. We established the Department of Health, Education, and Labor to promote the general welfare.

Thirty years ago we established the Federal Emergency Management Agency to help keep Americans secure in the blessings of their liberty in the middle of natural disasters.

On August 29, when Katrina hit land, a category 5 storm to hit the gulf coast and to hit the southeastern part of Louisiana and the southwestern part of Mississippi, and 3 weeks later when Hurricane Rita barreled into the southwestern part of our State, the Federal Government failed the people of the gulf coast.

Amazingly, nearly 1 year after this unprecedented failure, we have done

little, if anything, to ensure that this will not happen again.

Studies have been completed. Reports have been drafted. Senator LIEBERMAN and Senator COLLINS have been exemplary in their work in a bipartisan fashion in the Senate—1,000 hours of hearings, dozens of field hearings—to come up with comprehensive legislation. However, somewhere between the Republican leadership in the White House and the Republican leadership in Congress we have failed to come up with a single recommendation or a piece of legislation to come before this Congress to make sure that some of these recommendations are put into place.

The White House has not asked for a single law to be changed based on their own report of 125 recommendations. Contrast that with what happened after September 11. This Government was literally turned upside down and inside out. Laws—dozens of laws, maybe even hundreds of laws—were changed so that we could try to get to core answers to 9/11. Yet after the greatest natural disaster in American history, with the failure of the Federal Emergency Management, a failure that will be recorded in history for generations, not one law has been permanently changed. And it is almost 11 months after that storm.

Billions of dollars have been thrown at the problem. And at the request of myself and a few Members of our delegation, we have managed to move a few billion of those dollars out from this morass of a Federal agency that doesn't work to try to get money directly to parishes, counties, to economic development departments for the recovery and rebuilding.

I raise this point on this checklist not just for Louisiana which we are going to rebuild regardless of the mess we find ourselves in, but we want to raise this issue—I want to raise this issue—in hopes that it can prevent this kind of recovery taking place in Seattle, in the event of a tsunami, or in California in the event of an earthquake, or in Tennessee which also sits on a fault line of a geological structure.

I raise this point to honor the 1,836 victims of Katrina and the 120 victims of Rita. Surely there is enough sacrifice for people to make before their Government, led by a Republican Congress, takes the steps to make sure it will never happen again. I know that no Congress run by Democrats or Republicans can prevent a natural disaster. We understand that. We are going to have earthquakes, hurricanes, and we are going to have volcanic eruptions. While we can't prevent that, we can most certainly improve the response from the Federal level so that people do not have to suffer through the rebuilding that is going on now in Louisiana.

The first thing that must be done, which is part of our checklist, is to give the Director of FEMA the authority and the access he had under the stewardship of its most successful Director, James Lee Witt, under the previous administration. At that time, it was a Cabinet level position that had the trust and access of the President and the full command of Federal resources during such disasters.

Regrettably, we have all watched in horror on the television screen, and I have watched personally upfront as a witness of the failings of FEMA on the ground, constrained by the priorities of the Homeland Security Director, which is different than what the needs of this great city and region are. And after reading the exchanges between Director Brown and Secretary Chertoff, it most certainly doesn't seem to be their focus on emergency response in homeland security. FEMA needs to stand and win the internal battles to get priorities on the budget. Moving boxes around in the Federal Government organizational charts should not be our focus. And that is not the solution. The issue is that FEMA must be a priority for the highest levels of leadership. It must be able to command the attention of the Federal Government and the many resources and assets that this Federal Government has to help rebuild and reestablish confidence in any community that would find itself virtually destroyed, as in the case of St. Bernard Parish, a small parish that doesn't get the attention of the national media. But 60,000 people live there, and 95 percent of their homes were destroyed with 15 to 20 feet of water.

Senator BAYH and I had the pleasure of visiting down in that great parish with the great spirit, and just last Friday we walked into an unbelievable sight. A small trailer was sitting in the middle of complete ruin, with brave teachers and administrators inside this trailer trying to conduct what I guess is a summer school for children. We walked into this classroom with the lights low at naptime, with music, where 20 little children were sleeping. When we walked out of that trailer, all you could see was destruction as if you were in a war zone. Yet the happiness on the faces of the children and the spirit of those teachers was really a testament to the resilience of people despite the fact that their Government is failing them. They are not going to fail themselves or their children. But we can do better.

On 9/11, when the terrorists attacked New York, everyone said that one of the major failings was the failure of the communications system. We lost 335 firefighters—not because they lacked bravery, not because they lacked leadership, not because they lacked the armor or the covering to protect them from the fire as they ran to the building when everyone was running away—we lost many of them because their radios didn't work. We couldn't find a few hundred dollars to buy a radio for firemen running into a skyscraper that was falling down. We all know what we did wrong.

Today, we still don't have a system of communication that can operate when the cell phone towers go down, whether they are burned down, blown out, or flooded out. It doesn't exist. Five years is a long time.

I will tell you what we have done in 5 years. We built a continental railroad in 5 years. From the time of Pearl Harbor to Victory Day was 5 years. From the time the *Apollo* drawings were on paper until we hit the Moon was 5 years. But it is 5 years since 9/11.

When the people of the gulf coast had two major hurricanes barrel down on them and they went to use a cell phone, a land line, or a computer, the communications system was down. We were blamed for not having an evacuation plan. Let me say for the last time that the best evacuation plan doesn't work if you can't communicate it to your neighbors, let alone to the doctor in the emergency room or the ambulance driver or the bus driver trying to run the bus or the Superdome operator trying to keep thousands of people safe and fed and cared for.

I know our time is up in just about 2 minutes. I have gone a little over my time. I want to say in closing that there is a lot the Republican Congress could do to keep us on point, to keep us focused on the things that matter to the American people dealing with natural disasters, helping them to rebuild their shattered lives, their homes, their schools, their churches, and their businesses. When these storms and floods come through is one thing. It is very important to the people of this country.

I wish, as a Democratic Senator from Louisiana, that we would spend a little bit more time making sure the communications system works, that FEMA works, and that all the money the taxpayers are spending is being spent well and not wasted. That is sort of the third disaster—not the disaster itself but the disaster of wasting money when people are so desperate for the resources they need to rebuild.

Thank you, Mr. President, for presiding this morning. It is probably not the easiest thing to listen to. But these are some shortcomings that we believe we need to step up to and address for our country and put before the American people, the practical solutions.

I yield the floor.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues in calling for a ''Checklist for Change.'' We need a real jobs agenda in this country—one that stands strong and fights for American workers and American businesses.

This is about our way of life—a way of life based on good-paying, middle class jobs and the promise that—with hard work—every American can aspire to do better tomorrow than they did yesterday.

We need to stop the flow of American jobs overseas. Last year, a new $2 billion tax cut that I authored took effect, rewarding companies that create

manufacturing jobs here in the United States.

We need to level the playing field for American businesses. Currency manipulation and the free flow of counterfeit goods from countries such as China have put American workers at an unfair disadvantage for too long.

It is time we had an international trade prosecutor who can go after countries that cheat and make sure that America is getting a fair deal in the world market.

We need a new direction for American workers.

We challenge the Republican Congress to enact tax policies that stop the outsourcing of American jobs.

We challenge them to stand up and enforce our trade agreements so American businesses can compete on a level playing field and keep good-paying jobs here at home.

Americans want to export our products, not our jobs.

And we challenge the Republican Congress to follow the lead of my State of Michigan and raise the minimum wage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

RESPONSE TO THE CHECKLIST

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I have listened to part of the previous presentations. I think the impression has been given that if we just had a Democratic Senate we could accomplish so much more. But I think in the process of making such a presentation many things have been overlooked or not quite stated in a factual way.

Let me start by saying what has been said—that Republicans have cut $12 billion from college student aid, frozen Pell grants for higher education. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Republican Congress, since President Bush has been in office, has dramatically increased the absolute commitment to helping lower income students, many who are first-time college graduates in their family, and we are helping at the Federal level to an extent never seen before.

For instance, Pell grants will grow by $240 million. The number of recipients will increase by 59,000 to 5.3 million students. Funding for Pell grants rose from $8.8 billion in 2001 to $13 billion in 2006. In 2006, the Department of Education expects to make over $77 billion in grants, loans, and other aid to over 10 million students. It is a fact that we are increasing Pell grants. We are increasing the number of students who are eligible for Pell grants. We need to be honest when we are talking about what the difference would be if there were a Democratic Senate versus the Republican accomplishments.

In addition, the Department of Education in 2006 will make or guarantee more than $60 billion in new student loans, a $4 billion increase over the previous year. That is a huge accomplishment in just one year.

In addition, one of the things this Senate is focusing on currently is trying to get more of our students into the areas of math, science, and engineering because that is where the jobs are in the future. To make sure our students from low-income areas are able to pursue this type of career and to give them special attention, we have added a SMART grants program for Pell-eligible students that will give them a bonus if they pursue a degree in math or science, or a foreign language deemed to be critical for national security. We have taken steps so low-income students, only Pell grant-eligible students, will get this bonus to move in the direction of good jobs in our country.

It is important to stay on the facts and talk about some of the things we have tried to do. ''Tried to do is key.'' Many of the things I have heard in the last hour about what the Democrats would do if they were in charge were somewhat amusing because we have tried to do those very things; it is the other side of the aisle who has kept us from achieving those goals. Consider association health plans—small business health plans that would give millions of workers the opportunity to have affordable health care. Because they work for small businesses—maybe 10 employees or 20 employees—that employer cannot afford to offer health insurance options because the options are too expensive, and employers are not eligible for the big plans that bring the cost down.

We brought to the Senate floor, after trying for years, we passed legislation out of committee and brought to the Senate the small business health plans that would give millions of employees of small businesses the opportunity to have affordable health care. It was the Democrats, by an overwhelming majority of their caucus, who voted against association health plans again and again.

Making health care more affordable is a goal we have. One of the most important things we can do this year is to broaden the number of people who have health care coverage in our country. If the Democrats would sit down and work with us, we could do that. We cannot do it by ourselves. I am very concerned when it is implied that a Democratic Congress could produce this when it is the Democrats who have obstructed Republican initiatives.

Border security. I live in a border state. We have a northern border and a southern border. Since I came to the Senate, we have probably quadrupled the number of Border Patrol agents in both the northern and the southern sectors. We have put billions into more border control facilities, into surveillance techniques that extend the reach when you cannot have a person every mile. You cannot have a person every mile, but you can certainly extend your reach with infrared and UAVs. This is very helpful. We have put our money into this area, and we have made it a focus. Securing our border is going to continue with a Republican Congress.

Tax cuts. I have heard many people say: How can you have tax cuts when we have deficits and so many needs in our country? Let's put the facts on the table. Every time in recent history when we have had tax cuts in this country—from President Kennedy, President Reagan, and President Bush—the revenue of our country has increased. It happened again after the tax cuts of 2003. When people can keep more of the money that they have worked for and earned in their pocketbooks, they will either reinvest it in capital, which will increase jobs and prosperity and, therefore, revenue to our country; or they will save it, which does the same thing; or they will spend it and create new opportunities for jobs in the manufacturing sector.

That is exactly what has happened when the Republicans, over the objections of the Democratic caucus, did push through tax cuts giving marriage penalty relief, giving lower tax brackets for every American who pays taxes, giving a 15-percent capital gains and dividends rate, giving relief across the board to the people who are earning the money in this country that has caused a revenue increase.

Therefore, the deficit of this country is going to be $100 billion less this year than we thought might happen. If we do not continue the tax cuts, it will be a tax increase, and that will stall the economy. We will see the jobless rate rise and our economy will be adversely impacted. So tax cuts are a difference that we will see with a Republican-controlled Congress.

Now I will talk about energy. One of the things we have done in this Congress, which has not gotten very much play, is the Energy bill that was passed through the leadership of Senator PETE DOMENICI as chairman of the Energy Committee. For the first time in 10 years, we passed a significant Energy bill last year through this Republican-led Congress. The focus was on renewables, tax credits for renewables, increased investment in research into renewable energy.

Anyone who has filled up a gas tank, anyone who runs a small business and has higher costs of electricity and natural gas knows we have an energy crisis in this country. One of the reasons why is because we are over 60 percent dependent on foreign sources for our energy needs. These foreign sources are unreliable. We need to do what Americans do. That is, stand up and take control of our destiny. That means we are going to create energy that is renewable and clean, that protects the environment, energy such as biodiesel, made from soybeans; energy such as ethanol, made from corn. Wind energy is producing almost 10 percent of the electricity in my home State of Texas and Texas is a big State. It is very important that we have the wind energy credits we passed in that tax bill because it has enhanced energy resources

in our country. This is a significant contribution to diversifying our energy sources, and it is so important for our country.

My point is this: This Republican Congress has been a steady hand at the wheel. We have supported America's commitment in the war on terror. We have made it a policy that we will not leave when our commitment is not fulfilled. And when it is, and when the generals on the ground say Iraq can secure itself and Afghanistan can do it by themselves, we will then leave. We want to do that. We do not want to stay indefinitely in Iraq or Afghanistan, but we want to keep the terrorists where they are. We will keep our commitment to lower taxes and clean energy. We will keep our commitment to the small business people who are working in America and contributing to the economy. They are the heart of our country. That is what a Republican Congress would do. That is what we are going to continue to fight for.

I hope, rather than saying a Democratic Congress would do it differently, when they have blocked so many of the things we have done, they would cross the aisle and say: Let's do these things together. We can do something bipartisan. People in this country do not care about Republicans or Democrats. They want results. We can do it if we work together across the aisle instead of making so many issues political that do not need to be.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

WAR ON TERROR

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague from Texas for outlining so many of the very important issues facing this country and the Senate today.

I will talk about something that is extremely important to families, to people through the United States. That is the war on terror. How are we going to take the steps to prevent another September 11 attack in the United States?

I don't think anyone who has followed the progress of the Islamofascist terrorists who have threatened us believe we are going to be safe if we try a fortress mentality, to step back and say no one is going to hit us, they don't care about the United States. They do.

We work in a very secure place. People who visit us have to go through all kinds of security. Yes, we have built up some good barriers, good protections. High target areas such as the Congress and the White House are protected.

For the vast majority of places in America, there is no way you can build a security system such as we have here because of the high priority this rates in terms of terrorist interests. After September 11, we started some very serious consideration of what we needed to do to fight against terrorism.

I will read a very good editorial that appeared September 24, 2001.

The Bush administration is preparing new laws to help track terrorists through money-laundering activity and is readying an executive order freezing the assets of known terrorists. Much more is needed, including stricter regulations, the recruitment of specialized investigators and greater cooperation with foreign banking authorities.

Washington should revive international efforts begun during the Clinton administration to pressure countries with dangerously loose banking regulations to adopt and enforce stricter rules. These need to be accompanied by stronger sanctions against doing business with financial institutions based in these nations.

That is exactly what the Bush administration did. They set up the Terrorist Financing Tracking Program, a very effective program. This program went on clandestinely without any public notice or disclosure.

As the chairman of the subcommittee that funds the Treasury Department and as a Member of the Senate Intelligence Committee, I was briefed on it. I was briefed on the effectiveness of it and how valuable a tool it is to be able to follow the money because the terrorists did not know we could follow when they transferred money from al-Qaida or Hamas or Hezbollah to someone in the United States; or transferred money from a so-called charity in the United States back to a terrorist organization. They did not know how we were doing it. It was effective.

A number of the major terrorist captures we have made, the terrorist operations designed for the United States that we have interrupted, were enabled by the terrorist tracking program.

When the 9/11 Commission made its final report of its recommendations on December 5, 2005, they gave varying degrees of ratings, from the very best being A, to F being a very bad job, to all of the different activities we had undertaken to make our country safe, to make our homeland safe. Regrettably, many of them only got Bs. The Director of National Intelligence, the National Counterterrorism Center, they got Bs. Some of them got even lower grades, working with other countries.

But the one that led the rating was terrorist financing. We were doing the best job fighting terrorist threats to the United States by terrorist-financing tracking. We were, until last week. Because that editorial I read from about the need for that, about the need for international cooperation, was a New York Times editorial of September 24, 2001.

Well, the New York Times has blown the cover—blown the cover—on this very important terrorist-financing activity. Now the terrorists know there is a Belgian-based cooperative called SWIFT, the Society for Worldwide Interbank Financial Telecommunication. The SWIFT operation has a facility in the United States to which the Treasury Department issued narrowly targeted administrative subpoenas to get information on specific terrorist organizations and where their money transfers went. But now the terrorists know.

SWIFT is regulated by central bankers. The oversight committee knew about it. The oversight committee had in it the Federal Reserve, the European Central Bank, the Bank of England, the Bank of Japan, the Bank of Belgium. Their committee members overseeing SWIFT knew how this program was operating, and they knew it was operating lawfully.

But the New York Times, continuing its recent tradition, has decided that its right to publish is more important than the American public's right to be safe from terrorist activities. This is another chapter in a very sad series of revelations of our most sensitive intelligence-tracking activities.

Newspapers knew in World War II we could crack the codes of the Axis, that we were able to monitor the defense and military moves of Germany. But they did not expose it. Why? Because they knew our national interest required us to be able to keep confidential, to keep out of the hands of our enemies, the techniques by which we gathered the intelligence, which helped us win World War II—and which had, until recent disclosures, helped us be able to win the war against terrorist attacks in the United States.

Well, the New York Times has decided that its right to publish takes precedence over America's right to have intelligence collection methods that are not disclosed to the people of the United States and, thus, to the terrorists we attempt to track.

Sadly, as I have traveled around the world, meeting with our intelligence agencies, our military people—all across the globe—I found out, since the disclosures—beginning with the disclosure of the renditions of terrorists to other countries, the activities of the President's terrorist surveillance program—our intelligence capabilities have been compromised. Intelligence operatives tell us collections are way down. We don't know how we can replace these tools that have been disclosed by the New York Times and others.

In February, at the open hearing in the Intelligence Committee, I asked CIA Director Porter Goss: What has the damage been? What has the damage been to our intelligence system from this disclosure? He said: It's been very severe. Let me repeat, very severe.

Then again, when Michael Hayden was in a public hearing on his confirmation to be Director of the CIA, I asked him again—and this was before the disclosure of the Terrorist Finance Tracking Program—I said: What has been the impact of these disclosures on our intelligence system? He said: These disclosures have now applied the Darwinian theory to terrorists because the only terrorists we are capturing are the dumb terrorists. The smart terrorists know what we are doing, and they know how to avoid it. Therefore, they can plan their attacks, and we are severely crippled.

Well, disclosure of this Terrorist Finance Tracking Program is a very severe blow. This one particular program has had, in my view, as many successes as any of the other programs, and it has been a vital part of building the intelligence network that we need, gathering the information we need to identify and take out those people who are planning to launch deadly terrorist attacks in the United States.

I regret to tell my colleagues, my constituents in Missouri, and the people in America that we are much less safe.

This program, the SWIFT Program, did not need to be exposed. The Secretary of the Treasury has written to the New York Times a rebuttal to the disclosure they made. They said: Oh, there is a great need for the people to know this. Well, unfortunately, when the people of America know it, the terrorists know it.

Secretary John Snow, with whom I have worked on this program, laid it out very well. He said in a statement on June 22 of this year: After President Bush made it clear that ensuring the safety of our people from terrorist attacks was our No. 1 priority, one of the most important things the Treasury could do is to follow the flow of terrorist money. They don't lie. Skillfully followed, they lead us to terrorists themselves and, thereby, protect our citizens.

He said:

Given our intimate knowledge of the global financial system and financial flows, along with our close working relationships with financial institutions around the world, Treasury is uniquely positioned to track these terrorist money flows both internationally and domestically.

He said:

I am particularly proud of our Terrorist Finance Tracking Program which, based on intelligence leads, carefully targets financial transactions of suspected foreign terrorists. . . . It is an essential tool in the war on terror. . . . It is not ''data mining''. . . . It is not a ''fishing expedition''. . . . today's disclosure [is] so regrettable, because the public dissemination of our sources and methods of fighting terrorists not only harms national security but also degrades the government's efforts to prevent terrorist activity in the future.

If there are people sending money to help al Qaeda, then we need to know about it. We also need to take advantage of that knowledge to follow the money trail and thwart them.

He reports that the 9/11 Commission gave its highest level of recognition to this work.

Well, Mr. President, when we disclose how our allies are working with us, we not only give the terrorists information on how to avoid disclosure, how to keep their activities secret, what we do, and what is very serious, is we tell our allies that we cannot keep a secret. Our allies are getting more and more reluctant to deal with us on any international cooperative missions when everything we do is blown and all of a sudden they read in their papers in the United States how they have cooperated with the United States.

Now, that is not a very popular thing for some of these governments to do, and it makes it far more difficult for us to say: Hey, let's work together on a clandestine intelligence-gathering program that will keep your country safe and our country safe. Bam, they read about it in the newspapers. Well, this makes not only terrorists more able to get around our existing intelligence-collection assets, but it makes our allies far more reluctant to cooperate with us.

Mr. President, I regret to tell you and my colleagues how serious this has been.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the letter to the editors of the New York Times by the Secretary of the Treasury, John Snow; a copy of the September 24, 2001, editorial from the New York Times; and a copy of the Final Report on 9/11 Commission Recommendations, in which they said this terrorist financing program was the best.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, June 26, 2006.

Mr. BILL KELLER,
Managing Editor, The New York Times,
West 43rd Street, New York, NY.

DEAR MR. KELLER: The New York Times' decision to disclose the Terrorist Finance Tracking Program, a robust and classified effort to map terrorist networks through the use of financial data, was irresponsible and harmful to the security of Americans and freedom-loving people worldwide. In choosing to expose this program, despite repeated pleas from high-level officials on both sides of the aisle, including myself, the Times undermined a highly successful counter-terrorism program and alerted terrorists to the methods and sources used to track their money trails.

Your charge that our efforts to convince The New York Times not to publish were ''halfhearted'' is incorrect and offensive. Nothing could be further from the truth. Over the past two months, Treasury has engaged in a vigorous dialogue with the Times—from the reporters writing the story to the D.C. Bureau Chief and all the way up to you. It should also be noted that the co-chairmen of the bipartisan 9–11 Commission, Governor Tom Kean and Congressman Lee Hamilton, met in person or placed calls to the very highest levels of the Times urging the paper not to publish the story. Members of Congress, senior U.S. Government officials and well-respected legal authorities from both sides of the aisle also asked the paper not to publish or supported the legality and validity of the program.

Indeed, I invited you to my office for the explicit purpose of talking you out of publishing this story. And there was nothing ''half-hearted'' about that effort. I told you about the true value of the program in defeating terrorism and sought to impress upon you the harm that would occur from its disclosure. I stressed that the program is grounded on solid legal footing, had many built-in safeguards, and has been extremely valuable in the war against terror. Additionally, Treasury Under Secretary Stuart Levey met with the reporters and your senior editors to answer countless questions, laying out the legal framework and diligently outlining the multiple safeguards and protections that are in place.

You have defended your decision to compromise this program by asserting that ''terror financiers know'' our methods for tracking their funds and have already moved to other methods to send money. The fact that your editors believe themselves to be qualified to assess how terrorists are moving money betrays a breathtaking arrogance and a deep misunderstanding of this program and how it works. While terrorists are relying more heavily than before on cumbersome methods to move money, such as cash couriers, we have continued to see them using the formal financial system, which has made this particular program incredibly valuable.

Lastly, justifying this disclosure by citing the ''public interest'' in knowing information about this program means the paper has given itself free license to expose any covert activity that it happens to learn of—even those that are legally grounded, responsibly administered, independently overseen, and highly effective. Indeed, you have done so here.

What you've seemed to overlook is that it is also a matter of public interest that we use all means available—lawfully and responsibly—to help protect the American people from the deadly threats of terrorists. I am deeply disappointed in the New York Times.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. SNOW,
Secretary, U.S. Department of the Treasury.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 24, 2001]

FINANCES OF TERROR

Organizing the hijacking of the planes that crashed into the World Trade Center and the Pentagon took significant sums of money. The cost of these plots suggests that putting Osama bin Laden and other international terrorists out of business will require more than diplomatic coalitions and military action. Washington and its allies must also disable the financial networks used by terrorists.

The Bush administration is preparing new laws to help track terrorists through their money-laundering activity and is readying an executive order freezing the assets of known terrorists. Much more is needed, including stricter regulations, the recruitment of specialized investigators and greater cooperation with foreign banking authorities. There also must be closer coordination among America's law enforcement, national security and financial regulatory agencies.

Osama bin Laden originally rose to prominence because his inherited fortune allowed him to bankroll Arab volunteers fighting Soviet forces in Afghanistan. Since then, he has acquired funds from a panoply of Islamic charities and illegal and legal businesses, including export-import and commodity trading firms, and is estimated to have as much as $300 million at his disposal.

Some of these businesses move funds through major commercial banks that lack the procedures to monitor such transactions properly. Locally, terrorists can utilize tiny unregulated storefront financial centers, including what are known as hawala banks, which people in South Asian immigrant communities in the United States and other Western countries use to transfer money abroad. Though some smaller financial transactions are likely to slip through undetected even after new rules are in place, much of the financing needed for major attacks could dry up.

Washington should revive international efforts begun during the Clinton administration to pressure countries with dangerously

loose banking regulations to adopt and enforce stricter rules. These need to be accompanied by strong sanctions against doing business with financial institutions based in these nations. The Bush administration initially opposed such measures. But after the events of Sept. 11, it appears ready to embrace them.

The Treasury Department also needs new domestic legal weapons to crack down on money laundering by terrorists. The new laws should mandate the identification of all account owners, prohibit transactions with ''shell banks'' that have no physical premises and require closer monitoring of accounts coming from countries with lax banking laws. Prosecutors, meanwhile, should be able to freeze more easily the assets of suspected terrorists. The Senate Banking Committee plans to hold hearings this week on a bill providing for such measures. It should be approved and signed into law by President Bush.

New regulations requiring money service businesses like the hawala banks to register and imposing criminal penalties on those that do not are scheduled to come into force late next year. The effective date should be moved up to this fall, and rules should be strictly enforced the moment they take effect. If America is going to wage a new kind of war against terrorism, it must act on all fronts, including the financial one.

FINAL REPORT ON 9/11 COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

[December 5, 2005]

Homeland Security and Emergency Response	
Radio spectrum for first responders	F/C*
Incident Command System	C
Risk-based homeland security funds	F/A*
Critical infrastructure assessment	D
Private sector preparedness	C
National Strategy for Transportation Security	C–
Airline passenger pre-screening	F
Airline passenger explosive screening	C
Checked bag and cargo screening	D
Terrorist travel strategy	I
Comprehensive screening system	C
Biometric entry-exit screening system	B
International collaboration on borders and document security	D
Standardize secure identifications	B–
Intelligence and Congressional Reform	
Director of National Intelligence	B
National Counterterrorism Center	B
FBI national security workforce	C
New missions for CIA Director	I
Incentives for information sharing	D
Government-wide information sharing	D
Northern Command planning for homeland defense	B–
Full debate on PATRIOT Act	B
Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board	D
Guidelines for government sharing of personal information	D
Intelligence oversight reform	D
Homeland Security Committees	B
Unclassified top-line intelligence budget	F
Security clearance reform	B
Foreign Policy and Nonproliferation	
Maximum effort to prevent terrorists from acquiring WMD	D
Afghanistan	B
Pakistan	C+
Saudi Arabia	D
Terrorist sanctuaries	B
Coalition strategy against Islamist terrorism	C
Coalition detention standards	F
Economic policies	B+
Terrorist financing	A–
Clear U.S. message abroad	C
International broadcasting	B

FINAL REPORT ON 9/11 COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS—Continued

[December 5, 2005]

Scholarship, exchange, and library programs	D
Secular education in Muslim countries	D

*If pending legislation passes.

Mr. BOND. I would say also, it is fully compliant with the regulations, with the Constitution, and with statutes. If anybody wants to know, I will be happy to talk with them. There was no genuine public right to know that was satisfied by blowing this program. It was legal, and it was effective. No longer will it be effective, and no longer can we be as safe as we were before these disclosures started.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM). The Senator from New Hampshire.

RESPONSIBLE BUDGETING

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I rise to speak about a package of initiatives which were reported out of the Budget Committee, the purpose of which is to put some order into our financial house and to try to make the Government of the United States an affordable event for its citizens, especially for younger people who will be working to support the next generation as it retires.

This package has been grossly misrepresented by the other side of the aisle, especially by the leader on the other side of the aisle and by the assistant leader and by other Members who have come to the floor. They have taken out the bloody shirt of Social Security and waved it at this package in a totally irresponsible manner. Therefore, I think it is appropriate to come to the floor and point out what the facts are versus what they believe the politics should be.

The facts are rather startling, regrettably, as we head into the retirement of the baby boom generation, which is the largest generation in our history. The cost of supporting that generation, which will have to be paid by our children and our children's children, is astronomical.

There is now pending on the books of the Government $65 trillion—that is with a ''T''—of unfunded liability. What does that mean? That means we have programmatic obligations on the books of the Government—obligations to retired people, primarily—which will cost $65 trillion more than what we know will come into the Government under the present projections. In other words, we do not have the money to pay for it. We do not know where the money is going to come from. But we do know we have these obligations on the books.

To try to put a trillion dollars in perspective, or this number into perspective, since the beginning of the Nation, since the beginning of our country, we have only collected $40 trillion in taxes—only. We have collected $40 trillion in taxes: a lot of money. The total net worth of America and Americans—if you take all our cars, all our houses, all our stock, all our businesses—is $51 trillion. So we have on the books an obligation which exceeds our net worth as a nation.

We have to figure out how we are going to afford to pay for that, especially how our children are going to afford to pay for it because they are the ones who are going to bear the burden.

To try to put this in even more precise perspective, three programs—three retirement program, specifically; Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid—will cost the American taxpayer more, as we head into the year 2025, than what the total Government cost the American taxpayer today as a percent of gross national product. Traditionally, the Government of the United States has spent about 20 percent of the gross national product of America. These three programs alone, as a result of the retirement of the baby boom generation—which is the largest generation in the history of our country, by a factor of two—will cost the American taxpayer everything that we presently pay into the Government by the year 2025.

So that means, at that point, to pay for those three programs, you would be unable—if you were going to maintain the historical spending of the Government—you would be unable to pay for national defense, for education, for environmental cleanup, for all the other things the Government does.

And that is only the start. Because as that baby boom generation gets into fuller retirement, the cost of those programs continues to go up. What does that mean in practical terms? It means our children and our children's children, in order to support the retired generation, would have to pay a dramatic increase in taxes under the present scheme.

Basically, it would mean our children would be unable to afford a better lifestyle. They probably could not send their kids to college, buy a house or purchase a car the way our generation has been able to do because they would be sending so much of their money to the Federal Government to support these basic programs which are mandatory. It is not a tolerable proposal for our country. We cannot say, as one generation, that we are going to put on the books obligations that make the next generation pay so much in taxes that they essentially would not be able to live the quality of life we have. We would undermine their quality of life, and it is not fair to them.

What we did in the Budget Committee was try to address this, not by policy changes but by putting in place processes which will force us to face up to fiscal discipline, which will force us as public policymakers, the Senate and the House and the executive branch, to look at these numbers, these facts which exist. And they will not change unless we do something because the

generation that is going to cost all this money is already alive. It is my generation, the baby boom generation. We are this huge generation. We are going to cost our children these types of dollars. It is not going to change unless we do something.

It will force us, as public policymakers, to face up to this reality, these proposals which came out of the Budget Committee. The major point is, we have a huge problem coming at us as a Government, as citizens, and as parents. You can't tax your way out of it. You cannot possibly raise taxes enough to pick up the cost of these programs and still give earning Americans an opportunity to live well.

So what is the reaction from the other side of the aisle? They want to immediately attack any proposal, even though this one has no policy attached to it—it simply has processes which force a policy to occur, no specific policy to occur—attack any proposal as an attack on Social Security. How grossly irresponsible is that? How incredibly inappropriate is that? Does the other side of the aisle believe that our children should be faced with a burden which they cannot possibly afford? That seems to be the case. They have walked off the playing field of responsible public policy, waving the bloody shirt of Social Security for the purposes of political gain. It is inexcusable on their part.

What is the proposal we brought forward, this outrageous proposal which, according to the other side, is so outrageous? It is pretty simple. It is very responsible. It is an attempt to get at the essence of the problem we have today. It has eight parts. The first part puts back in place an idea which the other side of the aisle offered 2 years ago. Yet now they claim it is horrific, the statutory caps, which says on discretionary spending, that when we put caps in place, they will be enforceable. Today we put caps in place, but they get waived around here like buying peanuts. This goes back to the old Gramm-Rudman approach, where you have enforceable statutory caps. That means we set a number. We agree, as a Congress, this is how much money we are going to spend. Then we say: You actually can't spend more than that, unless you have a cut somewhere else.

That is totally irresponsible, according to the other side. We did it a few years ago. It worked. In fact, Chairman Greenspan said it was the most significant budgetary reform that has occurred around here in a long time. We are suggesting we put it back in place. It affects discretionary spending, which is every year spending, not mandatory spending.

The second idea—I will skip down so we can go in order—is to put in place a BRAC Commission. We had a BRAC Commission for defense spending, and it worked. We did it five times. This is a BRAC Commission for the whole Government, same idea, same philosophy. It says, take a look at the programs and then have the Commission send the ideas to the Senate and then the Senate has to vote for them or against them. It is a reasonable approach to trying to do something which we have not been able to do on a one-by-one basis. It is a broader approach.

It also has the President's proposal for a line-item veto or expedited rescission. It is a better proposal than what the President actually sent us because it is more balanced relative to the legislative branch and the executive branch. In fact, it is an idea that passed the Congress. In 1996, we voted for a much stronger line-item veto than this. It gives the President the ability, when we send him these omnibus bills that have billions of dollars of spending in them, rather than veto the whole bill and shut down the Government, for example, he can now put together a package of specific programs in those bills that he doesn't think make sense, send them up here, and Congress has to vote on them in an expedited process, for or against them. Obviously, he will have to send up a package which has majority support or else it will not get passed.

And we put in language which says that to the extent there is a rescission as a result of this, the savings have to go to the deficit. That is a very strong idea, in my opinion.

We also have biennial budgeting, an idea which people think will be a more effective way for us to address budgeting. We are now effectively in a biennial process anyway since every year there is an election, we can't pass a budget around here; at least we haven't in the last three election cycles, both under Democrats and Republicans.

And then there is reconciliation reform. The essence of the package is the mandatory reform effort, the effort to try to address this chart where Social Security and Medicare and Medicaid are essentially going to bankrupt our children, unless we do something intelligent about it. This is where the other side of the aisle has been so grossly irresponsible—first, in characterizing it, because they have been factually inaccurate, and then abandoning the field of debating the issue and coming up with other processes, if they believe they are better ideas. The first approach is something that passed this Congress already. It basically says that if Medicare for 2 years in a row is found to take more than 45 percent of its support out of the general fund—Medicare is supposed to be a hospital insurance program, not supposed to be supported by the general fund—if for 2 years in a row it is supported by general taxation by more than 45 percent of its costs, then a point of order is put in place, which can be waived by 60 votes, so it can be waived against any new entitlement spending. It is a reasonable approach. It is actually not that strong an approach, but it is something that basically highlights the problem.

Then we get to the more substantive policy driving events. An Entitlement Commission is put in place. This is where the other side has grossly misrepresented the facts and then taken out the bloody shirt and attacked the facts which they grossly misrepresent. And that's a great idea. First, you make up what the position is, and then you attack that position. And then you take absolutely no responsible position on your own part, which is exactly what the other side has done. Obstruction has become the only thing which the other side of the aisle appears to be able to do, obstruction for the purpose of obstruction for the purpose of obtaining power around here.

When are they going to face up to the fact that we are supposed to be doing policy which addresses the needs of our children especially and the affordability of the Government specifically?

What is the Entitlement Commission? It is a group of people who are put together. They are chosen by the leadership of both sides of the aisle. There will be eight Republicans and seven Democrats, if it were to be put in place today. Eight and seven, that is not an overwhelming majority for our side of the aisle. And it takes 10 members of the commission to put together a report to be sent under expedited procedures.

The leader on the other side of the aisle says: This is an outrage. It is a Republican steamroller. Tell me what is the steamroller. Eight to seven representation, takes ten people to put out a report? And then the other side of the aisle goes so far as to say: And they can't consider taxes.

That is a total misrepresentation also. They can consider taxes under the Entitlement Commission. And then they say: 51 votes are going to pass it. That is a total misrepresentation again. The proposal takes 60 votes to pass.

In response to the issues raised by the Senator from North Dakota in the markup of this bill and because I accepted the fact that maybe it wasn't structured correctly the first time around, we responded to that concern. The other side of the aisle, the leadership of the other side of the aisle not only doesn't give us credit for responding to the concerns of the Senator from North Dakota because we changed it so that it became a balanced commission—we changed it so that it takes a supermajority to report from it and then it takes a supermajority to pass it—they not only don't acknowledge the changes, they would say that we didn't make the changes and then attack the proposal and put forward absolutely no policy of their own.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GREGG. No, I won't yield. I think I have heard a significant amount from the other side of the aisle that has been irrelevant, inaccurate, and incorrect. And yielding at this time would limit my time.

The third item in this is the ability of the Congress to reduce the deficit as

a percentage of gross national product. We know that if we don't get the deficit down, our children are going to get all these debts. So what we put in a place as a mechanism that says essentially the deficit, as a percentage of gross national product, shall be reduced as a percentage of gross national product every year until we get to a balanced budget, essentially a balanced budget by the year 2012, and if we don't hit those deficit targets—and they are fairly reasonable because actually the next 2-year targets we have already hit or we will hit under present projections, so this doesn't even kick in, and it doesn't look like it is going to kick in because it looks like we will get to a balanced budget—should we not continue on that path, then what will happen is there will be a reconciliation instruction because we know that 60 percent of all spending around here goes to mandatory accounts. We will say to the mandatory account committees: Reconcile your accounts so that they can be brought into line with these projections for the deficit to head to zero.

What does that mean? That means that there will be policy changes which will allow savings to occur. I presume those policy changes, to the extent they affect entitlement programs such as Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid, will tie into the Entitlement Commission report. Should those two mechanisms which force policy to be addressed not be accomplished, then you go to a sequester on entitlement mandatory spending, something that has never happened around here. And I don't expect it would ever happen because one presumes responsible people would want to make the policy changes to get to the targets rather than allow it to happen automatically.

So where is the irresponsibility here? Well, the irresponsibility is on the other side of the aisle, which has buried its head in the sand of obstructionism because it wants to take power around here. It feels that if it doesn't do anything, if nothing is done around here, then outrage will occur and people will vote them into power. How cynical is that approach to governance?

I have said I am willing to adjust this. In fact, on the Commission, the Senator from North Dakota suggested that we change the makeup and make it all Members of Congress versus outside individuals. I am amenable to that. If he wants to bring that amendment forward, fine. The Senator from North Dakota at the markup said: It doesn't consider tax increases. Actually, the Commission can consider tax increases. But I said: Let's take it to the floor and discuss the issue of pay-go or tax-go, as I would call it, which is the only proposal from the other side of the aisle, to raise taxes. But no, the response is: This is going to savage Social Security. This is going to undermine Social Security. This is going to privatize Social Security—all the words the pollsters have told them to use to try to get reelected.

I will tell you what is going to savage Social Security. It is going to be my generation retiring and demanding the benefits that they have been paying for all of our working life and having our children have to pay for those benefits. Our children are going to get up in arms and say: We would like to buy a house. We would like to send our kids to college. We would like to have the good life you had, and we can't afford it because you put this huge tax burden on us. Because you, during your term of office, were unwilling to be responsible and address these issues.

We have tried to be responsible. We have tried to bring forward a package which should be debated and which should be effectively moved forward in order to try to reverse the direction which we are inevitably going toward, which means if we stay on this course, we will eliminate the capacity of our children to look forward to the Government. So we brought forward this package which we call stop overspending. It may not have all the elements it needs. It clearly needs some tweaking here and there. I don't limit that. But it should not be attacked in the way that it has been attacked through the demagoguery of Social Security's bloody shirt being waved at it.

That is not responsible. That is not governance. That is simply obstructionism for the sake of political gain.

At this point, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

STATE OF THE ECONOMY

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, yesterday, in the Joint Economic Committee, we heard from the chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. As often happens in that committee, there were a number of issues raised. I would like to take the floor simply to clarify where we really are with respect to the economy. There are so many things being said in this election period about the economy that it is always nice to reflect on what the late Senator Moynihan used to say:

Everyone is entitled to his own opinion, but not to his own facts.

Let's spend a little time talking about the facts and understand where the economy is. With a series of charts, I will try to do it as quickly as I can, with an understanding of where the economy currently is.

This first chart demonstrates economic growth as measured by GDP, gross domestic product. The bars on the chart represent quarters. The quarters with positive GDP growth are represented by blue bars. Quarters with declines in GDP are represented by red bars. If you will notice here in the beginning of 2000, the economy started to shrink—that which we refer to as the recent recession which began in 2000. These are the quarters in which that happened. We got a recovery starting in the fourth quarter of 2001, but as these bars above the zero line demonstrate, the recovery was pretty anemic. Not much happened for a little over a year, as the recovery did not get traction. The recovery took off in the second quarter of 2003. That happens to be the time that we passed tax relief. Economists will argue as to whether the tax relief that was passed at that time is responsible for the recovery, but as they say in Manhattan, ''it couldn't hurt,'' because the tax relief was passed there, and we see the strong economic growth that has occurred ever since the second quarter of 2003.

Let's go to the next chart. There was talk that, well, we may be in recovery, but we are not getting any jobs; this is a jobless recovery. Where are the jobs? This chart demonstrates that, indeed, that is correct. Starting in 2000, the jobs started to disappear, and we had a long period that went on where the job base was shrinking in this country. In 2003, that turned around, and we started to see strong job creation since the second quarter of 2003. Once again, that is the quarter where we passed tax relief. Did the tax relief cause the job recovery? Nobody can prove that it did or it didn't. Once again, it didn't hurt.

Now we go to the question of business investment. The recession, once again, started in 2000. Business investment went into negative territory all through 2001, 2002, and then, in the third quarter of 2003, after we passed tax relief, business investment picked up. All of these things started going up after this one event of the passage of tax relief. Did the tax relief cause the business investment to go up? No one knows, but once again, it couldn't hurt.

All right. With those facts before us, and they are indisputable, we now hear the argument: Yes, maybe the GDP growth is occurring; yes, maybe the jobs have come back; yes, maybe business investment has come back. But the big problem is that real wages are down; because productivity has gone up, real wages have gone down.

Here is a historic demonstration of the tie between productivity and real wages. This goes back to 1950. The blue line on the chart is productivity growth; the red line is growth in real compensation including benefits. The two grow together. The outstanding increase in productivity we have had since 2003 has not produced a lowering of real compensation to workers. The best thing that can happen for real wages, historically, is for productivity to go up. So those who are bemoaning the increase in productivity, saying, yes, but real wages are down, are ignoring 50 years of history and the current facts.

We are told that the wages people take home are down; the wages people have in their pocketbooks are down in this recovery. Here on this chart, from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, is the evidence of what is happening to real hourly wage growth. We can see that, in previous recessions, every time

there was a recession, real wage growth went down; recession, real wage growth went down; recession, real wage growth went down. In this recession, real wage growth did not go down as much as it historically has; real wages stayed higher than they have been in the past.

During this period of recovery, it looks like—yes, that argument has merit—real wages are going down. However, one of the things we have to recognize is that this chart does not include benefits. When you add benefits to wages and get the total compensation that goes into someone's pocket, the picture changes. Consider the next chart. Again, the dark blue line on the chart is productivity, and it shows that employee compensation in total in a recession goes down as productivity goes up. It goes down as productivity goes up. It goes down as productivity goes up. It goes down as productivity goes up. And then, when the recovery takes hold, real compensation comes back up above the line.

Here are the facts. Taking this as the line between growth and shrinkage, real employee compensation, including benefits, has been in positive territory. It went below that, just as it has in every previous recession, but when the recovery took hold, employee compensation has gone into positive territory and come back up to join productivity, just as it has done historically.

Where do we get these arguments that real wages are going down? It is the difference between the two charts. The difference is that one chart looks at wages only, and ignores benefits. The other shows total worker compensation that includes wages and salaries, but also benefits workers receive. Now we can consider some statistics that I hope make the importance of the distinction between wages only and wages plus benefits very clear. The employment cost index data shown in the final chart shows that in the 1980s, real compensation growth grew at a 0.82 percent rate. In the 1990s, coming after the recession—we have taken the recession out of this—the period of growth during the Clinton administration stayed at virtually the same level. But from 2001 to the present, it is much stronger, at 1.11 percent.

How can that be, given the rhetoric we have heard? Well, if you go to the salary growth, take out the benefits, you find that portion of that wage and salary growth was 0.46 in the 1980s. It was 0.82 percent in the 1990s. It was only 0.39 since the beginning of 2001. This is the number which is being focused on as a demonstration of the fact that people's wages are not that good. But when you look at the benefits growth, you find that benefits grew in the 1980s at 1.76 percent. In the 1990s, at 0.73 percent growth, there was very anemic benefit growth. That is why this number is so close to this number, because the benefit growth actually pulled this number down. But when you get to what has happened from the beginning of 2001 to now, people are contracting for more benefits. The benefit growth is extremely strong, which is why real compensation is stronger in the post-2000 period than it was in either of the previous two decades—not a bad economic record since the year 2000 and the recession we had.

I have more to say on this, but I recognize that other Senators wish to speak, so I will conclude here. I wish to make it clear that the facts demonstrate that we have a strong economy currently going, and the facts demonstrate that real compensation is keeping up with it. Productivity is going up at an accelerated rate, and real compensation is also going up at an accelerated rate. We should be proud of what we have accomplished since coming out of the recession of 2000.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, can you tell me what the order before the Senate is at this moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority has 2 minutes remaining in morning business.

Mr. DURBIN. Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator LIEBERMAN and I be recognized for 30 minutes equally divided, but that prior to that recognition, my colleague from South Dakota be recognized for not to exceed 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I will not object, but I ask to be recognized for 10 minutes after the Senator from South Dakota, and I believe the Senator from North Dakota will be seeking recognition for 20 minutes. I don't know when Senator LIEBERMAN is arriving. Would it be appropriate now to lock in these three requests—10 minutes for the Senator from South Dakota, 10 minutes for myself, and 20 minutes for the Senator from North Dakota?

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I know of no objection to that request. I would not object.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I make a unanimous consent request that the Senator from South Dakota be recognized for 10 minutes, I be recognized for 10 minutes, followed by the Senator from North Dakota for 20 minutes, and the Senators from Maine and Connecticut be recognized for 30 minutes.

Ms. COLLINS. If the Senator will withhold, I will object to that because the Senator from Connecticut and I had been planning to speak at 11:30. So what I would suggest, if it would be acceptable to the Senator from Illinois, is that the Senator from Connecticut and I would cut our time from 30 minutes to 20 minutes but proceed immediately before the other Members are recognized. Would that be acceptable to the Senator from Illinois, since we were here first?

Mr. DURBIN. The Senator from Maine is so persuasive. I don't know if the Senator from South Dakota still wants recognition.

Mr. THUNE. Yes.

Mr. DURBIN. So I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Dakota be recognized for 10 minutes, the Senators from Connecticut and Maine for 20 minutes combined, and then the Senator from North Dakota and myself for 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

THE WAR ON TERROR

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I rise to speak today about one of the great issues that faces us in this era, the war on terror. I rise to speak in support of the efforts being undertaken by our soldiers in Iraq. I consider my place on the Armed Services Committee to be an honor and a privilege. American soldiers are deployed the world over, and it is my duty to serve and to support them.

Today, our country is at war against an ideology of hate and oppression that has turned a peaceful religion into a platform for war. Our soldiers have faced such adversities throughout our history and defeated them. That is why yesterday I voted in favor of a constitutional amendment to protect the flag, which represents what our soldiers have always fought for.

The fight to combat Islamic fascism has not ended. Our soldiers, alongside Iraqi security forces, are fighting against the enemies of a free Iraq—enemies like Zarqawi, who made war on Americans and Iraqis alike. Zarqawi butchered innocent Iraqis in the streets with the hopes that he could intimidate them into submission or spark a civil war where his ideology of hatred could live. Zarqawi was wrong, and now he is dead.

Further, today we have reports that Iraqi security forces arrested a key al-Qaida figure who was involved in the destruction of the golden al-Askariya Mosque. Moreover, the Iraqis have not abandoned hope and neither should we. To the contrary, Iraqi and American forces are working together to bring a fledgling democracy into maturity. Iraqis are risking their lives so that their future generations can enjoy the freedoms of liberty.

While the Iraqis work toward unity, the U.S. Congress seems to be heading toward disunity. I am concerned over the increasingly visceral, unobjective, and unconstructive rhetoric launched by some on the other side regarding the global war on terrorism. I tried to remain silent on this matter waiting for the Democratic leadership to offer a constructive plan or enter into a constructive dialog. Unfortunately, neither of these things has happened.

To date, the Democratic plan for dealing with Iraq and the war on terror consists of simply quitting as soon as possible and launching a campaign of personal and negative attacks on the President and his administration. I suppose as we enter the beginning of an election year, the rhetoric will only get worse, and the issue will become more polarized.

The unfortunate victims of this Democratic charade are not the American people but the American soldier. Day after day, our soldiers see and hear people in this Chamber hammering away at the point that we are losing the war in Iraq, that Iraq is a lost cause or that this is a winless war, while all the time hiding behind the inconsistent mantra of opposing the war but supporting the soldiers. After visiting soldiers in both Iraq and Walter Reed Hospital, I am confident that for American soldiers there is no unwinnable war.

That is why I voted against Democratic amendments calling for troop withdrawals or artificial timelines. I believe the troops in Iraq are doing the work we have asked them to do, and that if we focus right now on artificial timelines, we will be doing them a grave disservice. I believe the calls that have come out of here are wrong for a couple of reasons.

First of all, they violate the spirit of the separation of powers doctrine that interferes with the President's ability to act as Commander in Chief.

Second, I think they turn what should be battlefield decisions into decisions made by politicians. Our commanders should make troop need decisions based on conditions on the ground.

The ''long war,'' as referenced by President Bush and also by Osama bin Laden, is not a war for Iraq, it is a war for hope, compassion, kindness, and a restoration of freedom to people the world over.

Now is not the time to send a message to Islamic fascists that they have won and we are pulling out because America has lost its resolve.

It is important to spur the Iraqis on, but we cannot force them to try and establish a working democracy by threatening to leave.

Since March of 2003, when American troops entered Iraq, there has been a great deal of advancement. While some on the other side take every opportunity to point out flaws and failures, I would like to point out that in January of 2005, 8 million Iraqis voted for a Transnational National Assembly, and in August Iraqi assemblymen presented a Constitution to their countrymen. In October, 80 percent of the people voted to ratify that new Constitution, taking their first steps to create a permanent government.

The people of Iraq have not undertaken this path to freedom without danger. They risk their lives standing in lines at voting booths and recruiting stations. Iraqis do these things because they know that they are taking the necessary steps which will govern their future.

While there have been positive advancements regarding the Government, the private sector has also seen improvements as well. There is much work to be done here. I will not stand before the Senate and state otherwise. However, the road to progress in Iraq is paved with growth. Oil production has increased from 1.5 million barrels per day to 2.25 million barrels per day. Electricity is also growing. U.S.-funded programs have added 2,700 megawatts to the national grid. It is clear that we need to inspire more Iraqi involvement, but that is not a farflung goal.

Since April 2003, 30,000 new businesses have started in Iraq, and their stock market is trading over $100 million per day.

I am very proud of what American soldiers have done in Iraq, and I believe more needs to be done. Every day we help Iraq move to a permanent government is another day we help Iraq become stable and no longer in need of America's servicemen. I will not abandon the idea that a free Iraq can be achieved or allow my actions to be governed by opinion polls or popularity contests.

It is not just Iraq that we are talking about, it is about the global war on terror and American security. Whether we want to acknowledge it or not, Iraq has become the front line in the war on terror, and those terrorists who are pinned down in Iraq are not planning and launching attacks against the United States.

In fighting and winning the war on terror, ''eternal vigilance'' is the operative phrase. Thomas Jefferson said: ''The price of freedom is eternal vigilance.''

Irrespective of how or under what circumstances we got there, we must now complete the mission. We must win. Failure means relegating future generations to a world of terror and fear where thugs and rogues rule and where freedom, as we know it, becomes a thing of the past.

The global war on terror is about not only bringing stability and freedom and democracy to that region of the world, it is also about ensuring that Americans can live in peace and security in the future. Every single day that our brave and courageous men and women are taking the fight to the terrorists in Iraq, it means we are not fighting them on American soil.

So I rise today again to congratulate and thank those brave men and women who are carrying freedom's torch in Iraq and doing the heavy lifting that is necessary to keep this country safe and secure for the future.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MURKOWSKI). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to amend my earlier unanimous consent request to add the following: That after I have spoken for 10 minutes and Senator CONRAD has been recognized for 20 minutes, the Senator from Colorado, Mr. SALAZAR, be recognized for 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. LIEBERMAN and Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 3595 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

(The remarks of Mr. DURBIN pertaining to the introduction of S. 3588 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

THE BUDGET

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I came to the floor a few minutes ago when Senator GREGG from New Hampshire was here. Senator GREGG is the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee. I listened carefully as he talked about a plan to reform budgeting in America. The first thing I can recall was the phrase often used by a friend of mine who serves in the House of Representatives, Congressman DAVE OBEY of Wisconsin, who frequently chides Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle for ''posing for holy pictures.''

I thought to myself, how interesting it is to hear the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee coming to the floor preaching for dramatic reform when it comes to budgeting. If one were not aware of the history of budgeting under this administration and under Republican leadership in Congress, you might be able to sell this story. But it is hard to sell when you look at facts.

When President Bush took office, he inherited a surplus. It was one of the first surpluses in the Federal budget in decades. It was the result of President Clinton increasing taxes and cutting spending, determined to reduce the deficit.

We reached the point where we had surpluses that were being generated so they could pay down the debt to the Social Security trust fund, give it longer life, make certain that we were moving toward a fiscally sound future. President Bush inherited a Federal budget surplus. He also inherited a national debt of $5.3 trillion.

Now where are we today, almost 6 years into the Bush-Cheney administration? The national debt in America has risen under the Bush-Cheney administration from $5.3 trillion to almost $9 trillion. In 6 years, it is a dramatic increase. During that 6-year period of time this administration, with a Republican Congress, has consistently given us deficit after deficit after deficit, digging the hole deeper and deeper.

So when you take a look at the situation, you say, clearly, the Democrats

must be at fault in this situation. But with the exception of 1 year, these were Republican Congresses generating the spending bills. So how many spending bills from Congress did President Bush veto in the 6 years he has been President of the United States? How many times did he say no to overspending by Congress? How many times did he use his Presidential veto pen denying earmarks by Congress? None. Not one. Zero. In 6 years, never. This President has never used his veto pen to stop spending by this Republican Congress, not one time.

Now comes these Republican leaders, and they say the problem isn't discipline. The problem isn't the President's veto. We have to reform the system. Now they are talking about this elaborate reform of the system.

If you are a student of political history, you have seen this before. When President Reagan's administration brought us the biggest deficits in the history of the United States, those who were responsible for the deficits were quick to the floor of the Senate, pleading for an amendment to the Constitution, a balanced budget amendment to save them from themselves. It did not pass, and it should not have passed because, as President Clinton demonstrated over 8 years, it isn't a matter of a weakness in our Constitution. It was a weakness of political will by the Republican side.

If you will take control of this economy and of this budget, you can truly reduce deficits and create a surplus. That isn't just a promise, it was a fact under the Clinton administration and evidence of failure in the Bush administration they have not come close to a surplus in any year. Now, as we face these record deficits and record debt for America, what do we hear from the Republican side of the aisle? It isn't our fault. We have to change the system.

No, you don't. The system worked under a Democratic President. The system worked to generate a surplus. Now to have them come as political sinners posing for holy pictures when it comes to balancing the budget is a very thin charade that most Americans will see through.

We understand what this is all about. It was not that long ago that President Bush decided to privatize Social Security. It was an idea that flopped across America. The President took his road show out, and every time he made a speech about privatizing Social Security, the popularity of the idea plummeted. Finally, he gave up on it, as he should have. It is a bad idea to cut back on the cost-of-living adjustments that people living under Social Security count on. It is a bad idea to take money out of the Social Security system, when we know we have made promises to future generations that must be kept. And it is a fact that the Social Security Administration untouched will be able to promise payments every year, with COLAs, through 2030. It is a strong system. We can make it stronger, but privatizing Social Security is the wrong way to go.

I urge my colleagues, when Senator GREGG and Republicans come forward with this so-called line-item veto, look closely. Line-item veto is the privatization of Social Security. America rejected it once. We need to reject it again.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I come to the floor to respond to comments that were made by the chairman of the Budget Committee moments go, that I don't think, if he were to have a chance to review what he said, would be what he intends to convey.

The chairman of the Budget Committee moments ago said that our side did not offer alternatives to the proposal that he was making to get our deficit and debt under control. The Senator knows that is not true. That is not accurate. That is not even close to being accurate.

Let me indicate that I have great respect for the chairman of the Budget Committee. He and I have a very good working relationship, although we disagree on some issues. We have, I have always felt, a respect between us. But for him to say we did not offer an alternative is not true. I think, on reflection, he would acknowledge that is not the case.

In fact, the record of the committee shows very clearly that we offered a comprehensive alternative to the one he was offering. In fact, he said publicly he appreciated the fact that I offered a comprehensive alternative.

Let's get straight, on a factual basis, what occurred in the Budget Committee. Here is the alternative I offered. It is an 11-point plan that involves a fully comprehensive approach to the explosion of deficits and debt. What was our alternative?

No. 1, we restored a strong Senate pay-go rule and statutory pay-go enforced with sequestration.

That is a lot of big words. The basic notion is pay-go. What is pay-go? Pay-go simply says, if you want to have more spending, you have to pay for it. If you want to have more tax cuts, you have to pay for them. This is a discipline we had in the 1990s that worked extremely well. Virtually every budget observer of either side said pay-go was an essential part of restoring budget discipline.

The second part of our proposal was to allow reconciliation—a special fast-track procedure in the Senate—for deficit reduction only. That was the intention of reconciliation when it was put in place. Unfortunately, in the last 5 years, reconciliation has been used not to reduce the deficit but to increase it. That was never the intent of reconciliation, to provide special fast-track procedures, limited debate, limited amendments. That was approved for one reason only, to reduce the deficit. We ought to go back to that plan.

Third, we suggest the budget ought to budget for the war instead of coming forward with these supplemental appropriations bills with tens of billions of dollars not part of the budget. We are over 3 years into this war. The President needs to be budgeting for the war.

Fourth, we reaffirmed the protections for Social Security—they exist in current law—ensuring its off-budget status so Social Security funds aren't pooled with all the other funds to disguise from the American people the seriousness of our fiscal condition. And to prohibit fast-track changes to Social Security—again, special rules that are outside the normal rules of the Senate that could lead to a shredding of Social Security and Medicare with very little debate and with virtually no amendments. I will get into that in a moment.

We also have a ''save Social Security first'' provision in our plan, a 60-vote point of order against any new spending or new tax cuts that increase the deficit until the 75-year Social Security solvency is restored.

We also restore for 2006 the 60-vote point of order against considering tax cuts or new spending or debt limit legislation without a new budget resolution.

It is amazing, but our colleagues on the other side last year put in place new spending caps as part of the plan that the chairman of the committee presented moments ago. Last year they put in place spending caps for 2006, 2007, 2008. Two weeks ago, when we passed the supplemental, they wiped them out. So when the Senator suggests that is the answer to our problems—no, it is not the answer to our problems. No process is the answer to our problems, unless there is the will to actually do the job of reducing deficits and debt. No process is going to solve the problem.

That is made clear by what happened two weeks ago. Again, I say to my colleagues, the Senator comes forward with a whole new package of spending caps—fine. Good. I am for spending caps—but spending caps that are enforceable and real, that aren't waived the next year when they start to pinch. That is what our colleagues on the other side of the aisle did week before last. Now they come with a new package of spending caps and say that's the answer? Wait a minute. Two weeks ago they undid the spending caps they put in place last year. Last year they put in spending caps for 2006, 2007, 2008. Then they come week before last in the supplemental appropriations bill and eliminate them.

Last year they put in place a budget point of order that says you can't have more tax cuts or more spending or more debt if you don't have a budget. Guess what they did two weeks ago—they waived it. They said: Well, we weren't really serious about what we did last year. Forget it.

Forget it. Forget the spending caps we put in place last year. Forget the budget point of order we put in place last year. Forget it.

Now what is their answer? Now they are under pressure in an election year. They come out with this ''stop overspending'' plan that rehashes a bunch of the tired old things that haven't worked in the past and that they paid no attention to when they did put them in place.

We restore that 60-vote point of order they just waived. We also allow Congress to strip earmarks in other items inserted in the conference reports.

There is abuse going on in the Congress, and everybody knows it. Matters that are never considered in the Senate or the House are inserted in the conference committee in the dead of night, behind closed doors, and come out here with a straight up-or-down vote. That shouldn't be permitted.

We require a 48-hour layoff period and a Congressional Budget Office score of conference reports because all too often that has been abused. We are presented with a 600- or 700- or 800-page bill nobody has ever read, and nobody has any idea what is in it. And we are told to vote in a matter of hours. No. We ought to have 48 hours to study what is out here, and we ought to have a CBO score of any legislation that is considered so we know what it costs and so we know what is in it.

In addition, we require the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Tax to score longer term revenue and outlays for us to enforce the Byrd Rule for reconciliation and to show fully phased-in 10-year cost of legislation.

Once again, what is happening is colleagues are coming and they are presenting the 5-year cost of something, when they know that right behind the 5-year window the cost explodes. That is true of tax cut proposals and spending proposals. And we need to put a stop to it.

Also, in my proposal we enforce the discretionary spending limits. We enforce spending caps that in conjunction with pay-go have been effective in the past. And we initiate a real bipartisan effort to reduce the deficit with the President and with lawmakers.

Here is the reality. This budget situation has gone totally red. These are the biggest deficits in the history of the country in the last 4 years.

Even more serious than the deficit is the growth of the debt.

Here is what has happened to the debt. After the first year of this President, the debt of the country was $5.8 trillion. The chairman of the Budget Committee told us in committee we wouldn't have a budget this year. There won't be a budget at all.

But if either the budget proposal that cleared the Senate and the separate one that cleared the House were adopted, here is what would happen to the debt by 2011. It would be up to almost $12 trillion. The consequences of all of this are that our debt is exploding and our debt held by foreigners is exploding.

This chart shows that it took 42 Presidents 224 years to run up $1 trillion of our debt held abroad; that is, debt held by foreigners. It took 42 Presidents 224 years to run up more than $1 trillion in U.S. debt held by foreigners.

This President has more than doubled that amount in just 5 years.

This is an utterly unsustainable course. It is why I agreed with part of the chairman's message that we are on an unsustainable course, and we need to address this. But we need to do it in a bipartisan way. That is the great flaw in what the Senator has proposed.

Here is what has happened, a consequence of these massive deficits—both the trade and budget deficits.

We now owe Japan over $600 billion. We owe the Chinese over $300 billion. We even owe Mexico now over $40 billion. Who would have believed it?

What is perhaps most stunning is if you look at the world's biggest borrowers, we are in the No. 1 position by far. In the 1980s, we were the largest creditor nation in the world. More countries owed us money than any other country in the world. We now owe more money than any other country in the world and by a large margin.

If you look at all the money that is available to borrow in the world, we are borrowing about two-thirds of it. We are borrowing 65 percent of the money that is being borrowed by countries around the world. Our country alone is borrowing 65 percent of the money that is available to borrow. The chairman came out. He has a program he calls SOS, ''stop the overspending.'' Who is overspending? His party is in control. His party has had control for 6 years. They control the White House. They control the House, and they control the Senate. There is not one dime of this spending they are not responsible for.

What has happened to spending? Spending has gone up 40 percent while they have had control—a 40-percent increase in spending.

The chairman comes out with this plan. He says stop overspending. But look at it. A big part of this is these spending caps. As I have indicated, they put in spending caps last year, which they threw in the ditch two weeks ago.

They have more budget points of order in their plan. They waived the budget point of orders they put in place last year. They did it week before last.

If you look at that specifics of the proposal the chairman has made, he goes back to the old Gramm-Rudman approach of setting targets. The problem was it didn't work then, and it is unlikely to work now because all of these targets can be gamed. That is what happened under Gramm-Rudman. They gamed them. So they meant nothing.

Here is the dotted red line that shows the first Gramm-Rudman targets. Then they changed them to this dotted red line. But the black line shows what actually happened to the deficit. These deficit targets didn't come within hailing distance of meeting these targets. Why? Because they were gamed just like they have gamed the spending caps that they themselves put in place last year when they started to pinch. They eliminated them.

That is exactly what happened under Gramm-Rudman.

It was gamed, and it meant nothing; the great press releases, the sound and the fury, signifying nothing.

This shows that the 1986 deficit, when they started Gramm-Rudman, was $221 billion. In 1990, the last year of Gramm-Rudman, the deficit was $221 billion. It was supposed to be zero. They made no progress. It didn't work.

The chairman comes out with a package that has Gramm-Rudman all over it again. It doesn't have pay-go; wouldn't want to do that. That worked. So let us go back to something that didn't work and act as though we are doing something when we are doing nothing. The GAO has concluded that Gramm-Rudman was ineffective.

Here is what they said:

> GAO has criticized Gramm-Rudman procedures for leading not to meaningful deficit reduction but rather to a whole generation of off-budget and other misleading practices that hid the true magnitude of the deficit problem.
>
> When even these practices failed to avoid sequestration, the deficit targets were simply revised and the date for achieving a balanced budget was postponed. Thus, instead of the government reaching a balanced budget in FY 1991, the original Gramm-Rudman target, the deficit reached record levels.

I appreciate the chairman's good intentions. I do believe he wants to do something about these deficits and debt. But the package he has come up with is not going to do the job.

That is why we objected. That is why we offered an entire alternative.

Former Senator Hollings, was one of the original architects of Gramm-Rudman, said this:

> Instead of using Gramm-Rudman-Hollings to cut back some $35 billion in spending each year, we were using it as a cover to increase spending $35 billion each and every year. So I said, Give me a divorce from that. I don't want my name connected with it.

The chairman's package also includes a biennial budget. Instead of budgeting every year, budget every 2 years. I guess we are not going to even have a budget this year. So maybe we are on a biennial budget without it even being in the law.

Can you think of any single major organization that just budgets every other year? What a bizarre idea. We are paying little attention to the budget. So the idea from the other side is let us pay even less attention. That is a good idea.

It takes words away from me. To have the idea that because we are not being successful in managing our fiscal affairs, the answer is we only budget every 2 years.

That would simply lead to more supplemental spending.

While the President is calling for a biennial budget, and his budget for 2006–2007 failed to provide a discretionary spending policy beyond the first year.

For the first time since 1989, this President, when he put out his budget, only gave 1 year of detail. Always before they had given 5 years.

Why it makes any sense to go to 2-year budgeting is beyond me.

In addition, they have proposed a line-item veto, even though the Supreme Court said it is unconstitutional. In this package, they come with line-item veto again. But they have done it in a way that requires our colleagues' attention. They have done it with no opportunity to amend or to have extended debate on the proposed line-item veto target.

They also allow the President to cancel new mandatory spending proposals, such as those dealing with Social Security, Medicare, veterans, and agriculture.

That is an extraordinary grant of power.

What if we had a bipartisan agreement to deal with the long-term challenges of Medicare and Social Security, and then the President would be given the power, under this act, to go undo it based on what he wanted to do, forget about the bipartisan negotiations? No, that can't be the way we do business around here. We truly need, on a bipartisan basis, to get together and deal with our massive deficits and debt. We can't engage in a negotiation, a detailed, difficult negotiation and then have the President, on his own authority, be able to undo the very agreements we have reached. What earthly sense does that make? How could we possibly have a negotiation under those terms?

The CBO Director believes the line-item veto was unlikely to greatly affect the bottom line. He said:

Such tools cannot establish fiscal discipline unless there is a political consensus to do so. In the absence of that consensus, proposed changes are unlikely to greatly affect the budget's bottom line.

He is right. No President needs the line-item veto.

This is from the Roanoke Times in Virginia. They said:

The President already has the only tool he needs, the veto. That Bush has declined to challenge Congress in 5-plus years is his choice. The White House no doubt sees reviving this debate as means of distracting people from the missteps, miscalculations, mistruths and mistakes that have dogged Bush and sent his approval rating south. The current problems are not systemic. They are ideological. A line-item veto will not magically grant lawmakers and the President fiscal discipline.

They are not alone in that view.

Here is a conservative columnist, George Will, who believes the line-item veto will shift too much power to the executive branch. He said:

It would aggravate the imbalance in our constitutional system that has been growing for seven decades. The expansion of executive power at the expense of the legislature.

An American Enterprise Institute scholar calls the line- item veto proposal ''shameful.''

Shameful. The larger reality is this line-item veto proposal gives the President a great additional mischief-making capability, to pluck out items to punish lawmakers he doesn't like, or to threaten individual lawmakers to get votes on other things without having any noticeable impact on budget growth or restraint.

He went on to say this:

More broadly, it simply shows the lack of institutional integrity and patriotism by the majority in Congress. They have lots of ways to put the responsibility on budget restraint where it belongs, on themselves. Instead, they willingly—even eagerly—try to turn their most basic power over to the President. Shameful. Just shameful.

The chairman of the Budget Committee indicated he has changed his proposal so the Commission on Social Security and Medicare would require a 60-vote majority in the Senate. That is true. His original proposal did not do that. His original proposal had a simple majority being able to pass whatever a commission sent back.

What is wrong with the commission proposal he has left us with? What is wrong is, this proposal comes to us on a fast-track basis. In fact, the way it is designed, you could have a circumstance in which no amendments are permitted. I hope my colleagues are listening. They want to adopt a commission process that would permit the following: The commission, which has a majority of Republicans, says we want to cut Social Security 50 percent, comes up here to the Senate, the majority leader gets recognition, which he has the right to do under Senate rules, puts in an amendment, offers a quorum call, goes into a quorum call for 50 hours, with no amendments, no debate, and at the end of the 50 hours, we vote on the commission proposal. That is at the heart of what is wrong with what the chairman proposed. That is a completely unacceptable procedure.

We are not going to have a circumstance in which the future of Social Security and Medicare could be determined in the Senate under fast-track procedures that deny Senators a chance to amend or debate what comes from an unelected, unaccountable commission. Is that what we have come to in this country? I don't think so. This is not some dictatorship where things come up here and Senators could be precluded from their right to amend or debate. That is the genius of the Senate.

Under the chairman's proposal, that is exactly what could happen. He says no majority leader would ever do that. Maybe not. Maybe what they would do, using that power, is say: There can only be five amendments, or I will use my power to preclude all amendments.

Have we ever seen a majority leader do that? Yes, I have been here. I have seen it.

I say, as one Member, I will never, ever, go along with something that would be so consequential, determine the future of Social Security, the future of Medicare, and set up a circumstance in which no Senator could offer an amendment except the majority leader of the Senate. That looks like not just a fast-track process, that looks like a bum's rush.

The Senator gets a big push back from our side, you bet. He will get a real big push back because we are not going to agree to that. That is radical. That is reckless. We are not going to go along with that. The Senator can say it can never happen, but we all know it could happen.

I respect the chairman of the Committee on the Budget. I like him. We work together well. When he came out here and said we offered no alternatives, that is flatly untrue. We gave a detailed, comprehensive alternative which he praised publicly in the committee. To come to the Senate and say we offered no alternative is just not true. He knows it; I know it. The record shows it.

I am quite certain the Senator was exercised and upset and probably misspoke. I hope he corrects the record on this question. It cannot stand. It does not enhance this discussion or debate for either side to say things that are not accurate. He is upset that some of our side apparently said the commission proposal would come up here on a simple majority. That was his initial proposal. Under my criticism of that approach, he did alter that. But he still left us with a fast-track process that could preclude amendments and debate on something as fundamental as the future of Social Security and Medicare. That is just not acceptable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

ENERGY

Mr. SALAZAR. Madam President, let me first say my colleague from North Dakota does an incredible job in terms of leading our country with a voice that stands for fiscal discipline. When he talks about the mountain of debt that we are continuing to build in this country, and passing on that mountain of debt to our children and our grandchildren, the American people deserve more of this Congress and more of Washington, DC, and more of this President. I look forward to his continuing leadership on this issue to try and bring about fiscal integrity and fiscal honesty to the United States of America. The American people deserve no less than that kind of candor and integrity from the Senate.

I rise today to talk about an urgent issue which we all ought to be very concerned about in the United States of America. That is the issue of energy. Last year, this Senate put together a bipartisan template on the National Energy Policy Act of 2005 which may go down in our history as being one of the most important achievements of the 109th Congress. Notwithstanding

the fact that we put together energy legislation that did some great things for conservation, that stood out for renewable energy, that said that new technologies were part of how we could lock in the future of our Nation's energy independence, we have had many opportunities to move forward and to continue to address the issue of energy. Yet we have not done that as a Congress nor as a Senate.

Six months of this year have already passed. It has been 5 months since the President of the United States, before the American people, said that we were addicted to foreign oil and we needed to take aggressive steps to move forward to get ourselves to energy independence.

I had the honor of hosting the President at the National Renewable Energy Lab in Golden, CO, and we looked at the possibility of renewable energy. Yet some 6 months after that January speech, we still are here in this Senate without having moved forward with any significant kind of energy legislation. That is wrong. Part of the people's business, the highest priority, is for us to look at this energy dilemma we are facing in this country and to embrace in a real, honest, and ethical way the imperative that moves us toward energy independence.

I will address part of what I think we ought to be doing with our movement toward energy independence in our country today. The time to get serious about growing our way to energy independence is long overdue. If Brazil, a Third World country, can do it, it is inexcusable for the United States of America, the strongest Nation on Earth, to do otherwise.

Today in Brazil, ethanol substitutes for 204,000 barrels of gasoline sold every day. Over 40 percent of all the gasoline that is sold nationally in Brazil comes from ethanol, making that country energy independent today.

In the last couple of months, we have had a lot of ideas discussed in this Senate and through multiple press conferences about how we can ease the pain at the pump for the American consumers. We have heard ideas to give $100 tax rebates. We heard ideas to create a tax holiday for gas, to enact a Federal gas price-gouging statute, to reduce the number of fuels that are currently on the market, to end royalty relief, and on and on. There are lots of ideas talked about that we should give careful consideration.

We should also talk straight to the American people. We are a nation that relies on oil to power our economy. We import almost 60 percent of our oil from countries such as Saudi Arabia, Nigeria, Iraq, and Venezuela. We are hostage to a cartel of oil-producing countries that decide how much oil will reach the market at any given moment. Many Members of this cartel are unfriendly to the United States. They know how much power their oil has over our national security.

The bottom line is that energy independence is important to all of us in the 21st century if we are to achieve national security.

Without a reliable and affordable supply of homegrown energy, our dependence on foreign oil will only continue to increase, further warping our foreign policy and jeopardizing the stability of our economy. If we continue at our current pace, in two decades we will be importing 70 percent of our oil from foreign countries. We cannot afford to stay that course on our energy policy.

Expanding our domestic production of oil and gas is an important component in our Nation's movement toward energy independence. We should continue to encourage the balanced development of the resources that we have. We should accelerate our development of clean coal technologies to produce clean-burning synfuel gases and jet fuels from coal, an abundant domestic resource. But none of the rhetoric can change the fact that we just don't have enough petroleum resources in this country to drill our way to energy independence.

Today, we are the world's third leading producer of oil, but our rate of oil consumption—primarily for transportation—is almost three times our rate of oil production. Furthermore, the sad truth is that we only have 3 percent of the world's reserves in the United States of America. That 3 percent includes the proven reserves in the State of Alaska.

We ought to look at our renewable energy future. If we make a dramatic, perhaps even a revolutionary new commitment to renewable energy, the fuel grown in American fields can help power our vehicle fleet. With a bold new commitment, we can produce enough fuel on our farm lands and ranch lands to meet 25 percent of our energy needs by the year 2025.

Farmers and ranchers and all of rural America are rallying behind this cry for a goal of ''25 by 25.'' Our farmers are growing corn, soybeans, and sunflowers to be used for ethanol and biodiesel. Ranchers are building windfarms and using animal manure for power. Rural business men and women are investing in biorefineries. New jobs are springing up in many places where they had no jobs. Rural economies, long forgotten, are starting to gather steam as part of the renewable energy chapter opens in America.

It is time for Congress as a whole to embrace rural America's vision for this renewable energy future. Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY and I have introduced a resolution that would make ''25 by 25'' our national goal.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this resolution because producing 25 percent of our energy on agricultural lands by 2025 is, in fact, a fully achievable goal. We can do it. We can do it if we get on task and we make a bipartisan commitment to work toward this goal. We should begin on this goal immediately.

First, we should raise the renewable fuel standards we set in last year's Energy Policy Act. That goal, in law today, is to produce 7.5 billion gallons of renewable fuels by 2012. That goal is far too modest. We will easily meet this goal under current policies. Yet we will not be putting enough renewable fuels on the market to give consumers a real choice or to make a real dent in our oil dependence on foreign countries. We should increase this target so we are producing 9 billion gallons of renewable fuel by 2012 and 30 billion gallons of renewable fuel by the year 2025.

Second, we should extend the renewable energy production tax credit until 2012. The existing production tax credit is now set to expire in 2007. That creates uncertainty for business people and investors who want to invest in renewable energy.

We have legislation that I have introduced, S. 1093, the Research and Development Investment Act, which extends the renewable energy production tax credits through 2012, allowing more investment and quicker growth in the renewable energy market.

Next, we should pass S. 2025, the Vehicle and Fuel Choices for American Security Act. This is an important piece of legislation with broad bipartisan support. S. 2025 will essentially do three simple but very important conceptual things.

First, it will increase the amount of biofuels we currently are producing in America. Second, it will ensure there are filling stations that are available across the country that will provide alternative fuels to give that choice to the American consumer. And, third, it will also help transform Detroit to embrace alternative fuel vehicle systems.

Right now, the United States consumes around 20 million barrels of oil every day. Twenty million barrels of oil every day are consumed in America. Two-thirds of those 20 million barrels a day are consumed in our transportation system—by our cars and our trucks—across this country. This is alarming: The massive amount of oil we are importing is barley enough to cover the needs of the transportation sector.

S. 2025 tackles this problem head on. It brings more gallons of biofuels to the market. It gives consumers access to alternative fuels. It retools America's vehicle fleet to run more efficiently and to run on alternative fuels. By passing S. 2025, we will give consumers more choices of fuels and vehicles, lower and stabilize the cost of fuel, and reduce our reliance on foreign oil.

This is not a Republican or Democratic agenda. This is an American agenda. And this American agenda toward energy independence is demonstrated by the group of Senators who are supporting S. 2025. They include Senator BROWNBACK, Senator BAYH, Senator GRAHAM, Senator CANTWELL, Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator COLEMAN, Senator DODD, Senator BILL NELSON, Senator ISAKSON, Senator KOHL, Senator LUGAR, Senator OBAMA, Senator

SESSIONS, Senator CLINTON, Senator CHAFEE, and others. We think this bill is effective, and we would hope the Senate can move forward and embrace this bill and pass it so the President can sign it yet this year.

What S. 2025 does, in more detail, is it is aggressive in encouraging the increased production of biofuels. It provides loan guarantees to farmer-owned ethanol producers, to help them make investments in renewable energy systems and infrastructure. It also increases the ethanol infrastructure tax credit that we passed last summer in the Energy Policy Act so that credit is set at 50 percent. This will lower the startup costs for farmers and communities and businesspeople who want to build a biorefinery or a processing plant.

These producers will benefit from the bill's investments in biofuels research. By doubling the funding for biofuels research, S. 2025 will improve yields and efficiencies and expand the range of feedstocks that can be used for biofuels production.

Secondly, S. 2025 helps reduce our foreign oil dependency by giving consumers access to alternative fuels at filling stations. Currently, in the United States, we have 5 million flexible fuel vehicles. These vehicles can run on either gasoline or E–85, an 85-percent ethanol-gasoline mix. We today are adding about 1.5 million of these flex-fuel vehicles to our national fleet every year. The trouble is, as you well know, there are only 485 filling stations in the country that carry E–85. There are only 485 filling stations today in the country that carry E–85. We have the technology on the road that allows cars to run on biofuels, but because consumers cannot pump E–85 fuel at their local filling station, we are not taking full advantage of the oil-saving rewards of the flex-fuel technology, which is now being deployed into our national fleet.

S. 2025 would solve this problem. It would solve this problem by helping to build the pumps and filling station infrastructure needed to deliver biofuels to consumers. The bill provides loan guarantees and tax incentives to farmers and business owners for the construction of pump stations to dispense fuels. It also uses CAFE penalties that have already been collected by the Government from foreign manufacturers to expand funding for grants to finance alternative fueling infrastructure.

One of the DOE grantees from this year alone, the National Ethanol Vehicle Coalition, will be able to build 300 stations with its $2 million grant. With at least 10 times the amount of that funding available, we should be able to equip at least 3,000 filling stations across America with the infrastructure that delivers biofuels to consumers who are in search for these alternative fuels.

The economic benefits of giving these fuel choices to consumers are clear. If consumers can rely on filling their tank with E–85 fuel wherever they go, demand for the fuel and demand for cars that run on E–85 will increase dramatically, cutting demand for petroleum-based fuel. Not only will this help us deal with gas prices, but it will also stabilize them. We can count on our farmers to harvest their crops, but we cannot count—we cannot count—on Iran or the Middle East to sell us their oil.

Finally, S. 2025 will help us retool our national vehicle fleet. S. 2025 sets goals for improving the efficiency of our vehicle fleet and for getting more advanced vehicles on the road. It sets these goals and then helps manufacturers retool their vehicle fleets to meet them.

The bill sets targets for manufacturers to produce alternative fuel vehicles, plug-in hybrids, fuel cell vehicles, flexible-fuel vehicles, and other technologies which can run on regular gasoline or biofuel alternatives. By 2012, 1 in 10 vehicles produced will be advanced vehicles. By 2016, 1 in 2 vehicles produced will be advanced vehicles that can run on these alternative fuels or these advanced technologies.

We will help manufacturers make these changes to their fleets. The bill establishes a tax credit for the costs the manufacturers incur when they are retooling or expanding their facilities to produce advanced vehicles. The bill also authorizes support for research that will provide lightweight materials to the auto industry and for technology for electric drive trains, batteries, and plug-in hybrids.

The bill closes the SUV tax loophole, limits idling by buses, and requires that fuel economy standards be set for heavy duty vehicles so we can stop burning fuel we do not need to burn. For each 1 mile per gallon efficiency we find in this country, we save 1 million barrels of oil per day, or $20 billion a year.

These are sensible, easy-to-implement solutions. Many of them, many of these ideas, have now been included in two bills that Senator BINGAMAN, Senator CHAFEE, Senator LIEBERMAN, Senator COLEMAN, Senator CANTWELL, and I and others have introduced. These are the Enhanced Energy Security Act of 2006, which will push the Federal Government to save 2.5 million barrels of oil per day by 2016, and at least 10 million barrels per day by 2031, and the new energy tax bill, which provides multiple incentives to manufacturers, businesses, and consumers alike to utilize energy-efficient programs and alternatives themselves.

The provisions of S. 2025 and the energy tax bill will give consumers more choices at the pump and reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

Each of us should be asking: What if we do nothing? What if we do nothing? What if we continue our malignant neglect of the long-term energy policy of the United States of America? If we do continue this malignant neglect, we will become increasingly vulnerable to the instabilities and whims of countries across the globe. The American consumer will continue to suffer, and the American economy will have lost an opportunity that has come its way.

We have devoted a lot of time to many issues over the last 6 months of this year in this Congress. We have not devoted enough time on this floor to the issue of energy and of energy independence. We need to do so because to do otherwise is to neglect the national security of the United States.

When you have a system that starts to break down, you have to address the cause as well as the symptoms of the problem. If your roof keeps springing leaks, you don't just put more and more buckets out. What you do is you eventually build yourself a new roof. We need to build a new energy policy in America, one that is built on the promise of renewable energy, technology, and conservation.

I believe Americans are eager for us as a Senate to do this. In States across the country, people are enacting renewable portfolio standards and demanding access to alternative energies. They imagine a renewable energy future that harnesses the business and work ethic of rural America and which breathes new life into sagging rural economies. They look at fields of corn, soy, and sunflowers and see the raw materials for biodiesel and for ethanol.

The renewable energy revolution is already underway in America thanks to farmers and ranchers and businesspeople who have been leading it, who have been doing their part. We now, as a Congress, need to do our part to push the renewable energy revolution forward.

I urge our Senate, in a bipartisan fashion, following the template of last year's national Energy Policy Act, to move forward to secure America's renewable energy future by making ''25 by 25'' our national goal.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THUNE). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ATTACK ON PAN AM FLIGHT 103 AND LIBYA

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to speak about an issue of great importance to the State of New Jersey, to the United States of America, and to all of those who stand against acts of terrorism and violence: the attack on Pan Am flight 103.

The attack on Pan Am flight 103 shocked the world and claimed the lives of 189 Americans, including 38 citizens from my home State of New Jersey.

After these terrible attacks, and significant pressure from the international community, the Libyan Government finally agreed to pay $10 million to the families of those who were murdered.

The Libyan Government still owes $2 million to these families, which it promised to pay as soon as it was removed from the state sponsor of terror list, an action the State Department announced on May 15. The 45-day waiting period ended today, and the Libyans will be off the list. But we cannot allow them to be off the hook.

Libya, according to a Washington Post article, declared yesterday that it no longer has a legal obligation to make the final payment of $2 million to the families of those killed. Libya is trying to argue that it doesn't have to pay this money because they were ''supposed'' to be taken off the terror list earlier. But what Libya forgets is that it had to earn the right to get off the terror list and that Libya's own actions are what delayed the process. In fact, the reason the process was delayed is because we discovered that the Libyans had been plotting to kill a member of the Saudi royal family, among other incidents.

Why should American families be deprived of their payment because of Libya's mistakes? Libya's argument is not only factually incorrect, it is immoral. At a time when we are fighting terrorism around the world, at a time when our men and women in uniform are putting their lives on the line to protect us from terrorists, at a time when we should send a message to the world that terrorism and the murder of U.S. citizens cannot be tolerated, we cannot allow the Libyans to get away with at least paying these grieving families that which they are owed. This money is not going to bring back their loved ones. It is not going to heal the pain. But it is an obligation that should be met.

Let me be clear: This money in no way absolves Libya of its actions in this incident. This money in no way will replace those who were murdered. This money in no way makes up for the loss, pain, and suffering of the families. But a promise made should be a promise kept, and Libya must keep its promise, period.

I hope the Libyans hear this message loudly and clearly. I also hope the administration hears the message loudly and clearly. Our State Department should be advocating for American families, not for facilitating the Libyans in breaking their commitment. We should not allow any implementation of diplomatic engagement until the Libyans honor their commitment.

I promise that, along with a number of other Members of Congress who represent families from different parts of the Nation who lost a loved one on Pan Am Flight 103, we will not rest until this payment is made, until the Libyans fulfill their promise. A promise made must be a promise kept. It is outrageous for the Libyans to act any other way. It would be equally as outrageous for our Government to act in any other way other than to make sure that we help these families in having this commitment honored.

I thank the senior Senator from New Jersey, Mr. LAUTENBERG, who has been a leader on the Pan Am Flight 103 attacks from the beginning, continuing to fight for the citizens of New Jersey and all of the other families who suffered in these terrible attacks. I am proud to join him, now that I am in the Senate, in this effort. I am committed to making sure that these families ultimately receive the commitment and the fulfillment of that commitment that the Libyan Government made. Our Government should ensure that we do no less.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 2:20 p.m. today, the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of the nomination of Henry Paulson to be Secretary of the Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING THE 230TH ''CAROLINA DAY''

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, June 28 is a great day in the history of my State of South Carolina and in the formation of our great Nation. You see, it is on this date that we celebrate Carolina Day.

Two hundred and thirty years ago today, a small but determined group of fewer than 1,200 South Carolina patriots held off a British force that was more than twice their size.

The battle—which took place on Sullivan's Island, just outside the entrance to Charleston Harbor—became the first major American victory of the Revolutionary War.

Colonel William Moultrie, who commanded the colonist troops, had few resources at his disposal. So, he built a fort out of palmetto logs—a plentiful local resource.

Facing such make-shift opposition, the British commanders thought they would easily sweep into Charleston.

But these amazing palmetto logs actually absorbed the impact of the British cannonballs. This strengthened the American defense and gave the brave colonists a critical advantage.

The British were soundly defeated in a long, nine-hour battle. More than 200 of the British were killed or wounded, compared to only 35 of Colonel Moultrie's command.

Many historians consider this battle to be one of the greatest defeats in the entire history of the British navy.

Many South Carolina heroes were made on that day.

One such, hero, Sergeant William Jasper, is recognized for saving the regiment's flag after it was shot down by British fire. Seeing that it had been hit, Jasper exclaimed, ''Colonel, don't let us fight without our flag!''

Sergeant Jasper then jumped into the face of enemy fire, walked the entire length of the fort—in full view of the British and cut the flag from its broken pole. He then added a new staff and replanted the flag back on the fort wall. Turning to the enemy, he gave three cheers and returned to his gun.

That flag—a blue banner with a white crescent—represented the dream of real freedom to these patriots. And today, that historic banner still serves as a source of pride and inspiration, as part of South Carolina's official State seal.

The blue background and white crescent also serve as the basis of our beautiful State flag, which incorporates a tall, proud palmetto tree . . . in recognition of the heroes of Fort Moultrie.

The resounding American defense of the City of Charleston at Fort Moultrie gave our fledgling Nation hope in the possibility of ultimate victory. And less than one week later—on July 4, 1776—the Continental Congress forever changed the course of history, signing our Declaration of Independence.

This story has profound relevance to what we face today as we fight the global war on terror. I can imagine those great patriots felt the same kind of joy that is plainly visible in the eyes of Iraqi citizens . . . people who are only now beginning to share in the sweet taste of freedoms that we so often take for granted.

Mr. President, as we celebrate Independence Day with friends and family, may we always remember the price that was paid for our freedom.

And may we resolve that the sacrifice of our brave soldiers across the years—from Fort Moultrie, SC, to Kirkuk, Iraq—will never have been in vain.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STEM CELL RESEARCH

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, here we sit in the Senate, quorum call after quorum call. Not much is happening. We just had our meeting of Democratic

leaders for lunch, and we are wondering what is going on here. Here we sit. Nothing is happening.

Over a year ago, the House of Representatives voted on and passed H.R. 810, the Stem Cell Research Act, and sent it over to the Senate. It is pending at the desk. That was over a year ago.

We have asked repeatedly—repeatedly—for the majority leader to bring up this bill so that we can debate it—I am sure under a time agreement—and pass it and send it to the President. The bill is supported by a majority of Senators on a bipartisan basis. It enjoys large majorities in every public opinion poll, which is hardly surprising because stem cell research holds tremendous promise for curing illnesses and saving lives.

One obstacle stands in the way of moving ahead aggressively in stem cell research. The Senate has squandered over a year waiting for the majority leader to make good on his pledge to bring H.R. 810 to the floor for a vote. So here we sit.

Why aren't we bringing up H.R. 810? Families with children with juvenile diabetes, families with members who are stricken by Alzheimer's, people with spinal cord injuries either from birth or from an accident or other illnesses, and people with other neurological disorders and diseases—these are the ones scientists tell us can be helped the most and the fastest through the application of stem cell therapy, which would be the result of stem cell research.

We just had a Health Week here, too. We had a Health Week about a month ago, and we didn't bring up H.R. 810 then. Everybody talked a lot about everything, but we didn't do anything.

The fact is, I said H.R. 810 has support on both sides. I just mention that Senators SPECTER, HATCH, and SMITH in particular have urged the majority leader to bring up the bill. As a matter of fact, last year, Senator FRIST himself gave a speech on the floor and endorsed H.R. 810. But again the majority leader has refused to bring it up for a vote.

We have written him letters. I have taken the floor numerous times, especially in lulls such as this when nothing is happening. It looks as if we will go all through today and tomorrow and, of course, then we won't be here on Friday. No wonder the American people have such a low opinion of this place. No wonder. They don't think we are doing anything, and they are right, we are not doing anything. Especially we are not attending to the urgent business of the American people.

People are suffering from incurable illnesses. People are hoping we will move ahead aggressively in embryonic stem cell research and in all areas of stem cell research, but we still sit here and dawdle, take our time, and don't do anything.

I don't mean to make it a partisan issue because it has never been a partisan issue. As I said, we have a number of Republicans supporting this bill in this body, and it was passed in the House with both Republican and Democratic support. I will say this: If the Democrats were in charge of this Senate, we would have had H.R. 810 up by now and would have passed it and would have sent it to the President.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield for a question?

Mr. HARKIN. Yes.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Is the Senator from Iowa aware of the fact that we have come up with a terrific product, that science has discovered a vaccine which will prevent cervical cancer?

Mr. HARKIN. That is right.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, taking this vaccine can reduce cervical cancer deaths by 70 percent—70 percent. In America, we lose about 4,000 women a year to cervical cancer. Across the world, the numbers are over 230,000 annually. Is the Senator from Iowa aware that there are detractors? The Senator is certainly aware, as he discusses stem cell research and conditions that are so painful for families, such as juvenile diabetes and other autoimmune diseases, that not enough money is going into these programs. But in this case, the chance to stop cervical cancer from killing women has detractors out there who say: If we do that, we will encourage promiscuity. Did you ever hear anything so silly in your life? It is the same as saying: If you give seatbelts to people, they are going to drive more recklessly. It just doesn't make sense.

So if the Senator is aware of these things, they will, I am sure, add interest and fervor to his appeal to get on with finding out what is killing people.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I would respond by saying that if anybody knows about saving lives and providing good health to people in America, it is the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. LAUTENBERG.

I was privileged to be here when the Senator got his amendment through to ban smoking on airlines. I remember the day you got on an airplane and it was packed with smoke. Then they had a divider, and in one place you could smoke and in another place you couldn't, and still the air would be filled with smoke. It was the Senator from New Jersey—God bless him—who got that amendment through. I will never forget, right after that amendment passed, I used to fly back and forth to Iowa, and flight stewardess after flight stewardess would come back to me and say: Do you know Senator LAUTENBERG? And I would say: Sure, I do. And they would say: Well, please tell him thanks. We have been breathing that smoke for years, and now we don't have to. So I thank the Senator for the countless lives he has saved and the working conditions he has made better for all of the people, and all of the passengers who fly on airplanes have the Senator to thank for that.

So when the Senator from New Jersey talks about the vaccine for cervical cancer, he is right on the mark, and he keeps up his long tradition of his focus on health care for all Americans. It is a shame that we have a vaccine which could be given to women, young women—as you know, I think it is three shots, if I am not mistaken, and I think it is good for life.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. For a lifetime.

Mr. HARKIN. So you could take it as a young girl. And what are we doing right now? Nothing. We should be moving ahead aggressively in this country and in other countries where cervical cancer is a killer. As the Senator knows, it is a killer. Yet we are not doing anything. We sit here doing nothing. It is in that spirit which I thank the Senator for bringing that up. I yield to him.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, the Senator may be aware that I recently sent a letter to the Centers for Disease Control saying: ''Get on with it. Get the vaccine out there. And don't let opponents stand in the way. You are responsible. The product has passed all the tests. It is considered safe and effective.'' So I sent this letter, and another one to the Food and Drug Administration. I don't know whether the Senator is aware of these letters, but I am sure that, knowing his disposition about these things, that he would want to join in this effort and say: '' CDC, don't you dare hold back on this information. Don't you dare.'' Right?

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I say to my friend, sign me up.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. We will do that. I would like to thank the Senator for the compliment on the smoking prohibition in airplanes. It has finally penetrated, after almost 20 years now, into homes, into restaurants, into places where smoking just isn't an acceptable habit anymore. Today's papers have stories about how dangerous secondhand smoke is; you don't have to smoke the cigarette yourself, you just need to be near someone who is. I am sure the Senator is aware of the fact that breathing other people's smoke can be as dangerous to your health as if you engaged in smoking yourself.

What a coincidence it is that as we have been talking about the no smoking in airplanes, our colleague from the State of Illinois, Senator DURBIN, has joined us on the floor. At the time, he was the House author of the ban and I was the Senate author, so the two of us together were able to put that legislation into effect.

Returning to the vaccine, is the Senator aware of the fact that there are detractors out there who, even if you get the good product, will stand in the way of it being made readily available to people who need it?

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I appreciate that. The fact is, yes, I think it is sick. There is some illness people have when they say we shouldn't be giving cervical cancer vaccinations to women because they may become more promiscuous. What kind of sick thought is

that? What kind of sick thought is that? But we hear it. It is out there. It is the same as those who are trying to stop embryonic stem cell research: Oh, no, we can't destroy these embryos. Well, we had a hearing yesterday morning on this issue. The Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. SANTORUM, has a bill in, and he testified before Senator SPECTER and me and Senator DURBIN from Illinois, who was also there for that hearing. I think what came out of that hearing is we have over 400,000 embryos left over from in vitro fertilization which are now frozen which are going to be discarded because obviously the parents who had in vitro fertilization—once they have had their children and they don't want to have any more, the in vitro fertilization organization calls up and says: Do you want to keep these? And they say: Well, no, we don't want to have any more children. And so they throw them away. They do this every day. They destroy these every day.

What we are saying is, why not take these things with about 16 cells in them and take the cells out and use them to derive embryonic stem cells, which can become any of the cells in our body—nerve cells, muscle cells, tissue cells—and use them to advance the research so that we can cure those illnesses from which so many people suffer?

Mr. DURBIN. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HARKIN. I will. Let me just say that a friend of mine recently passed away from ALS—Lou Gehrig's disease. If anyone has seen anyone get Lou Gehrig's disease and die of it, it is the worst. It is the worst. It is a death sentence as soon as you are told you have it, as soon as you are diagnosed with it. No one lives, and usually death occurs within a year to 2 years. As your muscles deteriorate and your lungs give out and you are no longer able to walk, to write, to speak, the mind continues on. You are aware of every second until the day, the minute you die. ALS—one of the most horrible diseases which afflicts mankind, humankind, and the scientists tell us one of the diseases which is in the target zone for embryonic stem cell research. Think about that. Yet we are told it is better to throw these away, take these in vitro fertilization leftover cells, throw them down the drain, but don't use them for life-giving research. I say to my friend from New Jersey, it is the same as those who want to stop women from getting vaccinations for cervical cancer because they think that, somehow, women will be more sexually promiscuous because of it. I don't understand that way of thinking.

I yield to my friend from Illinois who was at the hearing yesterday for any comments he would like to make.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would ask the Senators who are engaging in this colloquy, through the Chair—it is also curious to note that while we are taking this moral position against certain vaccinations against cervical cancer, if I am not mistaken, we are also financing Viagra products for some men through some of our same programs. A little hard to follow that logic.

But I would ask the Senator from Iowa or the Senator from New Jersey to make it clear on the embryonic stem cell situation: Were it not for President Bush's Executive order limiting Federal research with embryonic stem cells, we would be dramatically expanding research into diabetes, Parkinson's, Alzheimer's, Lou Gehrig's disease, spinal cord regeneration, and a multitude of areas where we clearly need breakthroughs in research?

Mr. HARKIN. Yes.

Mr. DURBIN. Is it not also a fact that the bill which passed the House of Representatives which has been sitting on the calendar in the Senate, our calendar of business, for 1 full year while people are suffering from these problems, is it not also true that in this bill, we are very clear: no human cloning. That is not a part of this, correct?

Mr. HARKIN. Right.

Mr. DURBIN. It includes ethical guidelines which will not allow the commercialization of these stem cells: you can't sell them, and you cannot direct them. You cannot say: The leftover embryonic stem cells from my wife and myself are going to go to my Uncle Charlie. You can't do that. So we have established strict ethical guidelines of commercialization, direction of the cells, no human cloning. Yet the bill has sat on the calendar for a year, despite the fact that the Republican majority leader of the Senate has promised us for a year he would call up the bill. For a year, people with these diseases have been waiting patiently.

Perhaps I can put my finger on the problem. I ask the Senator from Iowa, would we have a better chance calling the embryonic stem cell issue to the floor if we made it a constitutional amendment? It appears those are very popular. We just did two of those in the last few weeks.

If we could make this a constitutional amendment, would we have a better chance with the Republican majority?

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, if I may interject one point: is the Senator also aware, as the question of the Senator from Illinois is reviewed, that if we weren't busy giving tax breaks to the very wealthiest among us, to people who don't need the tax breaks and often don't even want them, we would have the funding necessary to do research on all kinds of things? The National Cancer Institute doesn't get the kind of money it deserves in terms of the positive effect it could have on our lives and on the financial condition in this country. The National Institutes of Health don't get the kind of funding they need. We see someone like Warren Buffett stand up and say that he is going to give nearly $40 billion away. That shows you what happens if you work hard in this country. It just shows you. But the administration and the other side want to give Warren Buffett more money. They want to give him more than he has, when he's busy giving it away. They want to give more to Bill Gates, who also is one of our more ennobling figures in this country. Is the Senator aware these are resources which could be used far better elsewhere?

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I am aware, I say to my friend from New Jersey. In fact, under the President's budget this year, as we are now giving more and more tax breaks to the wealthy, there is a cut in funding for the National Cancer Institute. For the first time in my career, since I have been here, we are actually cutting funding under the President's budget for the National Cancer Institute. Now, we here are going to try to put that money back in sometime this year, but I am just saying that the President's budget, what he sent to us, cuts money from the National Cancer Institute.

I say to my friend from Illinois, he is right on target. On August 9, 2001, President Bush got on television, national television—I remember watching him—and it was shortly after 9 p.m., and he made this executive finding that stem cells derived by our Federal researchers prior to 9 p.m. on August 9, 2001, were OK. We could use those for research. That was OK. That was ethical, moral, legitimate. But any stem cells derived after 9 p.m. on August 9 of 2001 were not ethical; they were immoral, not legitimate, and could not be funded by the Federal Government.

I thought about that. I thought, why did he pick 9 p.m.? Why didn't he pick 9:15? Why wasn't it 10 p.m.? Or 8:52? Why 9? It was just plucked out of thin air. It seems to me if it was wrong before, it was wrong after. Or if it was correct and good before, it was correct and good after 9 p.m. It was totally arbitrary.

I say to my friend from Illinois, the other thing we found out is, out of these so-called 75 lines which supposedly we had—which we thought at the time we had enough—it is now down to 21 cell lines. And here is the kicker: Every single one of those cell lines that were derived have been contaminated with mouse cells. They have been grown on mouse feeder cells, so not one of them will probably ever be useful for human therapy. Not a one of them.

The Senator from Illinois is absolutely correct. If it had not been for President Bush's announcement on August 9, 2001, right after 9 p.m.—if it had not been for that, we would have had 5 more years, that have now gone by, of good science, good research under the ethical kinds of guidelines, as the Senator from Illinois just outlined. And we would be much further down the road toward saying to those families with diabetes, kids with juvenile diabetes,

people who have ALS, Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's—we would be closer to saying hope is there because we are doing the research and we are going to find the cures. It will not happen unless and until we get over that Presidential proclamation of August 9, 2001.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, first, I want to say to our friend from Iowa how much we appreciate his diligence in promoting better health in this country, and more opportunities for all Americans. I think, for instance, of his work on the Americans with Disabilities Act. Because of that bill, people who have a disability and weren't able to get around as easily as some others, now have access to so many more places. We are so grateful to the Senator from Iowa for his work on that landmark legislation.

LIBYA

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, today the Bush administration is taking an action that is almost incomprehensible. Frankly, it is outrageous, when you think about it. The administration is removing Libya from the State Department's list of state sponsors of terror even though Muammar Qadhafi has not fulfilled his commitments to the American victims of Libyan terror. Even though Qadhafi is not keeping his promise to Americans who lost loved ones when agents of his government bombed Pan Am flight 103, the administration is going to give Libya full diplomatic privileges.

The President is taking this action even though this Senate recently passed my resolution which said that diplomatic credentials should not be given to Libya until Qadhafi provides all of the restitution promised to the families of the victims of the Pan Am Flight 103 bombing and other acts of terror supported by Libya. I know a lot of those families, families from New Jersey and in the area generally, who lost loved ones on that flight. Many of the victims were young college students from Syracuse University. I have a nephew who went there. He was to take that trip but at the last minute had to change his plans. He lost several very good friends.

I have been to Lockerbie, Scotland, and know too well what happened that fateful day when 270 people were killed, with the airplane and human remains falling onto that beautiful little community, Lockerbie, in Scotland. I have seen the remnants, the souvenirs that the victims had bought on that trip that was during the Christmas period. I saw Mickey Mouse hats and things that college kids enjoy. Even bottles of wine that survived were then put in a warehouse of things that were collected on the ground but could not be assigned to any single family because they didn't have any sort of identification attached to them.

It was a sad moment for mankind, for sanity in our world. Libya ultimately was convicted of providing the resources for those terrorists who brought that airplane down. Libya has not paid all of the claims that were awarded to the families of the victims; Libya has not paid the last installment of compensation due as a condition of being removed from the list of state sponsors of terror. That was the agreement. That was the understanding.

No matter how many years pass, these families will never forget their loss, their grief; neither will anyone who knows these families, who knows the pain visited upon these people when they heard that their son or daughter was killed in the downing of that airplane.

If Libya has indeed renounced terrorism, that is great news, as is the fact that Libya, which was thought to be engaged in the development of weapons of mass destruction, has agreed to stop that pursuit. Still, the Libyan government has an obligation it agreed to meet so that it could rejoin the community of nations, to achieve a level of acceptance around the world. Their past behavior cannot be excused. They murdered Americans and they must be held fully accountable.

Today, the Bush administration has rejected accountability for Libya. Today, the administration has put other interests ahead of the interests of the American victims of terrorism. What are those interests that prevailed in the end? We will let the investigative journals figure that one out.

But when leaders of our country say ''we must never forget the lessons'' of acts of terrorism, I think they should mean it. Libya should fulfill its promise, its commitment to the families of the victims of Pan Am 103 and not let that commitment be forgotten because part of it has been fulfilled but not all of it. We must not forget that Libya has failed to comply entirely with the basic promise to those families.

We urge the President and the administration to hold fast and insist that Libya pay its bills. The money will never compensate these families for the loss of their child, brother or sister, father or mother—never. But at least it shows that Libya is serious about honoring it commitments, something that is essential before it can achieve anything approximating the status of nations that follow the rule of law. So we must insist on that.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is now closed.

COAST GUARD AND MARITIME TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 2006—CONFERENCE REPORT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the order of June 22, 2006, the Senate receives a message from the House. The House concurs in S. Con. Res. 103, and having received the conference report on H.R. 889 from the House, the conference report is agreed to and the motion to reconsider is laid upon the table.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD on April 6, 2006.)

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF HENRY M. PAULSON, JR., TO BE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry M. Paulson, Jr., of New York, to be Secretary of the Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I hope before the day is out that we are able to help a very good American citizen by the name of Henry Paulson to be the next Secretary of the Treasury. Mr. Paulson had his hearing yesterday. That was before the Finance Committee that I chair. He was reported out on a unanimous voice vote this very morning in the Finance Committee.

Since the Treasury Secretary is the top economic policy official in the administration, and the Treasury Department implements so many of our Nation's laws—be it tax, trade, or commerce—we have a tradition in the Senate of moving with all deliberate speed on nominations to fill that post.

That tradition has held no matter which party controlled the White House or the Congress. I have moved aggressively on this nomination, but the timeline is consistent with past Treasury Secretary nominations.

Just as an example, everybody remembers Secretary Rubin in the Clinton administration. That timeline is something like: The Senate receives his nomination January 4, 1995. That was the first day of the session that year. The official ethics-related paperwork was received on January 5 of 1995. The Finance Committee staff expedited review of the complicated financial details of Secretary Rubin, also a senior official at Goldman Sachs—Henry Paulson being the CEO of that same firm. The Finance Committee held a hearing 5 days later, on January 10, 1995. On that same day, the committee reported Secretary Rubin's nomination. On that same day, the full Senate confirmed Mr. Rubin, and he was sworn in as Treasury Secretary.

So we are moving with a similarly aggressive schedule. I appreciate the cooperation of Members on what I will acknowledge is relatively short notice.

I thank the committee tax staff on both sides, especially the joint committee staffer Gray Fontenot, and the hard work that not only he did, but a lot of others, and it took a lot of long hours to process these papers over just a period of a few days prior to today.

My staff examined Mr. Paulson's complicated financial records, his tax return, and the activities of his firm, Goldman Sachs. We do this most often in the area of tax planning. We have received very good cooperation. Then, of course, after the review, we have high confidence in his qualifications for this position.

Mr. Paulson brings to the table an enviable set of assets, meaning qualifications to do a good job as Secretary of the Treasury, although I presume he brings a lot of other assets to the table as well. Mr. Paulson spent a good amount of his youth—would you believe it—in the cornfields of Illinois. As a bright young man with excellent academic credentials, he served in the Pentagon and in the White House.

After Government service, Mr. Paulson joined Goldman Sachs and rose through the ranks to the highest position of chief executive officer.

When you look at Mr. Paulson's story, you come away with a view that this is a guy who gets the best results at whatever he tackles, and that is just the sort of a person we need as Secretary of the Treasury because we have a very good economy, measured by long-term standard measures of the economy—creating 5.3 million jobs in the last less than 3 years, having 4.6 percent unemployment, having growth on average that we had during the 1990s; lots of measurements of the economy that are very good.

I am not picking out things that are never used to measure the economy. I am talking about things that have been used to measure the economy over the last 60 or 70 years. Those measurements say it is good. But if we don't have the right people setting the right policy for carrying out those policies that Congress might set, it could be in jeopardy.

That is why we need a person of Paulson's background—a person who comes out on the right end of almost everything he tackles—to be the chief economic voice for our country and to be the voice for this administration. But his work is the administration's work, his work is the country's work, and I think he is up to doing the country's work.

The impression I have and gave you about Mr. Paulson is reinforced when you have a personal meeting with him. I think it is fair to say that after yesterday's hearing, Members on both sides of the aisle came away very impressed with Mr. Paulson as a thoughtful and intelligent nominee who appreciates the concerns raised by Senators and will work with Senators on trying to solve those concerns.

I will touch briefly on one matter that came up at the hearing, and which I know is of concern to some Members. It is well known that Mr. Paulson is active in environmental issues. He is an avid bird watcher and is chairman of the board of the Nature Conservancy. I share the worry that Mr. Paulson knows his job is to be Secretary of the Treasury and not head of EPA. Mr. Paulson's response on this concern to about three of us on the committee who brought this up was this. He said:

> The President of the United States has nominated me to be Secretary of the Treasury, he hasn't nominated me to be Secretary of Interior, he hasn't nominated me to be head of the Environmental Protection Agency, that really big focus I have is going to be dealing with so many of the issues that we've been talking about today, the economic issues that are the core of our agenda . . .

Considering his sincerity—and I don't think he is a person capable of misleading—I think he is very transparent. I came away with the confidence that Mr. Paulson knows where his focus needs to be and where his responsibilities lie.

I did kid him the other day. There is a superintendent of that building you call the Treasury Department down there that is trying to get his favor. So they are probably right now building a bird-watching station for him outside of the Treasury building someplace because he is known very much for that.

But I think he is going to tend to business and not get over into other areas of the Government.

I also note that Mr. Paulson is here at just the right time. He is here to deal with tax reform, China currency, and with other major economic issues facing America.

I am pleased that Mr. Paulson has answered the call to return to public service.

I encourage Members to vote in favor of a highly qualified nominee to be Secretary of the Treasury.

For the public at large that does not quite follow everything every day in Washington, DC, I hope you understand that there are some people in America who are willing to give up the multimillion dollar salaries as CEOs of Wall Street firms to serve the public good, to serve as Secretary of the Treasury and a lot of other positions in Government and make less than $200,000 a year compared to the tens of millions of dollars that they make. Most people who like to make big money like to keep on making big money. But there are some people, such as Mr. Paulson, who are willing to serve the American public, to do what is right for our country and do it willingly and selfishly.

I urge my colleagues to vote for a very good citizen, a person who I believe will be a very good Secretary of the Treasury.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I thank my good friend, Chairman CHUCK GRASSLEY, for the way in which he has moved this nomination. It is the right thing to do. I commend him for it.

Mr. President, I also support Hank Paulson, this administration's nominee for Secretary of the Treasury.

Throughout its history, the Department of the Treasury has required enormous innovation, vision, and perseverance. Our Nation's first Treasury Secretary, Alexander Hamilton, laid the foundation principles of America's public economy, its credit, its industrial development, and commercial activity.

In 1790, Hamilton presented to Congress his plan for public credit, assuming the States' war debts, implementing import duties and excise taxes to repay these debts, and establishing a national bank. The next year, he laid out a plan for an American manufacturing economy, so far ahead of its time that it resonated well into the 20th century.

Henry Morgenthau Jr. steered the Treasury for over a decade in peace and in wartime. He defended the dollar against speculation through the 1930s, financed the war effort with war bonds, and ushered in a new system of international financial stability after the Second World War.

Secretary James Baker embraced new challenges, including the Latin American banking crisis and the Plaza Accords.

The Asian financial turmoil of the 1990s met the able and wise leadership of Secretaries Robert Rubin and Lawrence Summers. They steered the world economy through crises. And they managed our economy's remarkable growth and return to fiscal discipline.

Today, leadership and vision are as imperative as during our Nation's founding and in the two centuries since. The challenges are different. The world economy is more complex. China and India are economic powers on the rise. Speculative investments have grown. Twelve European nations are bound by a common currency. Financial markets are deeper, more liquid, and more integrated than ever before. But global economic growth and international trade are fundamentally out of balance.

Faced with these challenges, I welcome this administration's nomination of Henry Paulson to become Secretary of the Treasury. I have known Hank for many years. I believe that he is an outstanding choice for this demanding position. Hank has demonstrated his knowledge of financial markets and helped guide them through three decades of transformation. He rose to the helm of Goldman Sachs with our former colleague Governor Jon Corzine, and as sole CEO, presided over some of the most successful years of that company.

Hank is broadly respected by his colleagues. He has earned a reputation as a man of boundless energy and a relentless work ethic. Hank proved himself an innovative and prescient thinker, able to consider economic and financial challenges before they are upon

us. Today he has nobly answered the call to public service. And he will bring much-needed credibility to our economic message to hard-working Americans, and to the world.

Hank Paulson understands that our economy's strength is rooted in the entrepreneurial spirit and the competitive zeal of the American people. He understands just as well that our strength is not a given. That we cannot take our economic preeminence for granted. In the Rose Garden last week, he rightly declared that ''We must take steps to maintain our competitive edge in the world.''

I welcome Hank's determination to take steps to boost our economic competitiveness. I am convinced that economic competitiveness is one of the greatest challenges facing this administration, this Congress, and our Nation.

The competitiveness challenge comes from a rising China. China has tripled its share of global trade in 4 years. China has become the world's top information technology exporter. And China has drawn much of the world's investment.

The challenge comes from India. India's IT sector has grown 50 percent a year since 1993. India's universities are top-notch. And India's research capabilities attract billions of dollars in investment.

The challenge comes from countless smaller economic dynamos in Asia and Europe. These emerging markets have transformed their economies to embrace globalization.

Yet our competitiveness challenge also comes from within. America too often looks back at what we have achieved. Rather, we should prepare for tomorrow's challenge.

Our broadband infrastructure ranks 16th in the world. Our research and development spending ranks behind Sweden, Finland, Israel, Japan, and South Korea. Three out of 10 Americans do not graduate high school. One-quarter of Americans read below basic levels. And our national savings are negative.

These challenges are at our doorstep. We must act. That is why I urge Treasury Secretary Paulson, once confirmed, to lead this administration's engagement with Congress on economic competitiveness. As I have said in several dozen statements on competitiveness over the past months, we can wait no longer to implement a real competitiveness agenda. We in Congress are ready.

I have spent much of the past year developing a comprehensive economic competitiveness agenda. This agenda focuses on education as the foundation of a successful economy.

In the coming weeks I will introduce legislation that would provide scholarships and create tax incentives for early education, science, math, and engineering teachers. It would provide matching funds to offer universal early education, lower barriers to higher education, and double the number of advanced placement courses in our high schools. My education competitiveness legislation would support afterschool and mentoring programs. It would restore our commitment to Native American education. It would direct grants to outstanding young scientists. And it would encourage companies to get involved in making our schools the world's finest.

Upon this foundation of education must stand strong pillars of a competitive economy. One such pillar is energy, which fuels a successful economy. My energy competitiveness legislation would look to the future. It would create the new Advanced Research Projects Agency—Energy to conduct transformative research and create alternative energy solutions. While this research would look for tomorrow's energy alternative, my legislation would also encourage today's alternative energies, like coal gasification technology, wind, and other alternative fuels.

A second pillar of my agenda is the Research Competitiveness Act, which boosts what America does best—innovate. My legislation would simplify and make permanent the research and experimentation tax credit for innovators looking for tomorrow's next big thing. My legislation would provide access to start-up capital for small, research-intensive businesses. And my legislation would encourage support of basic university research.

The trade competitiveness initiative is the third pillar of my agenda. Trade is vital to American ranchers, farmers, and businessmen. But they must have a level global playing field.

Legislation I have introduced would create a Senate-confirmed trade enforcement official who would be dedicated to guaranteeing that our trading partners play by the rules. It would also give the Treasury Department the tools to keep countries from unfairly manipulating their currencies to keep their exports cheap.

A fourth pillar of my agenda is the Savings Competitiveness Act. It would underscore savings as critical to households and vital to a healthy economy. It would make the Saver's Credit into a refundable matching credit. It would make enrollment in 401(k) plans automatic. It would offer savings plans for small business employees. And it would create Young Saver's Accounts for parents' contributions to their children's savings.

Friends warned Alexander Hamilton against accepting a position as Treasury Secretary. They said the position was too difficult, too controversial. He replied simply: It is the situation in which I can do the most good.

I believe Hank Paulson can also do much good. I hope my colleagues will join me in welcoming this nomination. I hope we can work together to implement a comprehensive agenda to improve America's economic competitiveness.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINEZ). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I commend Chairman GRASSLEY and Senator BAUCUS for moving quickly to have the Senate consider the nomination of Henry Paulson. I am convinced he is the right man at the right time. It is my intent to strongly support his nomination and vote for him later in the course of this afternoon.

My hope, in particular, as Henry Paulson moves to this vital position, is that he will move quickly to set in place a strategy for reforming our Tax Code. Suffice it to say, a lot has happened to our tax system since 1986, the last time the Tax Code was overhauled.

For example, since 1986, there have been more than 14,000 changes to the Tax Code. It comes to three changes for every working day for the last 20 years.

There are substantial questions with respect to fairness in the Tax Code. I am one who feels it is critically important that every American have the chance to build and accumulate wealth. That is pretty hard to do, given some of this country's tax policies.

For example, this spring, Warren Buffett, who is the second wealthiest person in the United States, told me he was going to be paying a lower tax rate than his receptionist. That is not right. I am not interested in soaking anybody. I am not interested in any kind of class warfare. But I want middle-class people to be able to get ahead as well.

For the first time in decades, we have seen corporate profits go up. We are glad to see that. We have seen productivity go up. We are glad to see that. But middle-class people are not seeing much growth in their wages. They are living paycheck to paycheck.

As Hank Paulson goes to the Treasury Department, I know he is interested in coming up with a fresh approach to the Tax Code, an approach that can allow us to simplify it, get a fair shake for middle-class folks and all Americans. I particularly commend our ranking minority member, Senator BAUCUS, because I think Senator BAUCUS, in talking about global competitiveness and what it is going to take to create high-skill, high-wage jobs for Americans in the global economy, has done some of the heavy lifting on this key issue by spending a lot of time over the last few years looking at these issues, talking to people on both sides of the aisle, with business leaders and the like. I commend Senator BAUCUS because he has laid some of the key groundwork to discuss tax reform as a result of his focus on global competitiveness.

I also thank Chairman GRASSLEY for his discussions with me and with the committee. We have begun to look at corporate issues in this area. Senator GRASSLEY, as he begins the effort to look at tax reform, particularly because of the bipartisan way in which he has led our committee, is a person ideally suited to work with Senators

on both sides of the aisle and the administration, for us to build a strategy with a new Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Paulson, to get this job done.

Suffice it to say there will be some very tough issues. Look, for example, at the issue of State and local jurisdictions and the differing tax treatment we have for these jurisdictions. A State that may have high taxes, such as New York, looks at this differently than a part of the country that does not have the same dependence on revenues from that source.

With the leadership of Chairman GRASSLEY and Senator BAUCUS and a new Secretary of the Treasury who is going to look to bring people together, look at how we can modernize the Tax Code so we can make the kind of decisions that are necessary to give our citizens a better quality of life in a global economy. We are up to it.

We do not have a lot of time. The next 6 months, particularly the time between now and January, is key. That is why I have been so pleased Chairman GRASSLEY and Senator BAUCUS have been interested in looking at these issues. As a result of their examination of these topics, we can lay the groundwork so the administration next January could work with Senators on both sides of the aisle, work with the other body and work with the Senate, and we can enact comprehensive tax reform.

There will be a host of other issues we will have to look at. Obviously, health care, the fastest rising expense in the American economy, is dramatically affected by the Tax Code. I happen to think there are some good ideas on both sides of the aisle with respect to tax treatment of health care expenditures in our economy. We are spending over $150 billion through the Tax Code on American health care. I don't think we are getting our money's worth. In too many instances, we are subsidizing inefficiency. This is certainly going to be a controversial area.

Democrats and Republicans, under the leadership of Chairman GRASSLEY and Senator BAUCUS, and the new Secretary of the Treasury can dig into that issue.

The last point I mention, in the Commission that was set up that was chaired by Senator Mack and Senator Breaux, there are some good ideas the Congress can pick up on, working with the administration. Certainly, I don't agree with all the Commission has proposed, but let me give a couple of examples.

In legislation I have authored, the Fair Flat Tax Act, I have made it clear I want a Tax Code that is simpler, fairer and flatter. If you look at what the President's Commission has come in with, there is some opportunity for common ground. For example, in my Fair Flat Tax Act, there is a 1-page 1040 form, something a typical person can fill out in about half an hour. The administration's version, the one that came out with the advisory committee, is probably six, seven lines longer. I have a 30-line, 1040 form; theirs is six or seven lines longer. Big deal. For purposes of Government work, we can find common ground in a hurry in order to have a simpler Tax Code. That alone would be a real contribution for the American people.

On the question of making the Tax Code flatter, there are six brackets today in our Tax Code as it relates to the individual side of the code. My proposal involves three brackets. It is a progressive structure. Essentially, it is the same one that Ronald Reagan started with when he looked at tax reform. The President's advisory commission comes in with four brackets. Once again, big deal. We can find common ground as it relates to making the Tax Code flatter.

There are differences of opinion, certainly, in other areas. I have mentioned trying to get a fair shake for middle-class folks. We all understand what Henry Ford said about capitalism. Henry Ford was an industrialist. He said he wanted to do well, but for him to do well, his people had to have enough money to be able to buy cars.

Middle-class folks are getting hammered in a way today that makes it hard for them to make a lot of these purchases that are essential to them, which is why they wrack up so much debt. I think both political parties can find common ground on this tax issue.

For example, Henry Paulson yesterday talked about the value of low rates. I certainly agree with his interest there. Marginal rates are particularly important. It was something Ronald Reagan recognized in 1986. Senators on our side of the aisle, including Bill Bradley, said exactly the same thing. We can get the rates down. We can ensure fairness for middle-class folks.

What we are going to need is leadership. We are going to need it in a hurry. Chairman GRASSLEY and Senator BAUCUS are going to do everything they can to find common ground on this issue. I am very pleased that Henry Paulson, who could certainly find other things to do in his life besides public service, is willing to step up and take on this effort. He will have to move very quickly to drive this tax reform debate. As I pledged to him in my private meeting and said again yesterday, I am interested in working with him and the administration in a bipartisan way. There is a lot of good faith and a lot of interest in this issue. It is a key consideration in how we are going to create high-skill, high-wage jobs for Americans in the future and enhance the quality of life for middle-class folks.

Henry Paulson is the right person at the right time. He is going to have a lot to do, and he is going to have to do it in a hurry. I intend to work with Chairman GRASSLEY and Senator BAUCUS to ensure we have an opportunity, on a bipartisan basis, to tackle these big economic issues in the right way. Right at the top is tax reform.

I urge colleagues today to indicate their strong support for Henry Paulson, head of the Treasury Department.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BAUCUS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I rise in support of the nomination of Henry M. Paulson to be Secretary of the Treasury. If confirmed by the Senate, he would be the Nation's 74th Secretary of the Treasury.

From what I know about him from reputation, from his work on Wall Street, and from what I have learned in my discussions with him, I believe Hank Paulson will bring a kind of strong leadership, unique expertise, and knowledge of global financial markets and will be fully capable of keeping our country competitive in a global economy.

Mr. Paulson is a strong choice for Treasury Secretary for many reasons. Most people know of his talents, the intimate knowledge he has of the financial markets, and his ability to handle crises. He is considered a hard worker who is dedicated to his job and who understands the importance of strong and capable management to run a large organization.

Today I spoke about the SWIFT program, the very important Treasury terrorism finance tracking measure that was regrettably blown by the newspapers last week. When I talked to him, he obviously did not know about it. I did not know it was going to become an item of news. But as he seeks to repair our relations with banks across the world, his experience in dealing with international financial matters will be a great benefit.

He has a string of very important challenges facing him. We have the deficit, which is running out of control by reason of unsustainable entitlement spending. The value of the dollar is falling. How much of a problem is that? How do we deal with it? There is a tax gap in the IRS of roughly 15 percent of the money that is owed or some $345 billion that is not collected. He needs to work through the IRS to cure that. We have a Tax Code that is so complicated, even professional tax preparers disagree on what the implications of many normal transactions are. He will have to fight terrorism financing. He is going to have to confront the issues of dealing with rogue nations such as Iran, and others, through economic sanctions and getting others in the world community to join with him.

As of yesterday, as the chairman of the appropriations subcommittee that handles the Treasury, IRS, and other agencies, I have found that they have

water in their basement and they have extremely mundane problems like that, to the global issues that face any Treasury Secretary. I think even the media understands that this is a man who has experience and whose is held in high respect by major world financial leaders, as well as American financial leaders, and he will serve us well.

As chairman of the Transportation, Treasury, the Judiciary, HUD, and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee, and as a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee, I look forward to working with Mr. Paulson in meeting these challenges.

Even though he is a sophisticated Wall Street financier, I was pleased to find out that he is basically a Midwest farm boy at heart. We had a very useful and productive discussion about growing native grasses such as big and little blue stem and Indian grass and how to burn them in the spring to make sure the crops come back without weeds or other non-natives. So he has a strong foot in reality, a Midwest farming background, but he also has a very strong background and expertise in financial matters, and he has respect on Wall Street.

I urge my colleagues to support the nomination of Hank Paulson. This is a time when we have many serious issues, and having him confirmed by this body will be a great asset to us in dealing with everything from international negotiations, terrorism financing, and the other significant economic challenges the world presents today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, as we consider the nomination of Henry Paulson to be Secretary of the Treasury, I think it is important to bring a reality check to some of the claims about the current state of the economy—those claims made by the administration.

My colleague, Senator BENNETT, pointed out that yesterday we had a hearing in the Joint Economic Committee, and appearing as a witness was Edward Lazear, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. We had also two outside experts who were economists testifying on the state of the economy. Many of the Bush supporters are claiming that the economy is strong and everyone is benefiting, but I doubt that many working Americans would see it as strong as they do and see it as benefiting them as much as it is claimed by the administration.

It is true that the economy is experiencing a business cycle recovery after the 2001 recession and after going through the most prolonged job slump since the 1930s. The President pointed out that the economy has done better since 2003 than it did in 2001 and 2002, but they don't talk about how this recovery has not been particularly strong by the standards of previous recoveries.

This first chart shows the percentage change in payroll employment. The curve here is the average of seven previous recession recovery cycles. If you look back, historically, it is a much more robust increase over time than this lower line, which is the March 2001 to May 2006 statistics, the recovery in the last several years. In fact, this recovery is much less than the recovery was after the 1990 recession. That recovery was called the ''jobless recovery'' because job generation was so slow.

So what you are seeing is that job losses continued for much longer in this period of time, 2001 to 2006, than had been typical. This recovery has been much weaker than those in the past. At this point in the recovery, from the 1990 to 1991 recession, the economy had created 5 million jobs.

That is this delta right here—5 million more jobs than have been created in this recovery. So the difference between job generation at the same point in March 2001 to 2006, and comparing it to the 1990s, is plus 5 million jobs.

This situation is similar with respect to business investment. It took much longer for the recovery to start with respect to business investment, and the level of investment lagged behind what has been typical in past recoveries. Each year of depressed investment means less capacity to produce goods and services in the future.

Defenders of the President's economic record cannot deny that workers' wages have not been keeping up with inflation. Part of that is a result of many factors but, one, looking back at the investment, it has been a relatively small recovery in terms of business investment. Here is the average of seven previous recoveries and here is the 1991 recovery business investment and here is the current recovery. It is not as robust as it has been in previous recoveries.

As I suggested a moment ago, there is another very palpable impact of this bad economic news, and that is that wages have not been keeping up with inflation. This will be, no doubt, no surprise to working families as they work to get their paychecks each week. Some have suggested that this is a result of the fact that wages are held down but benefits are growing, and that compensation is growing at historic rates. This is not the case.

This is a chart that shows productivity, the output per hour, and real compensation per hour. What you generally see is that productivity increases will be closely tracking compensation increases except over the last several years where productivity is going up at a significant pace, but real compensation, wages plus benefits, is lagging far behind. This is what the average American is confronting today when they are looking at increased gasoline prices, soaring health care prices, and they are not seeing either in their paycheck or, in many cases, even benefit packages the same kinds of increases that are so necessary to keep up with an increase in inflation. Growth in compensation has lagged behind. Wages have grown more slowly than total compensation, but that is not because workers are negotiating better deals from their employers, it is because employers are facing higher costs for health insurance and are squeezing workers' wages as a result.

Increased health care prices, particularly in the area of small business, is causing many businesses to forego increases they would like to give to workers, in terms of wages, just to keep up with increased health care costs. This doesn't mean a better health care package for workers, and in some cases workers are being dropped, unfortunately, from health care protection because of the expense.

What we are seeing is that compensation is not keeping up with productivity and, typically, compensation does keep up with productivity. There is another issue, too, with respect to the situation for many American workers, and that is the fact that pension arrears have to be made up. Many companies now are putting money into pensions just to make them actuarially sound, where in the past they might have devoted that to wages. By and large, the situation, when it looks at the working men and women, is that we are not seeing the robust increases in wages or compensation that is important.

These points were made by one of the witnesses yesterday at the JEC hearing, chief economist of the Bank of America, Dr. Mickey Levy, who testified that:

> Wage and compensation increases have been somewhat disappointing. Real wages have been suppressed by higher energy costs and have not kept pace with labor productivity gains. . . .Wages may be constrained by higher employer costs for workers' health care, along with the heightened international competition related to low cost production overseas. . . .

Wage and compensation increases have indeed been disappointing, especially for the majority of workers who are not getting them. Gains in average earnings or income do not tell the real story when they hide growing inequality. When you look at one level, you see increases, but when you look at how the increases are distributed across the working population, it is another story altogether.

The red bars on this chart show that workers in the middle and bottom have experienced a decline in real earnings, while those at the top have experienced gains. This is in sharp contrast to the experience of the time from 1995 to 2000. Here in blue, in the data for gains in terms of earnings, broken down by the lowest 10th percentile, 25th, median, 75th, and 90th, at the upper level in the 1990s you saw increases, but they were almost comparable at the very lowest level of income. You saw the proverbial picket fence, where there were positive gains at every percentile. What we are seeing today is quite the reverse of that—losses in real terms of earnings at the lowest levels through

the middle levels, and only at the upper income levels are you seeing real gains in earnings.

So the distribution of the economic progress that is being made over the last several years is not being shared fairly. Those at the upper income levels are seeing gains but, frankly, not the same robust gains of the nineties. At the bottom-income and middle-income level, there is a loss in real earnings.

That is not an example of an economy that is working for all Americans. That is an economy that is working for the very affluent Americans. The answer of the Bush administration to these economic trends is basically to ignore them, try to gloss over them or redefine them or explain them away. They proposed tax cuts, which will do very little to help this distribution of earnings. In fact, what it does, essentially, is protect more of the earnings at the upper income levels. If we continue along the present course, we will be undermining the economy's longrun capacity for growth and undermining future living standards.

Another aspect here, too, that is not dwelt upon by the administration is the fact that we are virtually zero in national savings. Without national savings, there is not the pool of investment capital necessary to provide for the new technology, new capital of the future. We are borrowing huge amounts of money overseas to fund our deficit. This is investments made in our country. But in terms of national savings of this country, it is close to zero. In some cases, it is negative.

These are the real problems that confront this country. These are the real questions that Mr. Paulson has to address. How do we create an economy that performs as well as it did in the 1990s, where earnings gains are shared virtually equally across the spectrum of income, where low-income Americans don't see a loss of earnings but actually a gain? How do we ensure that wages and compensation keep up with productivity gains? How do we ensure essentially and fundamentally that the working families in this country cannot only get by but get ahead? That is the question that Mr. Paulson has to answer as Secretary of the Treasury.

I think it begins with looking hard at the deficit and the policies of the administration with respect to taxes. I don't subscribe to the theory that our deficit is caused by runaway entitlement programs. We have an issue with entitlement programs, but we also have an issue with tax programs that take away revenue and are targeted to the wealthiest Americans. We have problems with expenditures that we cannot avoid with respect to supporting our forces in the field. We cannot stop providing equipment and materiel for our forces fighting the wars today, and we have to take care of them in the future. But there are significant issues with which we have to deal. I hope Mr. Paulson will be a strong voice in this administration to look at the facts and propose realistic solutions that benefit not just the few who are wealthy but the vast majority of Americans.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Rhode Island. Senator JACK REED is our voice on the Joint Economic Committee. It is a committee that takes a look at the overall economy and reports to our caucus regularly. Senator REED has brought us economic indicators from time to time that give us at least some insight as to how we are doing in most general terms in America.

Everybody measures the economy by their own lives, their own family, maybe their own town, but when it comes to the appointment of a Secretary of the Treasury, we take a step back and look at the overall economy in America.

A good Secretary of the Treasury can make a big difference. When Bob Rubin became Secretary of the Treasury under President Bill Clinton, he faced enormous challenges with huge deficits as far as the eye could see and an economy moving ever so slowly. He put in place those policies on an economic, fiscal, and monetary basis that made a big difference.

Our Nation went from a deficit in our budget to a surplus. We actually put the indebtedness behind us for the first time in decades. The good news is we did it while the wealth of America was expanding dramatically. That period during the Clinton years saw people with their own savings accounts growing, more pension plans expanding, folks buying homes and starting businesses. It was a time of great economic expansion.

No one person deserves the credit or the blame for our economy, but Secretary of the Treasury Bob Rubin was the right person at the right time to speak sense to the President about what needed to be done to make America strong for years to come. I have the same confidence that Henry Paulson is going to do that as well, and we need him now more than ever.

I come to this with some prejudice because Mr. Paulson is a son of Illinois. He still calls Illinois his home. He spent his adult years—at least recently—commuting back and forth between Illinois and New York and places around the world in his capacity as an investment banker.

We had a terrific meeting in my office a week or two ago and talked about his life in Illinois, the experiences he had, about his family, and his commitment to our State. I readily concede I come to this nomination with some bias. But I think Mr. Henry Paulson is the right man for the job of Secretary of the Treasury at this moment in history.

He came up through the ranks of Goldman Sachs, starting in their Chicago office many years ago and eventually becoming the CEO of that important investment bank. I don't think a person can rise to that high level without understanding how business works and how the economy works. Since even a corner grocer knows that an organization cannot run up endless debt forever without paying a stiff price, I think Mr. Paulson understands that as well. I think his business experience may help to start balancing the books in the Washington, DC, situation, which has been far from balanced for a long time. It is not a moment too soon for someone with Mr. Paulson's business background to tackle this challenge.

Consider these realities Mr. Paulson will face when he becomes Secretary of the Treasury:

This Bush-Cheney administration has accumulated more foreign-held debt in the past 6 years they have been in office than all of the 42 Presidents before President George W. Bush. In other words, our indebtedness to foreign governments, such as Japan, China, Korea, and the OPEC nations, that, in fact, bankroll the debt of America, hold America's mortgage, has grown in dramatic terms over the last 6 years.

That is not the policy President Bush inherited from the Clinton administration, which was generating a surplus. It is an approach he has taken which, sadly, has left us deeply in debt. The Bush administration came to office with a national debt of less than $6 trillion—$6 trillion—and in just a 6-year period of time, it is almost $9 trillion, almost a 50-percent increase in America's mortgage, America's national debt in the short 6-year period of time.

During this period, all but for a few months, the President has had a Congress of his own political party. The Republicans have controlled the House and the Senate, and the President has yet to veto the first spending bill in the time he has served as President. Not once has he said ''no'' to a spending bill that has come from Congress, particularly from his Republican Congress, and in the meantime his tax policies and spending policies have driven us into the highest level of national debt in the history of the United States. Our indebtedness is held by mortgagers such as China and Japan who expect in return to have a piece of the American economy.

Secretary of Treasury Paulson will, I am sure, understand this, that as we become more indebted to these foreign nations, it is no wonder they take a claim on our economy. Why did we have to debate a Dubai Ports deal? Because Dubai happened to hold enough American dollars to have clout in our economy, and that is the reality.

As these foreign entities become more powerful in our economy, sucking good-paying jobs out of the United States, it is a serious challenge for any new Secretary of the Treasury.

The President has called for more tax cuts, which means deeper deficits,

more debt. It is estimated now that the indebtedness of the United States is a burden on every single man, woman, and child in America to the tune of $30,000 and growing. So in addition to a home mortgage and a student loan, we are unfortunately the victims of policies in Washington that increase the indebtedness of future generations.

This has to stop. This is a disaster in the making. We have to balance the books and do it quickly. I hope Mr. Paulson has the vision and the strength to convey that message effectively within this administration.

I hope he will take a very close look at our trade policies as well. My colleague, Senator SCHUMER, will speak after I finish. He has been one of the leaders in the Senate talking about the inequities in our trade policy with China.

I believe globalization is as inevitable as gravity. We know we are in a shrinking planet. We do more business with one another than ever before. But when we enter into trade agreements with countries such as China, we say we are establishing rules of conduct, fair trade. Unfortunately, particularly in the case of China, many countries ignore those rules. They violate those rules.

The Secretary of the Treasury has to be a strong voice to stand up for the American economy, American businesses, and American workers to demand that the countries with which we trade play by the rules. I think free trade is good for the future of our world, certainly good for the future of America. We are a land of opportunity. We have risen to every challenge, but we need to be involved in a fair fight where both sides play by the rules.

The Bush administration has not fought hard enough for these trade agreements and understandings. When we create a trade agreement, we need to ensure that there are proper labor protections in place. We are about to consider a trade agreement with Oman, a very small country in the Middle East. There are good reasons for us to enter into that trade agreement. But when Members of the Senate suggested to the Bush administration that we put a prohibition in the trade agreement with Oman that they could not use slave labor—slave labor—to produce goods and services sold to the United States, the administration said: No, we are going to remove that, we don't think we should go that far.

Slave labor? We should have basic understandings of what the labor standards will be. We know many countries will underbid us when it comes to the cost of labor, but there ought to be fundamental standards.

The same is true when it comes to environmental protections. U.S. businesses operate under laws which restrict them in terms of their conduct, whether it is a burden or some sort of a problem with our environment, whether it is water pollution or air pollution or similar things. What we should insist on for the good of this planet we call home is that the countries engaged in trade with the United States also have respect for the environment of the world. Whether it is global warming or toxic release, we are literally all in this together.

After we create these good trade agreements, the Secretary of the Treasury has to make sure there is proper enforcement so we don't just give our speeches on the Senate floor and then ignore the trade agreement afterward.

I hope Mr. Paulson will fight harder than his predecessors to promote trade that is aggressive and fair. I also hope he will push for a tougher and more proactive stance when it comes to China. I am sure my colleague will speak to that further.

He has traveled to China more than 70 times. He understands the importance of this critical relationship with this growing giant in the world economy. When we spoke in my office, I asked him specifically to deal with currency manipulation, intellectual property rights infringement, and trade violations.

He also has to be very strong when it comes to China's labor records and their record on the environment and human rights. While he did not have any specific suggestions—I didn't expect them—I believe he was responsive, he understands the challenge, and I think he can rise to that challenge. That is why I am supporting his nomination.

Finally, I hope Mr. Paulson's sensibility about the environment will become a source of real leadership in this administration. I know Mr. Paulson reiterated at his confirmation hearing that he is not running to be head of the EPA or Interior but Secretary of the Treasury. Still, Henry Paulson is a former chairman of the board of the Nature Conservancy. That is a group with which I have worked in Illinois that has great respect for our natural resources and has done a lot to reclaim them for future generations.

I hope he can push the Bush administration to take a forward look at the issue of global warming. This is an issue which is real, and this administration must start immediately working with Congress to move on international agreements that deal with global warming. Mr. Paulson's voice at the Cabinet table could make a difference, and I am hoping that his deeply held personal beliefs will lead him to be that voice.

I support the nomination of Hank Paulson to become Secretary of the Treasury. I think he will work as hard for farmers in the heartland as he does for bankers in New York. I look forward to working with him to strengthen America's economy and put the Federal Government's finances back in order.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I am going to take a few minutes. I am very happy with the support of the Senator from Illinois for the nomination of Mr. Paulson, but I challenge what was just said.

There is no question we have deficits. There is also no question that on 9/11, we experienced a great economic shock and we had a recession that was big. The tax cuts have led to the highest revenues this Federal Government has ever had.

On the spending side, I find it somewhat curious, the Senator from Illinois ranks No. 6 in the most spending voted for in the Senate last year. He ranks No. 8 in the cosponsorship of the most new spending outside the appropriations bills. You can't have it both ways. You can't complain that we are in deficits and we are in debt and never vote to lower the spending, never vote for amendments that trim wasteful spending, and then complain that somebody else made you do it.

If we look at the voting record on appropriations bills, there are not very many noes coming from that vote. The way we control spending—and we have proven it on our committee, the Federal management oversight committee—we identified over $200 billion worth of waste. If we want to balance the budget, let's have everybody on both sides of the aisle voting to trim the waste, fraud, and abuse out of the Federal Government, rather than when we go to a conference or a meeting with the President when there is excess money and demanding more spending, not less.

The numbers are fairly revealing. Last year, Senator DURBIN sponsored $93 billion in new spending—new spending, outside of what we did on appropriations. He put his name to spend $93 billion, and he put his name to trim $100 million. That is the problem we have. It is not taxes, it is wasteful spending and the idea that the only way we can accomplish something is to spend more money.

I am for the same priorities. We need to help the people who need help in this country. But we will never be able to afford it in the future without stealing from our kids if we don't do the hard work to get rid of the waste now, and that means voting against appropriations bills, not voting for them. The President signed what the Senator from Illinois voted for.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise to speak in enthusiastic support of the nomination of Henry Hank Paulson to be the 74th Treasury Secretary.

I have known Hank Paulson for 15 years. I recommend him to my colleagues wholeheartedly and without reservation. He is one of those great New Yorkers who come from somewhere else—in this case, the heartland of America—come to our city and become part of its life and a vital part of

this country and actually this world's economy.

Mr. President, Hank is an extraordinary leader, a great financial thinker, a businessman, a father, and, as I said, an adopted son of New York. Hank has excelled in every area of life—from the classroom to the football field to the boardroom and everywhere in between.

One of the things I like best about Hank is he is a straight shooter. He gives you direct answers to direct questions. We sure need somebody like that now.

He graduated from Dartmouth in 1968 and received his MBA from Harvard. He worked at the Defense Department, the Nixon White House, and then found his true calling at Goldman Sachs where he worked for 32 years. He became chairman and chief executive officer of Goldman in 1999, and should he be confirmed, he will continue a long history, a great tradition of leaders from Goldman serving in the Government, including Bob Rubin, one of the great Treasury Secretaries, and Jon Corzine, our former colleague, now Governor of New Jersey, and John Whitehead, who served honorably and well as Deputy Secretary of State under Ronald Reagan.

But the issue Hank really goes off the charts about, I say to my colleagues—particularly my colleagues on this side of the aisle will be happy to know—is the environment. Sometimes he would call me up and I would be sure he was talking to me about swaps or banking or some esoteric financial issue, and he would be talking to me about an environmental policy. I don't think he ever gets more enthusiastic than when he is talking about some rare bird that he saw on one of his birdwatching jaunts. He is an avid environmentalist and lover of all things in nature. I hope a few of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will not hold that against him.

He is also one of those unique, good people who could fill any number of Cabinet posts. For instance, given his environmental proclivities, he would be a great Secretary of the Interior. But financial issues and the health of the global economy are his passions, that is mostly where he is needed, and I am glad the President has nominated him for this post.

In the world of finance and international markets, there is simply no equal to Hank. At this critical point in our economy's history, we need Hank's expertise and experience to lead the way.

The bottom line, Mr. President—you know it because we traveled to China together—we are at an amazing time economically. The world economy is becoming integrated, closer and closer every year. There is almost a one world labor market. Capital flows freely to every corner of the world. These circumstances present tremendous challenges for our Nation, in our desire to remain the world's economic leader, and for the world as we try to integrate this system. One of the great challenges we face is we are converging into one economic system, but we don't have one political system, and the bumps and grinds which that causes are large.

So we need someone who understands markets. We need someone who has great experience traveling the world and knowing how the rest of the world's economic system works. Hank Paulson has all of those qualities. I am particularly glad that he knows a whole lot about China—I think he has been there over 70 times—because I believe the most important bilateral economic relationship in the next decade or two will be the American-Chinese relationship. Hank has the ability to understand the economies of both countries and figure out how we can work together.

I have been very concerned about China playing by the rules. I have been very concerned that China doesn't simply seek the advantages of free trade but not the responsibilities. I have related these concerns to Hank Paulson.

On currency, Senator GRAHAM and I have worked closely with his predecessor, and you, Mr. President, have been involved in those issues as well as we traveled to China together. And we have worked to push and prod China to allow its currency to float based on international market forces. We have made some progress, but the progress since July has been too little, particularly in light of the fact that the Chinese assured us they know they have to get to a place where their currency floats.

Hank's extensive experience in China, his personal relationships with both the Government and business side—where, incidentally, there is quite a dichotomy. Most of the businesspeople and people even on the economic side of Government understand the need for free markets. That is in China's interests—not just America's—that China open up its markets. But a lot of people on the Government side are afraid of that. They don't like change. They don't like giving up control.

I think Hank Paulson is the right man at the right place at the right time to tackle the issue of persuading China to open up its markets more quickly. I believe that he is going to be able to show the Chinese that it is not only in our interest but in their interest as well to allow the yuan to float freely and to open up China's vast economic markets to American financial firms.

On financial services liberalization, I know Hank will work closely with Ambassador Schwab, who was just confirmed, to make sure that China lives up to its WTO commitments. This is going to be very important in the next few months because on December 11 of this year, many of the current restrictions faced by American financial firms that want to do business in China, such as purchase Chinese companies or open up branches in China, will be lifted. Hank is the perfect person to monitor China's progress and, more importantly, to prod the Chinese to go further than they have already promised.

In short, Mr. President, Henry Paulson is a thoughtful, dedicated, and renowned financial leader. I think this country will greatly benefit from his leadership. I am not at all shy about criticizing the President's nominees when I don't think they measure up to the job. I have done that in the judicial area repeatedly. But when the President nominates a sterling person, that person deserves praise and credit and, in my judgment, unanimous support in this body, and I believe that Hank Paulson is such a person.

I will be proud to vote aye when his name is offered on this floor in a few hours.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I wish to address the nomination of Henry Paulson to be Secretary of the Treasury. I believe there is no question that Mr. Paulson is more than qualified to be Secretary of the Treasury, and it is to his credit that he is willing to give up the helm of Goldman-Sachs to serve his country in such a significant way. I am pleased that we have a nominee of this caliber.

However, I have raised concerns stemming from Mr. Paulson's well-known personal views on conservation and affiliations with groups such as the Nature Conservancy. Representing a State where about half of the land is already federally owned, and much more is otherwise federally restricted as to use, private property rights a very big concern. Similarly, our vast energy resources in the State of Wyoming are essential to our country's national energy policy, and we struggle to maintain a balance between development of those resources and the quality of life we enjoy in Wyoming.

I submitted several written questions to Mr. Paulson after our Committee on Finance hearing, and we have had good follow-up discussion on these issues. He has assured me that he is a strong advocate for personal property rights and has committed to working with me and the Senate to pursue a sensible policy.

I am pleased to be able to lend my support to Mr. Paulson, and I look forward to working with him.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for the nomination of Henry M. Paulson, Jr., to be Secretary of the Department of the Treasury. Mr. President, American

economy has changed dramatically in the past decade. International economic policy now has a direct effect on our domestic economy. The information age has transformed America's economic future. This new economy requires a new kind of Treasury Secretary. It requires someone who is experienced and knowledgeable in both the domestic and the international marketplace. It requires someone who has demonstrated exemplary leadership in both government and private enterprise. Henry Paulson will bring these vital skills to the Department of Treasury.

Mr. Paulson's outstanding career in both the public and private sectors has clearly demonstrated his ability to serve as our Nation's next Treasury Secretary. Prior to joining The Goldman Sachs Group Inc., Mr. Paulson served the public as White House domestic Council staff assistant to the President from 1972 to 1973 and as staff assistant to the Assistant Secretary of Defense at the Pentagon from 1970 to 1972. In 1974, Henry Paulson decided to enter the private sector. He joined The Goldman Sachs Group, Inc., in Chicago. Mr. Paulson worked his way up through the ranks of Goldman Sachs and is currently serving as chairman and chief executive officer. Clearly, Henry Paulson has had a very distinguished 32 year career in the private business sector.

Our Nation will be fortunate to have a Treasury Secretary with such broad and varied expertise, and these experiences will prove vital in leading a progressively diverse economy. I believe Henry Paulson will be an exemplary Treasury Secretary. He has already spoken of his keen appreciation for the role capital markets play in driving growth and efficiency, the globalization of finance and interdependence of major world economies, and ensuring that America's industries can compete in the new global economy. I am confident Henry Paulson will seek to strengthen and advance the competitive edge of our economy. I am certain his experience and leadership will be great assets in achieving these important goals.

Mr. President, it is my great honor to support Henry Paulson to head the Department of the Treasury.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to express my support for the nomination of Henry Paulson for Treasury Secretary. I believe we are quite fortunate to have someone of Mr. Paulson's caliber nominated to this vitally important position. Mr. Paulson has quite ably served in Government before in several positions before embarking on his impressive career on Wall Street, which culminated in his becoming CEO and chairman of Goldman Sachs. I am hard-pressed to think of many others in this country who might be more qualified for this position than Mr. Paulson.

Henry Paulson is joining the Bush administration at a very important time. Our Federal Government is in a precarious position as it stares down the abyss of ever-increasing entitlement obligations that threaten to swallow more and more Government revenue and, along with it, other vitally needed programs. As our Nation's baby boomers enter their retirement years, we will have fewer people working per retiree to support them while the cost of providing them benefits inexorably increases. It is a trend that cannot continue without bankrupting the country. Despite the highly partisan environment in which we find ourselves, it is at precisely this moment in history when our economy is strong and Government revenues are increasing sharply that we need strong leadership both from Congress and the administration. I believe that strong leadership and some bipartisan cooperation we will be able to successfully address these growing problems and come up with a lasting solution.

Now is also a propitious time to consider how to address the difficult problems facing our tax system. We need an Internal Revenue Code that is simpler, that promotes savings and economic growth, and that allows American businesses to compete fairly in the global marketplace. The Tax Code should serve the interests of the many, not the few, and one that is worthy of this great Nation.

Mr. Paulson is uniquely qualified to address the issues facing our country today. I view the expediency by which we have acted on his nomination as a confirmation both of Mr. Paulson's fitness for the job as well as of the importance of the position of Treasury Secretary. I urge my colleagues to vote to confirm him as our next Treasury Secretary.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise in support of the nomination of Henry Paulson to be the next Secretary of the Treasury. I had the pleasure of meeting with Mr. Paulson, and we talked about a range of issues.

I was most impressed with his commitment to protecting our environment and his record as a conservationist. I believe this administration needs someone committed to protecting our natural resources—even if he is at Treasury.

I found Mr. Paulson to be an engaging and thoughtful person. These are qualities we need in our next Secretary of the Treasury, because he will have his work cut out for him. He faces an impending crisis not of his making, and for which courage and persistence will be needed to even begin the process of righting the ship.

From the kitchen table to the national debt trade imbalance, our economy continues to move in the wrong direction. The middle-class is being squeezed like never before. Under the policies of this administration, families are forced to work harder and harder to make ends meet.

In Nevada, families, farmers, and businesses are on track to pay approximately $3 billion for gasoline this year. That is over $1.5 billion more than was spent in our State in 2001. The cost of college tuition in Nevada has increased 2 percent, while Federal student aid has failed to keep pace.

But this is not just a Nevada story. It is an American story. Nationwide, since President Bush took office, energy prices have increased nearly 100 percent, health premiums have increased by 71 percent, college tuition has increased nearly 60 percent, and the price of housing has risen dramatically, all while wages have been stagnant despite growing productivity.

Instead of focusing on the needs of middle-class families, the Bush administration has ignored their problems. The President argues that the economy is doing great—he thinks middle-class families are in fine shape. Meanwhile, he is pursuing policies that would only make matters worse.

The twin trade and budget deficits accumulated under President Bush have put the United States in a precarious situation. To fund our record trade deficits—which have more than doubled under President Bush—we have had to sell U.S. assets to foreigners. In 2005 alone, the United States sold to foreign governments and investors a portion of the U.S. economy that was larger than the combined economies of Nevada, Arizona, Ohio, Montana, Rhode Island, Wyoming, and North Dakota. Take a moment to absorb that fact.

And, the problem is just getting worse. If current trends continue, in 20 years, we will have sold the entire wealth of America to foreign countries and foreign investors. It turns out that when President Bush talks about an ''ownership society'' he means that under his policies, all of our assets will eventually be owned by foreigners.

Our trade deficit has been driven in part by unfair practices overseas, like currency manipulation in China. A number of people have raised concerns about Mr. Paulson's extensive ties to China while working for Goldman Sachs. I hope that those ties will give him the credibility and the negotiating toughness to make much needed progress with the Chinese Government. The Bush administration has talked a good game on getting China to end its unfair currency manipulation, but it has not delivered. To date, the Bush administration's policy has been rhetoric, not action, and on occasion, its excuses for its failures have sounded like the administration was an apologist for China's practice of currency manipulation. Mr. Paulson has to finally get this problem under control.

Mr. Paulson will also need to address the enormous Federal budget deficits and the growing Federal debt. The Bush administration turned a record surplus generated during the Clinton administration into a string of record deficits. President Bush inherited a unified budget surplus of $236 billion from President Clinton, the largest

surplus in American history. Budget surpluses were expected to continue for another 10 years when President Bush took office in January 2001.

By 2002, however, President Bush's policies had helped return the unified Federal budget to a deficit of $158 billion. The budget deficit has since reached historic highs. This year, the budget deficit is expected to exceed $300 billion. Of course, after this President's fiscal nightmare, that is not even a record. President Bush owns them all—$412 billion in 2004, $378 billion in 2003 and $319 billion in 2005.

Our fiscal problems will only grow worse in coming years as the baby boom generation retires.

In the last 5 years, the gross Federal debt has grown by almost $3 trillion. And it will exceed $11.8 trillion by 2011 if we don't do something to change course. And more and more of that debt is owed to people outside the United States. The United States has had to borrow more money from overseas during President Bush's 5 years in office than we borrowed during all previous Presidents combined. By contrast, during the last 3 years of the Clinton administration, the United States paid off more than $200 billion in debt to foreigners.

History is clear that these rising Federal budget deficits will ultimately cause long-term interest rates to increase. These costs are a hidden tax and will appear in the form of higher interest rates on home mortgages, auto loans, credit cards, and other types of consumer debt. As Mr. Paulson stated in his confirmation hearing, the longer we wait to deal with these fiscal challenges, the more expensive it will be to solve them. At the end of the day, it is hard-working families and our grandchildren who will pay the price for the Republicans' fiscal recklessness.

Unfortunately, the majority's fiscal policy, like its policy in Iraq, is more of the same—more of the same tax breaks targeted at multimillionaires, more of the same huge deficits, more of the same rising debt.

We can't just go on this way, placing greater and greater burdens on our children and grandchildren. I hope that the new Secretary of the Treasury will be aggressive in forcing the administration to confront these pressing economic challenges head on, because more of the same just won't cut it.

We need a new direction.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, it is my great pleasure to come to the Chamber to express my strong support for the nomination of my good friend, Hank Paulson, someone I admire tremendously, to lead the Department of Treasury. He is an outstanding choice to be the Nation's top economic policy official.

With 32 years of experience in finance, the last 8 of which he has served as president and CEO of Goldman Sachs, which, as we all know, is one of the Nation's largest financial institutions in the world, Hank Paulson is eminently qualified to craft and carry out the President's economic policies. Former Treasury Secretary Bob Rubin, who was also Hank's boss at Goldman Sachs, agrees that he is ''smart, he's bright, he's thoughtful, and he's intense. He's a very good choice.''

Hank will lead with drive, with passion, and a deep understanding of how Government policies affect the capital markets throughout the world as well as America's economic growth. With his detailed and intimate knowledge of global finance and his ability to thrive under pressure, America's economic leadership will be in very capable hands.

Hank Paulson is extraordinarily talented, smart, and hard working. He also happens to be a man of sterling character. Known for his candor and his down-to-earth demeanor, Senator SCHUMER calls Hank a ''straight shooter.'' He has led a life of impeccable integrity.

He grew up on a farm in Illinois. His high marks led him to Dartmouth, where he became a member of Phi Beta Kappa and a football star. He was named All Ivy, All East, and earned an honorable-mention All American. After earning an MBA from Harvard Business School, Hank went into public service as a staff assistant to the Secretary of Defense. In 1974, he joined the Chicago office of Goldman Sachs, where over the next three decades he rose to president and CEO.

Hank understands the macropicture, the global picture, as well as the micropicture, the more intimate, more defined microlevel. He understands the concerns of America's hard-working families and how big decisions here in Washington affect individual lives in a very personal way and in intimate ways and affect those individual opportunities.

He inherits a thriving economy—as cited again and again, a 5.3-percent gross domestic product growth in the first quarter, unemployment at historic lows, 5.3 million new jobs after 33 consecutive months of job gains, and home ownership at historic highs.

He understands that Americans are feeling those challenges in their everyday lives, those challenges of high gas prices, of escalating costs that seem to be skyrocketing out of the average person's reach.

He shares the Republican Party's conviction that we need to continue those progrowth, low-tax policies in order to continue to create jobs and to foster more innovation.

I am confident that under his leadership, America will continue to grow, to thrive, and expand. I look forward to voting to confirm Hank Paulson in a few moments as Secretary of the Treasury and to working with him to keep America moving forward.

At this time, I know of no others who desire to speak on the Paulson nomination, and I urge the Senate to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Henry M. Paulson, Jr., of New York, to be Secretary of the Treasury?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, as our colleagues know, there will be no further votes today and no rollcall votes today. We will be in session a bit longer as we finish the business over the course of the next little bit. When I close, I will have more to say about the schedule for tomorrow and Friday as well.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

OBJECTION TO PROCEEDING TO THE TELECOMMUNICATIONS BILL

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the major telecommunications legislation reported today by the Senate Commerce Committee is badly flawed. The bill makes a number of major changes in the country's telecommunications law, but there is one provision that is nothing more than a license to discriminate. Without a clear policy preserving the neutrality of the Internet and without tough sanctions against those who would discriminate, the Internet will be forever changed for the worse.

This one provision threatens to divide the Internet into technology haves and have-nots. This one provision concentrates even more power in the

hands of the special interests that own the pipelines to the Internet. This one provision codifies discrimination on the Internet by a handful of large telecommunications and cable providers. This one provision will allow large, special interests to saddle consumers and small businesses alike with new and discriminatory fees over and above what they already pay for Internet access. This one small provision is akin to hurling a giant wrecking ball at the Internet.

The inclusion of this provision compels me to state that I will object to a unanimous consent request to the Senate proceeding with this legislation until a provision that provides true Internet neutrality is included.

This bill means the American people will no longer be able to use the Internet free from discrimination. Sure, the time it takes you to access the Web might be slower with dial-up, or you might zoom around the Web at warp speed, but you get to choose the speed. Today, whatever speed you chose doesn't make any difference in which sites you can visit. You still get access to any site you want. This is the beauty and the genius of the Internet. The Net is neutral.

The days of unfettered, unlimited, and free access to any site on the World Wide Web, what I call Net neutrality, are being threatened. Those who own the pipes, the giant cable and phone companies, want to discriminate in which sites you can access. If they get their way, not only will you have to pay more for faster speeds, you will have to pay more for something you get for free today: unfettered access to every site on the World Wide Web. To me, that is discrimination, pure and simple.

The Internet has thrived precisely because it is neutral. It has thrived because consumers, and not some giant cable or phone company, get to choose what they want to see and how quickly they get to see it. I am not going to allow a bill to go forward that is going to end surfing the Web free of discrimination.

The large interests have made it clear that if this bill moves forward, they will begin to discriminate. A Verizon Communications executive has called for an ''end to Google's 'free lunch.''' A Bell South executive has said that he wants the Internet to be turned into a ''pay-for-performance marketplace.'' What they and other cable and phone company executives are proposing is that instead of providing equal access for everyone to the same content at the same price, they will set up sweetheart arrangements to play favorites. Without net neutrality protections, this bill is bad news for consumers and anyone who today enjoys unlimited access to all of the Net's applications, service and content.

There is no doubt in my mind that American consumers and small business will be the losers in this fight if this bill is allowed to move forward. Right now, a computer science major at the University of Oregon is working on the next big thing for the Internet. But she will never get the chance to get the next big thing out there if she cannot pay the big fees that will be charged tomorrow for the same Internet access she gets for free today.

Right now in Pendleton, OR, there is a small family wheat farm where dad is monitoring the fertilizer on their crop via a new Web service program that his son bought. If the network operators have their way, this Web service will get so expensive that it will be out of reach for this family farmer.

As a Senator who has devoted himself to keeping the Internet free from discrimination, from discriminatory taxes and regulations to assuring offline protections apply to online consumer activities as well, I cannot stand by and allow the bill to proceed with this provision. The inclusion of this provision compels me to inform my colleagues that I will object to any unanimous consent request for the Senate to move to consider S. 2686, the Communications Consumer's Choice, and Broadband Deployment Act.

There are other provisions in this legislation, such as the one relating to my proposal for the creation of kids television tiers, that are problematic, but none of them rises to the same level of concern as the one relating to network neutrality. Therefore, I will object to any further action on this telecommunications bill until it includes a strong net neutrality provision that will truly benefit consumers and small business.

Mr. President, Senator GRASSLEY and I have spent over a decade fighting to ensure that when a Senator puts a hold on or blocks a major piece of legislation that there is accountability. We have required, under our proposal, that holds are publicly announced. Because I feel so strongly about this way of approaching holds, I have come to the floor tonight to announce that I intend to object to any unanimous consent request for the United States Senate to move to consider S. 2686, the telecommunications reform legislation that came from the Senate Commerce Committee a bit ago.

The reason I have come to the floor to make this announcement is that I believe this legislation is a license to discriminate on the Internet. Right now, we all know that when you use your browser, you get to go where you want, when you want, how you want. The Internet's special quality is that all content is treated equally. It is my fear that, as a result of this legislation without a clear policy preserving the neutrality of the Internet, and without tough sanctions against those who would discriminate, the Internet will be changed forever against the public interest.

In the beginning of these remarks—and it is my intent to be brief—I compliment Senator STEVENS, Chairman of the Commerce Committee, and Ranking Member INOUYE, with respect to the procedure for how this legislation was considered.

Late last winter I was allowed to come to the Senate Commerce Committee as a former member of the committee and make a presentation with respect to why I thought an Internet free of discrimination was so important. I introduced the first legislation, the Internet Nondiscrimination Act, back in March. Since then I have worked closely with colleagues, particularly Senator SNOWE and Senator DORGAN, who have done such a great job championing an Internet free of discrimination. We have all worked for many months in trying to preserve a free and open Internet.

Unfortunately, despite the valiant work of those two Senators, Senators SNOWE and DORGAN, and with the help of others, particularly Senator CANTWELL, who spoke eloquently about why a free-from-discrimination Internet is so important, they were not successful. So now there is the prospect of major changes in the way the Internet works, changes that will affect millions of businesses and millions of consumers. At a minimum, I believe these changes are so important and mean so much to our country, it ought to be possible for the Senate to slow this down and take the time to consider what the implications are of a badly flawed piece of legislation with respect to its treatment of the Internet.

The failure to include what is called ''Net neutrality'' legislation is failure to keep the principle of keeping the Net free from discrimination. In my view, we run the prospect of dividing the Internet into technology haves and have-nots. What will happen is even more power will be concentrated in the hands of special interests that own the pipelines to the Net. In effect, the legislation codifies discrimination on the Net by giving a green light to a handful of large telecommunications and cable providers to set up what could be a system that will allow for differential treatment.

It means, for example, one small business may get service that won't be as good as another's. That translates, in my view, if it is done by deliberate design on the basis of who can pay, into discrimination.

The failure to include the Net neutrality legislation that Senators DORGAN and SNOWE and I and others have worked on for so long is going to allow the special interests to saddle the startup businesses, the consumers, and the innovators with a variety of new and discriminatory fees over and above what they already pay for Internet access.

In my view, what has happened today, failing to include provisions that keep the Net free of discrimination, is like throwing a huge wrecking ball at this extraordinary telecommunications innovation that we all enjoy, known as the Net. The failure to include this provision compels me to

state this objection to going forward on this legislation because I believe the days of unfettered, unlimited access to any site on the World Wide Web is threatened by this bill as written. Those who own the pipes, the cable companies and the phone companies, will be able to play favorites with respect to the sites that Americans can access.

If they get their way, not only will Americans have to pay more for faster speeds, they will have to pay more for how they use the Internet once they choose what speed to access it by, something they get for free today after they pay their basic access charge. In my view, the Internet has been such a great success precisely because it was free of discrimination. It thrives because the marketplace, consumers, small businesses, and others were able to choose what they wanted to see and how quickly they wanted to see it. So I am not going to let a bill like this go forward because it will end surfing the Web free of discrimination.

The large interests that have backed the legislation have written and have already made clear what their designs are. This is not some kind of atomic secret, Mr. President. There have been lengthy articles in the Wall Street Journal, for example, about pay-to-play. It outlined in great detail all of the ways in which the companies could play favorites, could give a break to a business who had a bit more money, and send somebody else who didn't have the funds off to the second tier. Instead of providing equal access for everyone to the same content at the same price, what we would have are sweetheart arrangements where certain parties would win and other parties would lose. This, in my view, is bad news for consumers and anyone who enjoys unlimited access to all of the Net's applications, services, and content.

Right now, there is a computer science major at the University of Oregon in my home State who is working on the next big thing for the Internet and has great dreams. I am sure that at universities and in garages in Oklahoma, where the Presiding Officer is from, there are constituents who are also working on the next big thing. My concern is that those dreamers in Oklahoma and Oregon, and the innovators and the people with the cutting edge ideas, would not get the chance to get the next big idea out because they would not be able to pay the big fees that Internet providers will charge tomorrow for them to get priority access to consumers or get stuck in the slow lane. Of course, they are going to be up against people, as they fight to show the worth of their idea, who can pay those big fees and have an advantage over them in the marketplace.

What is especially troubling to me, Mr. President, is it seems that if you have an innovative startup in Oregon or Oklahoma or elsewhere in our country, you are going to be up against these new barriers. But guess what? Our competitors around the world don't have the same kind of barriers with. So what I am concerned about is that if you have a good idea in our country, a promising kind of startup, and you run up against all of these hurdles—these new discriminatory hurdles placed on the Internet—you are going to say, what the heck, I cannot compete in that kind of situation, so I will just take the business overseas.

What I want to do—and I know the Senator from Oklahoma wants to do it—is create high-skill, high-wage jobs in our country. We ought to keep the incentives here rather than making it attractive to take promising ideas overseas. I have been involved in a lot of technology issues, and the principle that I have always thought was most important was ensuring that there is no discrimination.

Today, I was very pleased that the Senate Finance Committee accepted my amendment to make permanent the ban on discriminatory and multiple taxes on electronic commerce. We have been at this since 1996. We passed it three times in the Senate, always by large majorities, and I said let's get at it now and make it permanent so that we give predictability and certainty in the marketplace. I was very pleased that, with the support of GRASSLEY and BAUCUS, I was able to win passage of that legislation that involved taxes, ensuring that there was no discrimination in the tax and the electronic commerce areas. I was pleased that it passed.

Unfortunately, what was done today in the Commerce Committee by giving a green light to discriminators undoes a lot of what the Senate has done over the last few years in terms of ensuring nondiscrimination in electronic commerce.

We made sensible decisions in the tax arena because we barred discrimination as it related to taxing electronic commerce. Now the Senate Commerce Committee comes along and says we are going to pass on this Net neutrality issue; we are not going to include it, so now there can be other forms of discrimination on the Net. That makes no sense to me, and it seems particularly ironic today, of all days, as the Senate has been trying to prevent discrimination in the taxation area of electronic commerce, to essentially undo that important policy by allowing unprecedented discrimination in the marketplace.

There is another area I think is worth noting as I object to the consideration of S. 2686. We have heard from a number of those opposed to Net neutrality legislation that there has been no problem, that there are no instances of discrimination. No. 1, that is factually incorrect because there is already a major Federal Communications Commission case, Madison River case, and No. 2, the big telecoms and cable companies have already announced their plans to discriminate. I have described the plans in the Wall Street Journal which are not any kind of hidden effort to sneak something by people. The Wall Street Journal describes the plans for differential treatment.

I note, as we consider this issue, the consequences of discrimination. If those who want to discriminate—and my sense is, by their own admissions, they are going to start very quickly—are able to set in place the discriminatory routers and other equipment that would allow them to treat those small businesses and individuals differently, once those routers and other discriminatory systems are in place, it is going to be very difficult to undo them. They will be embedded in that system of pipes and infrastructure which makes it possible for Americans to enjoy the Net. I am not willing to sit by and let all of those discriminatory routers and other kinds of complicated systems that make up the pipes for the Net go into effect without an opportunity for the Senate to really consider the consequences.

We are talking with respect to this legislation and its absence of strong Net neutrality language, about changing policy that has been the bedrock of the telecommunications field for many years—non-discrimination.

This legislation contains a variety of major changes in the country's telecommunications law. I happen to support many of them. But I will tell the Senate tonight that a communications bill that does not embed, and do it clearly, that the Internet will be free of discrimination is legislation that I believe is badly flawed.

This is a complicated subject. There are differing views on Net neutrality and I am the first to admit it. But I think all sides would agree that this is a complicated issue. It ought to be one the Senate takes the time to really think through. And I will make it clear to the Senate that I, for one, feel so strongly about ensuring telecommunications policy continues to be based on principles that bar discrimination that I am taking this action tonight for purposes of carrying out that objective.

Let me state again, it is my intent to object to any further action on this legislation, S. 2686, until it includes a strong Net neutrality provision that will ensure there is a vibrant, healthy Internet for decades to come.

My colleagues, Senator SNOWE and Senator DORGAN, did a superb job this afternoon in making the case for our point of view. I am very proud to have been able to work with them. The legislation they introduced is very similar to mine. Unfortunately, the Snowe-Dorgan legislation went down on a tie vote in the Commerce Committee today. However, this discussion needs to continue. I hope the Senate will insist that the way the Internet works today, and particularly its egalitarian nature where everybody uses their browser and gets to where they want, when they want, how they want, is continued for generations to come.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT JULIANO

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise today to take note of the 65th birthday of Robert Juliano.

Robert Juliano has spent more time working on Capitol Hill than most Members of Congress. He is a longtime political adviser, labor representative, and champion of philanthropic causes.

He recently received the Sons of Italy in America 2006 Humanitarian Award for his support of charitable causes, including the National Coalition for Breast Cancer, the Lions Club, and the Crusade of Mercy.

I am proud that Bob hails from the city of Big Shoulders, the son of an Italian immigrant. Bob grew up on the West Side of Chicago and worked in that great city's hotel industry in the 1960s and 1970s starting as an elevator operator. From there, he came to Washington, DC, to serve as legislative representative for the Hotel and Restaurant Employees International Union. He served as chairman and vice chairman of the U.S. Government's Travel and Tourism Advisory Board in the 1980s and 1990s. He has worked to protect the health care benefits of retired miners and worked on nearly every major piece of labor legislation over the last 30 years.

It is clear Bob Juliano never forgot his roots. And he never forgot the workers who need a strong voice for their values. One of the reasons Bob has been so successful is his ability to bring people of all political persuasions together to work on the most pressing issues we face. It is a skill that is in great shortage these days.

I wish Bob Juliano well on his 65th birthday.

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SPECIALIST BOBBY WEST

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, I rise today in honor one of our Nation's fallen, Army SPC Bobby West. He died defending this Nation so that others might have the same freedoms we cherish as Americans. For those who knew Specialist West, he will be remembered for the laughter he brought to the lives of those around him. He will also be remembered for acting on his conviction of defending and fighting for the values and liberties we hold so dear as Americans.

At 17, after graduating from Beebe High school, Bobby enlisted with the Arkansas National Guard. Like so many of us, he was deeply affected by the terrorist attacks that took place on September 11, 2001. However, he felt that the burden to defend our country rested squarely on his shoulders and shortly thereafter he enlisted in the Army with his older brother Patrick. Specialist West served our country in Egypt's Sinai Peninsula before being sent to Iraq. Tragically, he was serving his second tour of duty in Iraq and was killed when a roadside bomb detonated while he was on foot patrol with his unit in Baghdad on May 30. His unit was scheduled to leave Iraq in the fall.

I am honored to stand here today and pay tribute to a great soldier and more importantly a loving son, brother and friend. His loved ones remember how much laughter he brought to their lives with his quick wit and sense of humor. His fellow soldiers will remember him not only for the burden he carried with him to defend this Nation and bring freedom to others, but also for the competitiveness he brought to everything he did in life. His fellow soldiers tell the story of the fierce competitiveness he brought to a pickup basketball game while stationed in Egypt. Regardless of the fact that they were playing in a tin building in 125–135 degree heat, Bobby wouldn't let his opponents leave until they could beat him. It is this sense of commitment and dedication that he brought to his military service. He also believed in what he was doing and loved being a soldier. It is people like Bobby West who make our military the strongest in the world.

I am grateful for the service of Bobby West. I am also reminded of the tragic human cost of war and am saddened at the death of another Arkansas soldier. In the words of his brother, Bobby ''was born to defend the greatest Nation on Earth.'' He gave his life defending the greatest Nation on Earth and we owe him and all others who have made that sacrifice an enormous debt of gratitude. Our prayers are with his father Ricky West, his mother Linda Wiggins West, and his older brother Patrick West, and we all pray for the safe return of Patrick who is serving in Iraq with the 101st Airborne Division.

FLAG DESECRATION AMENDMENT

Mr. REED. Mr. President, yesterday I opposed Senate Joint Resolution 12, which would have created a constitutional amendment allowing Congress to ban desecration of the flag.

As a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy and a former officer in the Army, I am deeply offended when people burn or otherwise abuse this precious national symbol.

I also believe, however, that the values and beliefs that the American flag represents are more important than the cloth from which this symbol was created. Prominent among these beliefs are the right to voice views that are unpopular, and the right to protest. In fact, these fundamental values, preserved by our Constitution, have distinguished our Nation for more than 200 years. The Framers understood that democracy cannot thrive, or even survive, without freedom of expression. Colin Powell has rightfully said, ''The first amendment exists to ensure that freedom of speech and expression applies not just to that with which we agree or disagree, but also that which we find outrageous. I would not amend that great shield of democracy to hammer a few miscreants. The flag will be flying proudly long after they have slunk away.''

I oppose this amendment not because I condone desecration of our flag, but because I celebrate the values our flag represents. Flag burning is despicable. However, the issue is whether we should amend our great charter document, the Constitution, to proscribe it.

In The Federalist, James Madison declared that the Constitution should be amended for ''certain great and extraordinary occasions.'' Except for the prohibition amendments, since the adoption of the Bill of Rights, we have only amended the Constitution for ''great and extraordinary occasions:'' abolishing slavery and giving African Americans the right to vote; extending voting rights to women; and regulating elections and the tenure of the Presidency. Of the 27 amendments, 17 protect individual rights and liberties. In fact, we have never amended the Constitution to constrict rights that other amendments already guarantee.

So are we facing a ''great and extraordinary occasion'' justifying the use of a constitutional amendment? I would argue no.

First, an amendment permitting government restraints on free expression cannot compel loyalty to or love for either our country or our flag. The proposed amendment would pronounce to the world that we value free speech, except when it offends, that we tolerate free expression, except when it is demoralizes.

Second, is this a problem needing such strong medicine? Are we facing an epidemic of flag burnings? In fact, over the past 10 years, only 7 incidents of flag desecration have occurred per year on average, most of which have been successfully prosecuted under laws prohibiting vandalism, theft, disorderly conduct, and disturbance of peace. Indeed, passing such an amendment would probably do more to promote flag burning by malcontents than any other action this Congress could take.

Third, proponents of such an amendment declare that it would boost the morale of our troops and help restore some of the American values so basic to the fabric of our country. But, as one veteran recently wrote, ''I did not believe then, nor do I believe now, that I was defending just a piece of geography, but a way of life. If this amendment becomes a part of our Constitution, this way of life will be diminished.'' I cannot help but believe that a more appropriate expression of support for our troops would be providing them with the equipment they need in the field, better benefits for their families, and an adequately funded medical system at home.

Although I oppose a constitutional amendment, I did support an alternative approach offered by Senator DURBIN. Senator DURBIN's amendment contained two elements. First, it would

have created a statutory prohibition against desecration of our flag. This part of his amendment was drafted to follow the guidance of the 2003 Supreme Court decision in Virginia v. Black, which upheld a Virginia law banning cross burning that is intended to intimidate. The Durbin amendment took a similar approach and prohibited desecration of the flag when it is intended to incite violence. The Durbin amendment also would have promoted respect for families of deceased members of the Armed Forces by prohibiting demonstrations at their funerals. The amendment was narrowly tailored to make these disrespectful demonstrations punishable.

In sum, debating a constitutional amendment on desecration of the flag, although politically popular, is not how the Senate should be spending its few remaining legislative weeks. But this is a campaign year, and the majority appears to want the Senate to spend time on topics which defer and deflect us from concentrating finding solutions to pressing issues facing our Nation: restoring fiscal discipline, creating safe and affordable housing for working families, securing our borders, expanding health insurance coverage to the uninsured, ensuring students have the skills and tools to compete in an ever-expanding global economy, and redeploying our troops as quickly as possible out of Iraq. Unfortunately, the majority has provided limited time to debate most of these issues.

I hope that with the rapidly dwindling number of days left in this session we will work to address the very real concerns that impact American families every day. I fear, however, that this debate is only a harbinger of what is to come and very clearly signals why we need a new direction.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, 17 years ago the U.S. Supreme Court, in a 5-to-4 decision, struck down a Texas flag protection statute. The Supreme Court ruled that burning an American flag was a form of ''speech,'' and therefore protected under the first amendment of the Constitution.

I disagreed with the Court's decision then and I still do. I don't believe that the act of desecrating a flag is an act of speech. And I believe that our flag, as our national symbol, can and should be protected by law.

In the intervening years since the Supreme Court decision, I have supported Federal legislation that would make flag desecration illegal. Yet on several occasions, I have also voted against amendments to the Constitution to do the same.

I voted that way because, while I believe that flag desecration is despicable conduct that should be prohibited by law, I also believe that amending our Constitution is a step that should be taken only rarely, and then only as a last resort.

In the past year I have once again reviewed in detail nearly all of the legal opinions and written materials published by constitutional scholars and courts on all sides of this issue.

After that review, I have concluded that there remains a way to protect our flag without having to alter the Constitution of the United States. That is why I have cosponsored S. 1370, a bipartisan piece of legislation introduced by Senator BENNETT of Utah.

S. 1370 protects the flag by criminalizing flag desecration when its intended purpose is to incite violence. This is the same standard which makes it illegal to falsely cry ''fire'' in a crowded theater. Reckless speech that is likely to cause violence is not protected under the ''fighting words'' standard, long recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States. The Congressional Research Service believes that this type of statute will be upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Last night, I voted for an amendment offered by Senator DURBIN, which incorporates many of the provisions of S. 1370, the bipartisan bill of which I am a cosponsor. The Durbin amendment would also prohibit the disruption of military funerals by demonstrators. This amendment would protect the flag, but do so without altering the Constitution.

I know that supporters of a constitutional amendment will be disappointed by my decision to support this statutory remedy to protect the flag, rather than support an amendment to the U.S. Constitution. I know they are impatient to correct a decision by the Supreme Court that they and I believe was wrong.

I have wrestled with this issue for a long time, and I respect those who passionately believe that we must amend the Constitution to protect the flag.

More than 11,000 constitutional amendments have been proposed since our Constitution was ratified. However, since the ratification of the Bill of Rights in 1791, only 17 amendments have been enacted.

Protecting the American flag can be accomplished without amending the Constitution, and that is a critically important point. I believe that future generations, and our founding fathers, would agree that it is worthwhile for us to find a way to protect our flag without altering the Constitution.

LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2005

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the need for hate crimes legislation. Each Congress, Senator KENNEDY and I introduce hate crimes legislation that would add new categories to current hate crimes law, sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society. Likewise, each Congress I have come to the floor to highlight a separate hate crime that has occurred in our country.

On June 10, 2006, Queens, NY, three gay men were out walking when a group of eight men began shouting antigay slurs at them. The group then surrounded and attacked them, striking one victim in the head with a baseball bat.

I believe that the Government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act is a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation and changing current law, we can change hearts and minds as well.

HEALTHY FAMILIES ACT

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, today I am proud to cosponsor the Healthy Families Act, S. 932 and S. 1085, introduced by my friend, Senator TED KENNEDY. This legislation will provide full-time employees with up to 7 paid sick days a year so that they can take care of their own medical needs or the medical needs of family members. Part-time employees would receive a prorata amount of paid sick leave. All employers—public and private—with at least 15 employees would be covered by the Healthy Families Act.

Today, 86 million workers in the United States do not have paid sick days. Thus, when faced with either a personal or family medical issue, they are forced to choose between caring for themselves or their loved ones and going to work to keep food on the table and a paycheck in the mail. This is not acceptable. People get sick every day. They should have the right to get medical treatment without jeopardizing their jobs or harming the people around them. The Healthy Families Act would guarantee them that right.

According to Harvard University's Global Working Families Project, 139 nations provide some sort of paid sick days; 177 of those nations guarantee at least a week of annual sick pay. The United States, however, has no such guarantee—the Federal Family and Medical Leave Act provides only unpaid sick leave for serious personal or family illnesses. This lack of paid sick leave puts our Nation's workforce, both present and future, at risk.

As ranking member of the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, I am extremely conscious of the regulatory burden that our businesses face particularly our small businesses. I believe that government should avoid weighing down small businesses with unnecessary regulations. However, the more I have examined this issue, the more obvious it becomes that this legislation benefits both employees and employers.

It does not take a rocket scientist to figure out that healthy employees are the key to a productive and vibrant economy. Healthy employees are more productive and often more efficient. But, without paid sick days, many employees will go to work rather than take time off to get regular preventative medical checkups or to recover from an attacking illness or to care for

a sick child. Thus, they will get sick more often, and their illnesses will spread. Employees who opt to come to work when sick can make their condition worse or even spread their illness to coworkers. For a business, it is far more costly to cope with a depleted staff or to search for a replacement when an employee is suffering from an extended illness than it is to provide just 7 sick days. Providing employees with a small number of paid sick days is a simple and commonsense fix that will save businesses time and money.

In addition, I have heard—my staff has reported—that small businesses often complain that they want to offer this benefit, but are unable to and need a level playing field. This legislation would offer them just that.

Mr. President, I hope that my colleagues will take a look at the Healthy Families Act and will join me in cosponsoring it.

SERVICE MARKED BY INTEGRITY, COMPASSION AND DEDICATION

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, Ronald Reagan once said ''I know in my heart that man is good. That what is right will always eventually triumph. And there's purpose and worth to each and every life.'' How appropriate that these words reflect the heart and persona of someone who used to work for the Reagans in the White House and who, for the past 2 years, has worked faithfully and tirelessly as my executive assistant.

Mary Klappa met the challenge of the job with excitement and expertise. She brought professionalism and trust to her position. We all depend on our executive assistant to make certain we get where we need to be on time and well prepared, a duty in which she excelled.

Effectively managing a Senator's time is not easy. Frankly, I am glad I don't have to do it. It requires a careful sense of timing and intuition and exacting attention to detail. It also requires someone who, regardless of the demands on their time, is pleasant and helpful to all who call or walk in, regardless of their personality or requests. Mary has been all of these things and more. She carried her phone and Blackberry with her constantly, and I always knew I could call her whenever I needed something. She worked diligently to make sure I met with Idahoans who came to Washington, and she coordinated my State scheduling as well. She has taken exceptional care of my family and was utterly selfless in her commitment to ensure that I conduct my job in the most efficient and responsible manner possible. Her vast knowledge of protocol and her understanding of the nuances and complexities of Washington politics on and off the Hill have been of immeasurable benefit to me.

I will miss her highly dependable and capable management and her kindness and honesty. Mary is a very special person, and I am most honored and grateful for her tremendous service. She made my job easier and, in the process, made me more effective.

I end where I started, with another thought from her former boss, a great and wise man: ''Government is the people's business and every man, woman and child becomes a shareholder with the first penny of tax paid.'' Mary believes this in her soul. She has a heart of service for our country and lives it out in her work and her life. And Idaho and I have been better off for it.

HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF SENATOR MALCOLM WALLOP

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a true patriot and tireless advocate of the great State of Wyoming, U.S. Senator Malcolm Wallop. I am pleased to be joined by Senator ENZI and Representative CUBIN in this tribute.

Malcolm hails from Big Horn, WY, born into a hard-working family with a long history of public service. Malcolm continued this family tradition by serving in the U.S. Army as a first lieutenant, then in the Wyoming State Legislature from 1969 to 1976. He followed this with a distinguished 18-year career representing the people of the State of Wyoming in the U.S. Senate.

Throughout his tenure in the Senate, Malcolm held true to his convictions—maintaining a strong national defense, a Federal Government that works best when it is smaller, individual liberties and freedoms are the core of our Nation, and States rights must be protected from encroachment by the Federal Government. His unwillingness to compromise his forthright beliefs earned him the respect of his Senate colleagues on both sides of the aisle. Senator LEVIN said about Malcolm:

> While we disagreed, again, probably as often as we agreed, that did not stand in the way of my admiration for the quality, the characteristic that he had of letting you know precisely where he stood and why. And his patriotism is second to none in this body.

His depth of understanding and knowledge on defense policy was widely respected. In 1978, Senator Wallop became the first elected official to propose a space based missile defense system, a program that later became part of the Strategic Defense Initiative. Given the proliferation of new missiles today, it is remarkable how profound his ideas and observations were at the time.

Although Senator Wallop retired from the Senate in 1994, he remains engaged in the debate on key issues confronting our Nation. He is currently a senior fellow with the Heritage Foundation where he writes and speaks on issues of foreign policy and national defense. Malcolm also chairs the Frontiers of Freedom, a nonprofit organization he established upon retiring from the Senate. And he remains a strong and respected voice on individual property rights, Endangered Species Act reform, Social Security privatization and civil liberties.

Malcolm's contributions to Wyoming, and the Nation as a whole, are remarkable. The Wyoming State Legislature recently passed a joint resolution establishing July 8, 2006 as Malcolm Wallop Appreciation Day. With your permission, I will submit the resolution for the RECORD.

He remains an intelligent, articulate individual with incredible foresight. We are pleased to take this moment to express our gratitude to Senator Wallop for his service, and extremely proud to have such a distinguished and respected individual call Wyoming home.

Although many have tried to sum up the man, President Reagan may have said it best when he said, ''Leadership, hard work, experience, loyalty to Wyoming—that's what Malcolm Wallop is all about.''

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the aforementioned resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A JOINT RESOLUTION OF THE MEMBERS OF THE FIFTY-EIGHTH LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF WYOMING HONORING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR MALCOLM WALLOP

A joint resolution to commemorate Senator Malcolm Wallop's service and dedication to the people of Wyoming and to proclaim July 8, 2006 as ''Malcolm Wallop Appreciation Day.''

Be it Resolved by the Fifty-Eighth Legislature of the State of Wyoming:

Whereas, this proud son of Sheridan County was born on February 27, 1933, the third generation of a Wyoming pioneer family; his grandfather was a young Englishman named Oliver Henry Wallop, the youngest son of the fifth Earl of Portsmouth, who headed out to the great American West after graduating from Oxford in 1883, buying the Canyon Ranch in Big Horn in 1895, which has remained in the family for four generations; and

Whereas, Malcolm's story ties together a family's commitment to public service across two nations; his grandfather was elected to the Wyoming Legislature in 1910 and helped draft the state's first game and conservation laws; when Oliver's elder brother died in England in 1925, he returned to assume the post of Earl of Portsmouth and served in the British House of Lords, but the Earl never abandoned his love of America, the West and Canyon Ranch, where he remained until his death in 1942; and

Whereas, Malcolm was educated at Big Horn School, Cate School in Carpinteria, California, and attended college at Yale University, earning a Bachelor of Arts degree in 1954; upon graduation from Yale, Malcolm served in the U.S. Army Artillery from 1955 to 1957, as a First Lieutenant; and

Whereas, he returned home to Big Horn after his service to his country and his extensive business career included management of his Wyoming ranch holdings, establishment of a feedlot, and development of oil and gas projects in Nebraska, Montana and Wyoming; in addition, Malcolm has been an active real estate developer and investor; and

Whereas, following in his grandfather's footsteps, Malcolm served in the Wyoming Legislature from 1969 to 1976, serving two terms in the Wyoming House of Representatives where he served on the House Livestock and Agriculture Committee; the House

Game and Fish Committee; the House Travel, Recreation and Wildlife Committee; and the House Corporations, Elections and Political Subdivisions Committee; and one term in the Wyoming Senate, where he served on the Senate Education, Health and Welfare Committee; the Senate Travel, Recreation and Wildlife Committee; and the Senate Transportation and Highways Committee; and

Whereas, he went on to be elected to the United States Senate on November 2, 1976, was reelected on November 2, 1982, and again on November 8, 1988, serving Wyoming in Washington for 18 years, where the Senator distinguished himself through a long and notable record of legislative achievements to mark his three terms in Congress; and

Whereas, during his tenure, Senator Wallop served on numerous committees, including Energy and Natural Resources, Finance, Small Business, Armed Services, Environment and Public Works, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and he was the first non-lawyer in history to serve on the Judiciary Committee; and

Whereas, on the national stage, the Senator may be best remembered for his work related to federal deregulation, states rights, tax reform, energy policy, free trade, national defense, private property rights, and individual liberties and he has earned a national and international reputation related to his expertise on these issues; and

Whereas, Senator Wallop was a great friend to Wyoming throughout his tenure in the United States Congress and his legislative conservation victories include the Wyoming Wilderness Act, which became law in 1984; the Senator was the author of the 1984 Wallop-Breaux Sport Fishing Restoration Act; the designation of the Clark's Fork as a Wild and Scenic River was another piece of legislation he sponsored, as was legislation to repair and upgrade the Buffalo Bill Dam in Cody, as well as safety and repair work at Jackson Lake Dam, Seminole Dam, and Fontenelle Dam; and

Whereas, Senator Wallop achieved many other victories for the state including efforts to stop the congressional Appropriations Committee from requiring that Wyoming share 100 percent of the federal administrative costs for the mineral royalty management programs; he sponsored legislation to provide inheritance tax relief for family businesses and ranches; he sponsored the Energy Policy Act of 1992, which provides for energy development and conservation programs; and he successfully sought to reduce trade barriers in Japan, Taiwan, the European Community, and Brazil for trona exports; and

Whereas, considered one of the nation's most knowledgeable experts on defense policy, when the history of the Cold War is written, a chapter will be devoted to Senator Wallop, so dedicated and determined was he in this arena; in 1978, Senator Wallop was the first elected official to propose a space-based missile defense system, which became part of the Strategic Defense Initiative; throughout the 1980s, Senator Wallop served on both the Senate Arms Control Observer group and the Committee on Security and Cooperation in Europe, also known as the Helsinki Commission; his extensive travel for these responsibilities took him to the Soviet Union, Eastern and Western Europe and the issues of arms control in SALT II, INF, START I and START II were the most complex international relations issues of the era; and

Whereas, an early supporter of volunteerism, Senator Wallop's legislation establishing the Congressional Award program was approved by Congress in 1979, which honors the nation's youth for community service and personal achievements and is the only award given in the name of Congress; the Senator was also responsible for bringing the Close Up program to Wyoming to give young people in Wyoming the opportunity to travel to the nation's Capitol to learn about the democratic process firsthand; and

Whereas, although a listing of the many awards and honors he has received do not do full tribute to the man, his countless honors include the American Conservative Union's John Ashbrook Award and Ronald Reagan Award, the National Energy Resources Organization's National Leadership Award, the Center for Security Policy's ''Keeper of the Flame Award,'' the Congressional Award's Leadership Award, the Fund for American Studies' Congressional Scholarship Award, and Citizens for a Sound Economy's Jefferson Award; and

Whereas, the Senator, who has built a reputation as a tireless promoter of individual freedom and small government, is the founder and chairman of Frontiers of Freedom, a non-profit public policy organization he established in 1995, after retiring from the Senate; and

Whereas, in the best testament of a man's character, his staff speak proudly and fondly of their service under his tutelage; a recurring theme of kindness, humility, and keen intellect runs a thread through recollections of their former boss and friend; one staff member noted, ''I learned more about our state in the few years I worked for him than anyone previously and his love for this state and the Wyoming people was obvious from the first day I began working for him,'' another staff member recalls that the Senator, ''had the incredibly rare ability to look ahead and plan today for what will be needed in the future,'' yet another notes that ''My family often said that we slept better at night knowing that a man like Malcolm Wallop was making decisions for us at the federal level, based on strong and thoughtful values and he did not let the capricious opinion of the day sway him from his reasoned positions;'' and

Whereas, the Senator's Chief of Staff and current Chief Justice of the Wyoming Supreme Court, William Hill, notes, ''Malcolm is a man made of many parts—you first are struck by the warmth and friendliness of his personality, he is a genuine and sincere man, with no artifice about him; he is a man of great honor and dignity, of great kindness and decency; despite his many gifts and accomplishments, he is a man of great humility; his loyalty runs deep and he is a staunch friend, as a public servant, his patriotism is matched only by his abiding love for Wyoming and the people of our state;'' and

Whereas, his colleague in the United States Senate for 16 years, Senator Alan Simpson, remembers him as ''a practical politician, a formidable foe in debate, a friendly companion with friend or foe, a highly articulate spokesman, an avid reader, master of languages, a student, an author, a patriot, a diplomat, a very wise and witty man, and a highly respected U.S. Senator among his peers, always with the best interests of his native state in mind.'' Now therefore, be it

Resolved, by the members of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming:

Section 1. That, on behalf of the people of the State of Wyoming, we extend our deepest admiration and gratitude to Senator Malcolm Wallop for his long and distinguished service to our state and our Nation.

Section 2. That we recognize that the strength of our local communities, the success of the State of Wyoming, and the vitality of American society depend upon the dedication of citizens like Senator Wallop, who used his considerable talents to unselfishly serve others and that his contributions will inspire others to continue his tradition of public service.

Section 3. That we hereby designate July 8, 2006 as ''Malcolm Wallop Appreciation Day'' marking and celebrating his election to the United States Senate 30 years ago, a post to which he served admirably; his integrity during his service will be his lasting legacy. Be it further

Resolved, that this resolution be transmitted to Senator Wallop on July 8, 2006, so that he may know of our deepest appreciation for his passionate devotion to Wyoming.

THE DROUGHT AND WATER SITUATION IN NEW MEXICO

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, today I rise to share my concerns about the water crisis that has ravaged the West for more than 5 years.

Water is our most precious and scarce resource. This year, my home State of New Mexico is battling a very real and devastating drought that has expanded throughout most of the Western United States. The ongoing drought continues to break records, and I believe that in years to come, 2006 will be looked at as the year where most basins set new record lows. The question on the minds of New Mexicans is, Will there be enough water to meet the current needs?

Drought is a unique emergency situation because it creeps in unlike other abrupt weather disasters. New Mexico, like many other States in the West, has had little to no precipitation, and our winter snow pack was far below average. Many New Mexico towns, municipalities, and agricultural producers heavily rely on runoff provided by snowpack.

On April 18, 2006, the Texas Agriculture Experiment Station predicted a dramatic decrease in water flows and reservoir storage throughout New Mexico. Early predictions indicate that river water supply will be at 54 percent due primarily to receiving half our annual snowpack and above average temperatures in my State. Additionally, several of our reservoirs are at severely diminished capacity. Specifically, the Elephant Butte, El Vado and Caballo reservoirs are all well below 10 percent of capacity. Earlier this year New Mexico's State engineer, John D'Antonio, correctly predicted that it will be difficult, if not impossible, without really good snowpack to keep the Rio Grande River flowing through the summer.

The drought has exacerbated many of New Mexico's most acute problems. For example, wells are running dry, ranchers are being forced to sell their livestock, farmers are being forced to watch their way of life blow away with the dust, and many of our cities are in various stages of water restriction. Because of a lack of precipitation, many New Mexico communities are running out of water. The disruption to water supplies will have disastrous implications for affected communities. Absent some immediate help, it is unclear where these communities will get water for municipal purposes.

The communities of Ruidoso, Ruidoso Downs, Las Vegas, Capitan,

and Cloudcroft, NM, are already operating under stringent water restrictions. I am happy to say that the fiscal year 2006 supplemental appropriations bill provided $9 million for drought emergency assistance to these and other New Mexico communities that have been especially hard hit by the drought.

The Rio Grande River is another unfortunate example of the water shortages in New Mexico. Water flowing in the Rio Grande provides water to almost a million people living along its banks. New Mexico's largest cities and fastest growing towns are along the Rio Grande—the Pojoaque Valley, Santa Fe, Rio Rancho, Albuquerque, Los Lunas, and Belen.

The drought and the mounting legal requirements on both the Pecos and Rio Grande Rivers are forcing us toward a severe water crisis in New Mexico. Indeed, every river in the intermountain west seems to be facing similar problems. Drought conditions have affected nearly everyone in our States in some way. As I have said many times, we must continue our efforts to stretch existing water supplies and create new water supplies by encouraging increased conservation efforts, a better understanding of available resources, and a more reasoned approach to endangered species and water quality regulations.

America is reaching the extent of our water supply, and we cannot wait to address this problem. I believe we must bring to bear every tool available to confront these problems in the West, and doing so remains one of my top priorities.

The fiscal impacts of drought on individuals, businesses, and governments are not insignificant. According to NOAA, there have been 12 different drought events since 1980 that resulted in damages and costs exceeding $1 billion each. For instance, in 2000, severe drought in the South-Central and Southeastern States caused losses to agriculture and related industries of over $4 billion, and the Eastern drought in 1999 led to $1 billion in losses.

While drought affects the economic and environmental well-being of the entire Nation, the United States lacks a cohesive strategy for dealing with serious drought emergencies. The current state of the drought should prompt us to take action. Better planning on our part could limit some of the damage felt by drought. I believe that passage of the National Integrated Drought Information System Act of 2006, S. 2751, is a good start. Without a national drought policy in place, we constantly live with the uncertainty of what next year will bring.

The past several days have brought some precipitation in places, but it alone will not be enough. These are difficult times, and all we can hope for is help where we can get it. I want to make the Senate aware of the difficulties we are experiencing in my home state because of the prolonged drought and the hot, dry, windy conditions, and as their Senator, I continue to ask for help on their behalf. As this drought persists, I want to ensure each New Mexican that I am committed to doing everything possible to make sure they have the tools and resources they need to help cope during this very difficult time.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO PEG SAGEN

• Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the retirement of Peg Sagen. Peg has spent the last 11 years as editor of the Rapid City Journal, the largest newspaper in western South Dakota. On behalf of the Rapid City community and the State of South Dakota, I take this opportunity to thank Peg for her service and her commitment to quality journalism.

Peg began her career in the newspaper industry over 30 years ago. She has been dedicated to providing her readers with timely and accurate news. Peg has used her talent to assure that the citizens in the Rapid City and surrounding communities received the news in a fair and unbiased manner. In addition, she is known throughout the Rapid City area as a philanthropist. We are all grateful for her service to the newspaper industry and to the community.

It gives me great pleasure to commemorate the retirement of Peg Sagen and to wish her the best in the years to come.•

RECOGNITION OF ECONOMIC EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENTS

• Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I am proud to recognize the achievements of several individuals from Hawaii who have excelled in an area of great interest to me, economic education.

I wish to recognize the students from Iolani High School in Honolulu, HI, who won the 2006 National Economics Challenge in New York City. They are the first team ever to win the national competition 2 years in a row. Seniors Bryce Aisake Atkinson, Megan Chock, Dean Ushijima, and Sumil Thapa, coached by their teacher, COL Richard Rankin, beat more than 1,000 teams from 35 States to win the Economics Challenge championship in the Adam Smith Division. Hawaii's State-level competition was sponsored by the Hawaii Council on Economic Education, which has done a wonderful job in fostering economic education in Hawaii. The national competition was sponsored by the National Council on Economic Education and the Goldman Sachs Foundation. I am very pleased to know that Hawaii is producing such high-quality young people knowledgeable about economics.

As the economy is intricately tied to the welfare of our Nation, economic and financial literacy is vital to ensuring our country's future. I have been very active in promoting economic and financial literacy in the United States. For example, I have introduced several pieces of legislation including the Mutual Fund Transparency Act, the College Literacy in Finance and Economics Act and the enacted Excellence in Economic Education Act. As the economy grows increasingly complex, everyone needs to be able to make informed financial decisions which will greatly impact their financial well-being.

We must strive to educate all sectors of society about financial literacy, especially our young people, so that they grasp essential concepts such as the importance of saving, budgeting, maintaining good credit histories, and applying economic principles to daily decisions. Our Nation's future is in our children hands. I am proud to extend my sincere congratulations and appreciation to the Iolani Economics Team for their hard work and dedication.•

RECOGNITION OF EXCELLENCE IN CREATIVE MEDIA

• Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure and pride to announce that students from Waianae High School, on the Island of Oahu, recently won the National Television Academy's National Student Television Award in the sports category. Waianae High School's Searider Productions was one of only seven school-based production operations from across the United States to be honored.

The National Student Television Awards are sponsored by the National Television Academy, which is dedicated to the advancement of the arts and sciences in television. The academy is best known for recognizing excellence in television programming through its coveted Emmy Awards. In its purpose statement, the academy states that it is committed to promoting excellence in broadcasting through education and inspiring the next generation of broadcast journalists.

I recognize the following four Waianae students who produced the excellent news piece: Katie Hoppe, Priscilla Mathewson, James Kapu-Kaaihue, and Justine Campos. Submissions for this competition were held to professional standards for high-quality journalism as well as creativity, execution, and strong writing. The special presentation of sports news that these students produced, entitled ''A Paddle Through Time,'' far exceeded professional standards.

I also take a moment to recognize Searider Productions, the multimedia education program of Waianae High School, which nurtured these excellent students. This innovative program offers the opportunity for talented students to gain workplace experience while developing their artistic and academic skills. Over the course of a few

years, Searider Productions has produced incredible work and has garnered an enormous number of accolades. From highly acclaimed public service announcements to an update of an online voting Web site, the work Searider Productions has performed is outstanding.

As a former teacher and principal, I take pride in seeing students from Hawaii receive national recognition. I know that it is because of school and parental support, dedication, and commitment that these students excelled in this area. These four students have made their families, school, and community proud. I look forward to seeing the future productions by the excellent students of Waianae High School and its Searider Productions.●

DON BURTENSHAW: COMMUNITY SERVANT AND STATESMAN

● Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I pay tribute today to a very special Idahoan. Don Burtenshaw, a farmer and rancher from Terreton, is retiring from the Idaho State Senate after serving five terms representing the 35th district. Having served in the Idaho State Legislature myself, I can attest to the work that this public office entails, and I would be pleased to be honoring him today if just for that. But Don's accomplishments and influence in and around Jefferson County went far beyond a seat in the State legislature.

Don is an active member of his church and owns Burtenshaw Cattle Company. He served as a partner in the Rexburg Livestock Auction, Salmon Livestock Auction, and the Bozeman Livestock Auction. According to the West Jefferson Lions Club, who has awarded Don its prestigious Spirit of Service Award this year, his long and selfless service to the community has touched the lives of many youth and adults alike. Don served on the Jefferson County districts 251 and 253 school boards for 24 years. He also served on the board of directors for the Owsley Canal.

Over the years, he has placed particular emphasis on the children of Jefferson County. And I am sure that with the time saved from having to drive to Boise 2 or 3 months a year, he will be able to focus more on the youth in his own family, including 38 grandchildren, with another coming very soon, and 23 great grandchildren.

I congratulate Don on his dedication to his fellow Idahoans, and Susan and I wish him well as he leaves State-level public service. I am certain his public commitment will continue in other ways at home in eastern Idaho.●

HONORING CHARLES WHITEPIPE, SR.

● Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, today I wish to honor and recognize a true hero and a great American. Charles I. Whitepipe, Sr., of Gregory, SD, passed into the spirit world at 7 on Monday evening. Mr. Whitepipe, a Sicangu Lakota from the Rosebud tribe, valiantly served in the Army as a codetalker in World War II. He served as a ''Forward Observer'' on Japanese-held islands in the South Pacific, communicating by radio with a ship-based partner, using the Lakota language to direct artillery fire from ships at sea onto the islands.

During World War II, about a dozen known Sioux Indians were Army radio operators who used their native Lakota, Nakota and Dakota dialects to transmit strategic messages to foil enemy surveillance in both the Pacific and European theaters. There is no doubt that the bravery and the courage of Mr. Whitepipe and the other codetalkers helped to make the United States the free and proud place it is today. While Navajos have received the most recognition, it is important to remember that members of at least 17 other tribes also served as codetalkers in World War I and World War II.

The syntax and tonal qualities of the native languages were so complex that no message transmitted by any codetalker was ever decoded by the enemy. However, for the codetalkers who returned home there were no parades or special recognition, as they were sworn to secrecy, an oath they kept and honored, but one that robbed them of the accolades and place in history that they rightfully deserved.

The accomplishments of the codetalkers were even more heroic, given the cultural context in which they were operating. Subjected to alienation in their homeland and discouraged from speaking their native languages, they still stepped forward and developed the most significant and successful military code of their time. That spirit of military service continues today. Native Americans make up a higher percentage of servicemen and servicewomen in the armed forces than any other ethnic group in America. They have served with honor in all of America's wars, beginning with the Revolutionary War and on through our current operations in Iraq.●

HONORING MERRY TRUDEAU

● Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Merry Trudeau, a longtime employee of the Internal Revenue Service in Idaho.

Merry started with the IRS in 1976 in the collection division holding various positions, quickly advancing from clerical to Revenue representative to Revenue officer. She then advanced to problem resolution officer, which was the predecessor to the taxpayer advocate. This turned out to be Merry's true calling, and it is where my staff and I got to know her well.

All of us work with our constituents on a daily basis to help resolve issues with the IRS. Having a helpful, energetic, pleasant person at the IRS to work with makes our job so much easier. Merry is that person. She knows her job well and she consistently seeks to serve Idahoans well. For that I am grateful.

On behalf of the hundreds, if not thousands, of Idahoans Merry has helped, I say thank you. Merry, we wish you the best in your next endeavor, knowing you will continue to serve your neighbors and community well.●

125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF BATH, SOUTH DAKOTA

● Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to the 125th anniversary of the founding of the community of Bath, SD. After 125 years, this progressive community will have a chance to reflect on its past and future, and I congratulate the people of Bath for all that they have accomplished.

Bath is located in northeast South Dakota, within Brown County. The area that now makes up Bath Township was first settled by a trapper named Theodore A. Chose in 1878. As early as 1881, religious services were held by a Presbyterian clergyman from Watertown, and the first building, a hotel, was erected. In 1882 the Bath school district was organized, and by 1884, the civil township was organized along the same lines as the school district.

Today, Bath has come a long way from the days when several general stores and lumber yards made up the sum total of commerce. The town now boasts a variety of businesses, including those in both the services and manufacturing sectors. It also offers a variety of employment opportunities both within the township and in nearby Aberdeen, the metro area closest to Bath.

Bath has grown into a credit to Brown County and to the State of South Dakota. The people of Bath celebrated their achievements June 24–25. I am proud to join with the community members of Bath in celebrating the last 125 years and looking forward to a promising future.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 2:20 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by

Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

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.

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

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. STEVENS)

At 3:30 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 42. An act to ensure that the right of an individual to display the flag of the United States on residential property not be abridged.

H.R. 4843. An act to increase, effective as of December 1, 2006, the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of certain service-connected disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4973. An act to restore the financial solvency of the national flood insurance program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5341. An act to amend section 5313 of title 31, United States Code, to reform certain requirements for reporting cash transactions, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 42. An act to ensure that the right of an individual to display the flag of the United States on residential property not be abridged; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4843. An act to increase, effective as of December 1, 2006, the rates of disability compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for survivors of certain service-connected disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 5341. An act to amend section 5313 of title 31, United States Code, to reform certain requirements for reporting cash transactions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 4973. An act to restore the financial solvency of the national flood insurance program, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 3590. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to delay the effective date of the amendments made by the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 requiring documentation evidencing citizenship or nationality as a condition for receipt of medical assistance under the Medicaid program.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–7354. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model BD–100–1A10 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–NM–034)), received on June 18, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7355. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. Model EMB–120, –120ER, –120FC, –120QC, and –120RT Airplanes in Operation'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2006–NM–021)), received on June 18, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7356. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310–200 and –300 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 2005–NM–231)), received on June 18, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7357. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International Inc. ALF502L Series and ALF502R Series Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(Docket No. 92–ANE–34)), received on June 18, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7358. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, United States Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Massalina Bayou, Panama City, FL'' (RIN1625–AA09) received on June 18, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7359. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, United States Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Anchorage Regulations; Port of New York and Vicinity'' (RIN1625–AA01) received on June 18, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7360. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, United States Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulated Navigation Area; East Rockaway Inlet to Atlantic Beach Bridge, Nassau County, Long Island, New York'' (RIN1625–AA11) received on June 18, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7361. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, United States Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zones (including 2 regulations): [CGD13–06–009], [COTP Charleston 06–003]'' (RIN1625–AA00) received on June 18, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7362. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, United States Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Chelsea River, Chelsea, MA'' (RIN1625-AA09) received on June 18, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7363. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, United States Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulations (including 4 regulations): [CGD05-06-020], [CGD05-06-024], [CGD05-06-023], [CGD05-06-015]'' (RIN1625-AA08) received on June 18, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7364. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, United States Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zones (including 5 regulations): [CGD09-06-024], [COTP Guam 06-008], [COTP Charleston 06-003], [CGD09-06-029], [CGD05-06-051]'' (RIN1625-AA00) received on June 18, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7365. A communication from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, United States Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Security Zones (including 2 regulations): [CGD05-06-052], [CGD05-06-052]'' (RIN1625-AA87) received on June 18, 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7366. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Hazardous Waste and Used Oil; Corrections to Errors in the Code of Federal Regulations'' (FRL No . 8188-2) received on June 18, 2006; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–7367. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans: Alabama; Open Burning Revision'' (FRL No. 8187-1) received on June 18, 2006; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–7368. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri'' (FRL No. 8188-6) received on June 18, 2006; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–7369. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Kansas'' (FRL No. 8188-4) received on June 18, 2006; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–7370. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Extension of Site-Specific Regulations for University Laboratories XL Project'' (FRL No. 8186-3) received on June 18, 2006; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–7371. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Kentucky; Redesignation of the Boyd County SO2 Nonattainment Area; Correction'' (FRL No. 8187-4) received on June 22, 2006; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–7372. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri'' (FRL No. 8189-2) received on June 22, 2006; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–7373. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Oregon: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision'' (FRL No. 8188-8) received on June 18, 2006; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–7374. A communication from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Office of Policy, Economics, and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Protections for Subjects in Human Research; Nursing Women'' (FRL No. 8071-6) received on June 22, 2006; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–7375. A communication from the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of New York, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank's 2005 management report; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–7376. A communication from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Seattle, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank's 2005 management report; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–7377. A communication from Assistant Secretary, Investment Management/Office of Regulatory Policy, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fund of Funds Investments'' (RIN 3235-AJ17) received on June 22, 2006; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SHELBY, from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, without amendment:

S. 3589. An original bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, to restore the financial solvency of the flood insurance fund, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 109-271).

S. 811. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the bicentennial of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

S. 3569. A bill to implement the United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on Finance.

*Henry M. Paulson, Jr., of New York, to be Secretary of the Treasury.

By Mr. ENZI for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

*Jonann E. Chiles, of Arkansas, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation for a term expiring July 13, 2008.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CARPER:

S. 3587. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on certain footwear with coated or laminated textile fabrics; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 3588. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize capitation grants to increase the number of nursing faculty and students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SHELBY:

S. 3589. An original bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, to restore the financial solvency of the flood insurance fund, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. KERRY, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 3590. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to delay the effective date of the amendments made by the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 requiring documentation evidencing citizenship or nationality as a condition for receipt of medical assistance under the Medicaid program; read the first time.

By Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. CHAFEE, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. OBAMA):

S. 3591. A bill to improve efficiency in the Federal Government through the use of high-performance green buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. OBAMA, and Mr. SALAZAR):

S. 3592. A bill to appropriate $160,500,000 for the Department of Veterans Affairs to improve security for personal data of veterans and other persons held by the Department of Veterans Affairs and to provide remedial assistance to veterans and other persons who have had personal data stolen from the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. DODD, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HARKIN, Mrs. CLINTON, and Mr. LIEBERMAN):

S. 3593. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide additional support to students; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 3594. A bill to help protect the public against the threat of attacks targeting nuclear power plants; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. CARPER):

S. 3595. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the United States Emergency Management Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. GREGG (for himself and Mr. SUNUNU):

S. Con. Res. 107. A concurrent resolution congratulating Donald Andrew Hall for his selection by the Librarian of Congress as the 14th Poet Laureate of the United States and for his great accomplishments in prose and essays focusing on New England rural living, baseball, and how work conveys meaning to ordinary life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 330

At the request of Mr. ENSIGN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 330, a bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require a voter-verified permanent record or hardcopy under title III of such Act, and for other purposes.

S. 472

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 472, a bill to criminalize Internet scams involving fraudulently obtaining personal information, commonly known as phishing.

S. 932

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 932, a bill to provide for paid sick leave to ensure that Americans can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families.

S. 1085

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1085, a bill to provide for paid sick leave to ensure that Americans can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families.

S. 1321

At the request of Mr. SANTORUM, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1321, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on telephone and other communications.

S. 1353

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr.

CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1353, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of an Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Registry.

S. 1603

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1603, a bill to establish a National Preferred Lender Program, facilitate the delivery of financial assistance to small businesses, and for other purposes.

S. 1687

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1687, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide waivers relating to grants for preventive health measures with respect to breast and cervical cancers.

S. 1864

At the request of Mr. TALENT, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1864, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain farming business machinery and equipment as 5-year property for purposes of depreciation.

S. 1934

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. SALAZAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1934, a bill to reauthorize the grant program of the Department of Justice for reentry of offenders into the community, to establish a task force on Federal programs and activities relating to the reentry of offenders into the community, and for other purposes.

S. 2388

At the request of Mr. VOINOVICH, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2388, a bill to establish a National Commission on the Infrastructure of the United States.

S. 2566

At the request of Mr. LUGAR, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2566, a bill to provide for coordination of proliferation interdiction activities and conventional arms disarmament, and for other purposes.

S. 2585

At the request of Mr. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2585, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit military death gratuities to be contributed to certain tax-favored accounts.

S. 2644

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2644, a bill to harmonize rate setting standards for copyright licenses under sections 112 and 114 of title 17, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 2663

At the request of Mr. DODD, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. COLEMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2663, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish grant programs to provide for education and outreach on newborn screening and coordinated followup care once newborn screening has been conducted, to reauthorize programs under part A of title XI of such Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2918

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2918, a bill to provide access to newspapers for blind or other persons with disabilities.

S. 3500

At the request of Mr. THOMAS, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3500, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to protect and preserve access of Medicare beneficiaries in rural areas to health care providers under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 3519

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3519, a bill to reform the State inspection of meat and poultry in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 3521

At the request of Mr. GREGG, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ALLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3521, a bill to establish a new budget process to create a comprehensive plan to rein in spending, reduce the deficit, and regain control of the Federal budget process.

S. CON. RES. 96

At the request of Mr. BROWNBACK, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 96, a concurrent resolution to commemorate, celebrate, and reaffirm the national motto of the United States on the 50th anniversary of its formal adoption.

S. RES. 507

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), and the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 507, a resolution designating the week of November 5 through November 11, 2006, as ''National Veterans Awareness Week'' to emphasize the need to develop educational programs regarding the contributions of veterans to the country.

S. RES. 508

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 508, a resolution designating October 20, 2006 as ''National Mammography Day''.

S. RES. 513

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 513, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the President should designate the week beginning September 10, 2006, as ''National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week''.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 3588. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize capitation grants to increase the number of nursing faculty and students, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would request the Chair to inform me when I have used 6 minutes of the 10 minutes I have requested.

We have a lot of bipartisan battles in the Senate. I am going to try to bring an issue to the consideration of the Senate and to their attention which I believe is very bipartisan. It affects the State of Alaska, the State of North Dakota, the State of Illinois, and the State of Maine. It affects us all. What I am speaking to is the shortage of nurses in America.

We face a critical shortage of nurses. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services looked at all of the licensed nurses and found that in the year 2000, this country was 110,000 nurses short of what was necessary to provide adequate health care. By 2005, the shortage had doubled to 219,000 nurses. By 2020, we will be more than 1 million nurses short of what is necessary to maintain quality health care in America.

To avoid this shortage which the Department of Health and Human Services projects, we have to substantially increase the number of nursing graduates and those entering the workforce each year. Just to replace the nurses who are retiring, we need to increase student enrollment by at least 40 percent. The baseline supply for nurses—as you can see on this chart—in our country, for the current time and through the year 2020, is on a steady downward flow, whereas demand goes up dramatically. If we had 90 percent more nursing graduates, we still would not reach the projected demand in America as baby boomers reach the point where they need help and many others need quality nursing.

The problem is that there are not enough teachers at schools of nursing. That is what it comes down to. Last year, nursing schools across America denied admission to 35,000 qualified students because there just weren't enough teachers.

In my home State of Illinois, schools of nursing are denying qualified students admittance because of the shortage of teachers. This is an indication

here. These are B.A. and graduate nursing programs in Illinois. These are the enrollees and these are the numbers turned away. As you can see, from the year 2002 to the present time, we are up to 2000 potential nursing graduates who are turned away each year despite their qualifications because, sadly, we can't keep up with teaching them.

The American Association of Colleges of Nursing surveyed more than 400 schools of nursing this last year. Two-thirds of the schools, represented by the blue part of this pie chart—69 percent reported vacancies on their faculty. An additional 15 percent said that they were fully staffed but still needed more faculty.

Statistics paint a bleak picture for the availability of nursing faculty now and into the future. Take a look at the age of full-time nursing faculty across America. Unfortunately, that reflects an older population now teaching in our nursing schools, soon to retire. The median age of a doctoral-prepared nursing faculty member in America is 52. The average age of retirement for faculty is 62. It is expected that 200 to 300 doctorally prepared faculty will be eligible for retirement each year from 2005 to 2012, reducing even more the faculty available to train the nurses we need.

We think help should be on the way, and it should start in the Senate. Our leader on the Democratic side of the aisle is Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI of Maryland. She has been the strong voice for nurses as long as she has served in the Senate. I am happy today to join her in introducing the Nurse Education Expansion and Development Act. The Act would provide schools of nursing with grants to hire and retain new faculty, purchase educational equipment, enhance clinical laboratories and expand and repair infrastructure. This bill would also require the Government Accountability Office, the GAO, to report on ways to increase participation in the nurse faculty profession.

Nurses care for our kids, our grandkids, our parents—people whom we love. We know the difference they make in everyone's life and increasingly we are noticing the difference when we do not have enough nurses, these dedicated men and women, when we need them the most. We must take deliberate action now to solve this critical health care problem. I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this Mikulski-Durbin legislation. I think this is an important step in the direction toward quality health care for generations to come.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3588

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Nurse Education, Expansion, and Development Act of 2006''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds as follows:

(1) While the Nurse Reinvestment Act (Public Law 107–205) helped to increase applications to schools of nursing by 175 percent, schools of nursing have been unable to accommodate the influx of interested students because they have an insufficient number of nurse educators. It is estimated that—

(A) in the 2005–2006 school year—

(i) 66 percent of schools of nursing had both 1 to 16 vacant faculty positions and needed additional faculty; and

(ii) an additional 15.7 percent of schools of nursing needed additional faculty, but lacked the resources needed to add more positions; and

(B) 41,683 eligible candidates were denied admission to schools of nursing in 2005, primarily due to an insufficient number of faculty members.

(2) A growing number of nurses with doctoral degrees are choosing careers outside of education. Over the last few years, there has been a 12 percent increase in doctoral nursing graduates seeking employment outside the education profession.

(3) The average age of nurse faculty at retirement is 62.5 years. With the average age of doctorally-prepared professors currently at 57.5 years, a wave of retirements is expected within the next 10 years.

(4) Master's and doctoral programs in nursing are not producing a large enough pool of potential nurse educators to meet the projected demand for nurses over the next 10 years. While graduations from master's and doctoral programs in nursing rose by 10.5 percent and 1.5 percent, respectively, in the 2005–2006 school year, projections still demonstrate a shortage of nurse faculty. Given current trends, there will be at least 2,616 unfilled faculty positions in 2012.

(5) According to the November 2005 Monthly Labor Review from the Bureau of Labor Statistics, more than 1,200,000 new and replacement nurses will be needed by 2014.

SEC. 3. CAPITATION GRANTS TO INCREASE THE NUMBER OF NURSING FACULTY AND STUDENTS.

(a) GRANTS.—Part D of title VIII of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 296p) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 832. CAPITATION GRANTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—For the purpose described in subsection (b), the Secretary, acting through the Health Resources and Services Administration, shall award a grant each fiscal year in an amount determined in accordance with subsection (c) to each eligible school of nursing that submits an application in accordance with this section.

''(b) PURPOSE.—A funding agreement for a grant under this section is that the eligible school of nursing involved will expend the grant to increase the number of nursing faculty and students at the school, including by hiring new faculty, retaining current faculty, purchasing educational equipment and audiovisual laboratories, enhancing clinical laboratories, repairing and expanding infrastructure, or recruiting students.

''(c) GRANT COMPUTATION.—

''(1) AMOUNT PER STUDENT.—Subject to paragraph (2), the amount of a grant to an eligible school of nursing under this section for a fiscal year shall be the total of the following, as determined by the Secretary:

''(A) Not to exceed $1,800 for each full-time or part-time student who is enrolled at the school in a graduate program in nursing that—

''(i) leads to a master's degree, a doctoral degree, or an equivalent degree; and

''(ii) prepares individuals to serve as faculty through additional course work in education and ensuring competency in an advanced practice area.

''(B) Not to exceed $1,405 for each full-time or part-time student who—

''(i) is enrolled at the school in a program in nursing leading to a bachelor of science degree, a bachelor of nursing degree, a graduate degree in nursing if such program does not meet the requirements of subparagraph (A), or an equivalent degree; and

''(ii) has not more than 3 years of academic credits remaining in the program.

''(C) Not to exceed $966 for each full-time or part-time student who is enrolled at the school in a program in nursing leading to an associate degree in nursing or an equivalent degree.

''(2) LIMITATION.—In calculating the amount of a grant to a school under paragraph (1), the Secretary may not make a payment with respect to a particular student—

''(A) for more than 2 fiscal years in the case of a student described in paragraph (1)(A) who is enrolled in a graduate program in nursing leading to a master's degree or an equivalent degree;

''(B) for more than 4 fiscal years in the case of a student described in paragraph (1)(A) who is enrolled in a graduate program in nursing leading to a doctoral degree or an equivalent degree;

''(C) for more than 3 fiscal years in the case of a student described in paragraph (1)(B); or

''(D) for more than 2 fiscal years in the case of a student described in paragraph (1)(C).

''(d) ELIGIBILITY.—For purposes of this section, the term 'eligible school of nursing' means a school of nursing that—

''(1) is accredited by a nursing accrediting agency recognized by the Secretary of Education;

''(2) has a passage rate on the National Council Licensure Examination for Registered Nurses of not less than 80 percent for each of the 3 school years preceding submission of the grant application; and

''(3) has a graduation rate (based on the number of students in a class who graduate relative to, for a baccalaureate program, the number of students who were enrolled in the class at the beginning of junior year or, for an associate degree program, the number of students who were enrolled in the class at the end of the first year) of not less than 80 percent for each of the 3 school years preceding submission of the grant application.

''(e) REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary may award a grant under this section to an eligible school of nursing only if the school gives assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that, for each school year for which the grant is awarded, the school will comply with the following:

''(1) The school will maintain a passage rate on the National Council Licensure Examination for Registered Nurses of not less than 80 percent.

''(2) The school will maintain a graduation rate (as described in subsection (d)(3)) of not less than 80 percent.

''(3)(A) Subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C), the first-year enrollment of full-time nursing students in the school will exceed such enrollment for the preceding school year by 5 percent or 5 students, whichever is greater.

''(B) Subparagraph (A) does not apply to the first school year for which a school receives a grant under this section.

''(4) Not later than 1 year after receipt of the grant, the school will formulate and implement a plan to accomplish at least 2 of the following:

''(A) Establishing or significantly expanding an accelerated baccalaureate degree nursing program designed to graduate new nurses in 12 to 18 months.

''(B) Establishing cooperative intradisciplinary education among schools of nursing with a view toward shared use of technological resources, including information technology.

''(C) Establishing cooperative interdisciplinary training between schools of nursing and schools of allied health, medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, optometry, podiatry, pharmacy, public health, or veterinary medicine, including training for the use of the interdisciplinary team approach to the delivery of health services.

''(D) Integrating core competencies on evidence-based practice, quality improvements, and patient-centered care.

''(E) Increasing admissions, enrollment, and retention of qualified individuals who are financially disadvantaged.

''(F) Increasing enrollment of minority and diverse student populations.

''(G) Increasing enrollment of new graduate baccalaureate nursing students in graduate programs that educate nurse faculty members.

''(H) Developing post-baccalaureate residency programs to prepare nurses for practice in specialty areas where nursing shortages are most severe.

''(I) Increasing integration of geriatric content into the core curriculum.

''(J) Partnering with economically disadvantaged communities to provide nursing education.

''(K) Expanding the ability of nurse managed health centers to provide clinical education training sites to nursing students.

''(5) The school will submit an annual report to the Secretary that includes updated information on the school with respect to student enrollment, student retention, graduation rates, passage rates on the National Council Licensure Examination for Registered Nurses, the number of graduates employed as nursing faculty or nursing care providers within 12 months of graduation, and the number of students who are accepted into graduate programs for further nursing education.

''(6) The school will allow the Secretary to make on-site inspections, and will comply with the Secretary's requests for information, to determine the extent to which the school is complying with the requirements of this section.

''(f) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall evaluate the results of grants under this section and submit to the Congress—

''(1) not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this section, an interim report on such results; and

''(2) not later than the end of fiscal year 2009, a final report on such results.

''(g) APPLICATION.—To seek a grant under this section, a school nursing shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information and assurances as the Secretary may require.

''(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For the costs of carrying out this section (except the costs described in paragraph (2)), there are authorized to be appropriated $75,000,000 for fiscal year 2007, $85,000,000 for fiscal year 2008, and $95,000,000 for fiscal year 2009.

''(2) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—For the costs of administering this section, including the costs of evaluating the results of grants and submitting reports to the Congress, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2007, 2008, and 2009.''.

(b) GAO STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study and submit a report to the Congress on ways to increase participation in the nurse faculty profession.

(2) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A discussion of the master's degree and doctoral degree programs that are successful in placing graduates as faculty in schools of nursing.

(B) An examination of compensation disparities throughout the nursing profession and compensation disparities between higher education instructional faculty generally and higher education instructional nursing faculty.

By Mr. JEFFORDS (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. CHAFEE, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. OBAMA):

S. 3591. A bill to improve efficiency in the Federal Government through the use of high-performance green buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works,

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I rise today to introduce the High-Performance Green Buildings Act of 2006. This bipartisan bill will go far to further expand Federal green building initiatives and ensure our Federal buildings and schools are safe, efficient and good for the environment.

I would like to thank all of the bill's cosponsors for working with me in a bipartisan manner to introduce this important legislation and implore my colleagues to join us in moving this legislation forward. Not only will this bill improve Federal building efficiency and employee health and productivity, it also demonstrates the leadership of the Federal Government on high-performance green buildings. This bill seeks to codify existing green building initiatives outlined in memorandums of understanding or executive orders, and further enhances ongoing green building programs all across the Federal Government, including the White House. I commend the past and current leadership of the White House Office of the Federal Environmental Executive for all they have done within the administration.

Preliminary studies are showing that high-performance green buildings generate huge savings in utility costs due to their efficient operating systems. These studies have also demonstrated that high-performance green buildings provide a healthier work environment for the occupants, resulting in fewer absences due to illness. This in turn increases worker productivity and ensures fewer health related costs. All of these savings are generated, while sustaining very little impact on surrounding environments.

According to the Department of Energy, throughout the United States buildings account for 39 percent of total energy use, 70 percent of electricity consumption, 38.1 percent of greenhouse gas emissions, and 30 percent of raw materials use. The Environmental Protection Agency reports that building related construction and demolition debris account for nearly 37 percent of the total nonindustrial waste, generating 136 million tons of waste in a single year. Building occupants also consume 12 percent of potable water consumption. Why not build buildings that strive to conserve our precious resources, reduce the harmful pollutants that are damaging to the environment and utilize recycled building materials?

In an era of great security concern, green buildings have reduced energy requirements and may use renewable sources of energy that are off the electricity grid. Green buildings also use less water and some even collect rainwater to use throughout the building. Should there be a terrorist act that damages or destroys our Nation's resources, these buildings could assist in keeping our government up and running.

There is no downside to utilizing high-performance buildings. This initiative is taking off in the private sector. According to the U.S. Green Building Council, there are 500 certified green buildings across the United States with 3,000 in the pipeline. This legislation would ensure that the Federal Government is keeping pace with the real world and doing its part to protect the environment and provide a safe workplace for its employees.

In my home State of Vermont, environmental quality and economic opportunity are inextricably linked and green buildings are a visible representation of this connection. The design, construction, and functioning of green buildings will not only enhance environmental quality, worker productivity, and student learning, but will also contribute to the enhancement of a new economy. Environmental technologies and applications represent a new value added area of economic growth that is both efficient and effective.

The Federal Government can learn from progressive policies being implemented in the private sector, State government and our Nation's universities. For example, the University of Vermont, understanding the positive environmental, economic, and human resources benefits, recently adopted a green building policy for its campus that would ensure that all new construction and major renovations be at the certified level of the U.S. Green Building Council's, USGBC, Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design, LEED, green building rating system. This policy is both responsible and affordable.

In the 108th Congress, I introduced S. 2620, the High-Performance Green Buildings Act of 2004. This new bill updates that earlier version and includes a few new provisions. This legislation will coordinate the efforts within the

Federal Government to promote high-performance green buildings, provide public outreach, and expand existing research.

The General Services Administration, GSA, is the largest civilian landlord in the United States, with over 8,900 buildings in their current inventory. This legislation creates an office within GSA to oversee the green building efforts of agencies within the government. The GSA is a natural leader to focus on our Federal buildings and ensure that they are safe, healthy, and efficient. The GSA is working to provide quality work environments for Federal workers through green initiatives and is currently conducting research on how best to increase workplace effectiveness and occupant comfort. This bill will strengthen what they have already started.

The bill creates a green building advisory committee to advise the office within GSA. The committee will be comprised of key representatives from each relevant agency, State, and local governments, green building associations, experts within the building community, and environmental health experts for both adults and children. This committee will enable the Federal Government to stay up to date with technology and the latest advancements to ensure that high-performance green buildings operate with the maximum efficiency and provide a healthier environment for their occupants.

In addition, research efforts will be expanded to focus on buildings and the impact their systems have on human health and worker productivity. We just don't know enough about the impact of the built environment on its occupants. Take natural daylight for instance. Studies are showing that a simple thing like exposure to daylight actually makes employees more productive and reduces absences due to illness. I would like to pursue this further, as well as an indoor air quality program for all Federal facilities. We need to not only ensure the safety of working employees for existing buildings, but also during construction and renovation of facilities.

The High-Performance Green Buildings Act also requires that a good hard look be taken at the budget process we have used for years and explore ways to improve the approval process for government projects. We need to grow with the times and ensure that our budget process allows us to take full advantage of life-cycle costing. This means that we allow our financial experts to factor in savings that green buildings generate over time, and not just look at the upfront cost of a building. It has been documented that high-performance green buildings recover any initial upfront costs from incorporating efficient systems within the first few years of operation. The average life of a Federal building is over 50 years. In the times of soaring budget deficits, it is imperative the Federal Government pursue all cost-saving options.

High-performance green buildings are not just for Federal buildings, but involve any type of building, including schools. This legislation focuses on providing healthier, more efficient school facilities for our children. The Government Accountability Office reported years ago that over 14 million children have their health affected by poor conditions in schools. The Healthy Schools Network is now reporting 32 million children are at high risk of getting sick from their school facility. It is unacceptable to stand by and let the Nation's children become ill from preventable causes. This bill takes a modest step forward and provides $10 million in grants to state and local education agencies for technical assistance and the implementation of Environmental Protection Agency's, EPA, programs to address environmental conditions of our schools like the Tools for Schools Program and the Healthy Schools Environmental Assessment Tool, Healthy SEAT. The bill will help schools develop plans to focus on the design, construction, and renovation of school facilities, and look at systematic improvements for school siting, indoor air quality, reducing contaminants, and other health issues. This legislation also encourages research to study the effects these systems are having on student health and productivity. Our children deserve to learn in an environment that is safe and conducive to learning.

This bill will also promote leadership within the Federal Government by requiring all new construction and acquisition be green, that leases for Federal employees be energy efficient facilities and include green design features, and that guidelines be issued on how to best renegotiate existing leases to adopt these principles. Leadership is also promoted through Federal incentives for government agencies to build high-performance green buildings, as well as expanding the monitoring of each Federal agency's performance in meeting green building requirements and initiatives. It also creates a clearinghouse to keep individuals and entities, including the Federal Government, informed on the information and services that the office would provide.

Finally, by supporting this legislation, we will advance our understanding of green building technologies and implications and simultaneously advance our society. We have the capacity. This legislation provides the Federal leadership to convert our academic buildings to integral components of the curriculum rather than to just facilities that house programs. As learning centers and demonstration facilities, these green buildings will be an example to all of us to be environmentally responsible citizens.

I strongly encourage your support of the High-Performance Green Buildings Act of 2006 and ask unanimous consent that the text of the High-Performance Green Buildings Act of 2006 be printed in the RECORD, as well as the attached letters of support for the bill.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3591

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''High-Performance Green Buildings Act of 2006''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definitions.

TITLE I—OFFICE OF HIGH-PERFORMANCE GREEN BUILDINGS

Sec. 101. Oversight.
Sec. 102. Office of High-Performance Green Buildings.
Sec. 103. Green Building Advisory Committee.
Sec. 104. Public outreach.
Sec. 105. Research and development.
Sec. 106. Budget and life-cycle costing and contracting.
Sec. 107. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE II—HEALTHY HIGH-PERFORMANCE SCHOOLS

Sec. 201. Definitions.
Sec. 202. Grants for healthy school environments.
Sec. 203. Federal guidelines for siting of school facilities.
Sec. 204. Environmental health program.
Sec. 205. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE III—STRENGTHENING FEDERAL LEADERSHIP

Sec. 301. Incentives.
Sec. 302. Federal procurement.
Sec. 303. Federal green building performance.

TITLE IV—DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

Sec. 401. Coordination of goals.
Sec. 402. Authorization of appropriations.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of General Services.

(2) COMMITTEE.—The term ''Committee'' means the Green Building Advisory Committee established under section 103(a).

(3) DIRECTOR.—The term ''Director'' means the individual appointed to the position established under section 101(a).

(4) FEDERAL FACILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''Federal facility'' means any building or facility the intended use of which requires the building or facility to be—

(i) accessible to the public; and

(ii) constructed or altered by or on behalf of the United States.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term ''Federal facility'' does not include a privately-owned residential or commercial structure that is not leased by the Federal Government.

(5) HIGH-PERFORMANCE GREEN BUILDING.—The term ''high-performance green building'' means a building that, during its life-cycle—

(A) reduces energy, water, and material resource use;

(B) improves indoor environmental quality including, reducing indoor pollution, improving thermal comfort, and improving lighting and acoustic environments that affect occupant health and productivity;

(C) reduces negative impacts on the environment throughout the life-cycle of the building, including air and water pollution and waste generation;

(D) increases the use of environmentally preferable products, including biobased, recycled content, and nontoxic products with lower life-cycle impacts;

(E) increases reuse and recycling opportunities;

(F) integrates systems in the building;

(G) reduces the environmental and energy impacts of transportation through building location and site design that support a full range of transportation choices for users of the building; and

(H) considers indoor and outdoor effects of the building on human health and the environment, including—

(i) improvements in worker productivity;

(ii) the life-cycle impacts of building materials and operations; and

(iii) other factors that the Office considers to be appropriate.

(6) LIFE-CYCLE.—The term ''life-cycle'', with respect to a high-performance green building, means all stages of the useful life of the building (including components, equipment, systems, and controls of the building) beginning at conception of a green building project and continuing through site selection, design, construction, landscaping, commissioning, operation, maintenance, renovation, deconstruction or demolition, removal, and recycling of the green building.

(7) LIFE-CYCLE ASSESSMENT.—The term ''life-cycle assessment'' means a comprehensive system approach for measuring the environmental performance of a product or service over the life of the product or service, beginning at raw materials acquisition and continuing through manufacturing, transportation, installation, use, reuse, and end-of-life waste management.

(8) LIFE-CYCLE COSTING.—The term ''life-cycle costing'', with respect to a high-performance green building, means a technique of economic evaluation that—

(A) sums, over a given study period, the costs of initial investment (less resale value), replacements, operations (including energy use), and maintenance and repair of an investment decision; and

(B) is expressed—

(i) in present value terms, in the case of a study period equivalent to the longest useful life of the building, determined by taking into consideration the typical life of such a building in the area in which the building is to be located; or

(ii) in annual value terms, in the case of any other study period.

(9) OFFICE.—The term ''Office'' means the Office of High-Performance Green Buildings established under section 102(a).

TITLE I—OFFICE OF HIGH-PERFORMANCE GREEN BUILDINGS

SEC. 101. OVERSIGHT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall establish within the General Services Administration, and appoint an individual to serve as Director in, a position in the career-reserved Senior Executive service, to—

(1) establish and manage the Office in accordance with section 102; and

(2) carry out other duties as required under this Act.

(b) COMPENSATION.—The compensation of the Director shall not exceed the maximum rate of basic pay for the Senior Executive Service under section 5382 of title 5, United States Code, including any applicable locality-based comparability payment that may be authorized under section 5304(h)(2)(C) of that title.

SEC. 102. OFFICE OF HIGH-PERFORMANCE GREEN BUILDINGS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director shall establish within the General Services Administration an Office of High-Performance Green Buildings.

(b) DUTIES.—The Director shall—

(1) ensure full coordination of high-performance green building information and activities within the General Services Administration and all relevant agencies, including, at a minimum—

(A) the Environmental Protection Agency;

(B) the Office of the Federal Environmental Executive;

(C) the Office of Federal Procurement Policy;

(D) the Department of Energy;

(E) the Department of Health and Human Services;

(F) the Department of Defense; and

(G) such other Federal agencies as the Director considers to be appropriate;

(2) establish a senior-level Federal green building advisory committee, which shall provide advice and recommendations in accordance with section 103;

(3) identify and biennially reassess improved or higher rating standards recommended by the Committee;

(4) establish a national high-performance green building clearinghouse in accordance with section 104, which shall provide green building information through—

(A) outreach;

(B) education; and

(C) the provision of technical assistance;

(5) ensure full coordination of research and development information relating to high-performance green building initiatives under section 105;

(6) identify and develop green building standards that could be used for all types of Federal facilities in accordance with section 105;

(7) establish green practices that can be used throughout the life of a Federal facility;

(8) review and analyze current Federal budget practices and life-cycle costing issues, and make recommendations to Congress, in accordance with section 106; and

(9) complete and submit the report described in subsection (c).

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and biennially thereafter, the Director shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) describes the status of the green building initiatives under this Act and other Federal programs in effect as of the date of the report, including—

(A) the extent to which the programs are being carried out in accordance with this Act; and

(B) the status of funding requests and appropriations for those programs;

(2) identifies within the planning, budgeting, and construction process all types of Federal facility procedures that inhibit new and existing Federal facilities from becoming high-performance green buildings as measured by—

(A) a silver rating, as defined by the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design Building Rating System standard established by the United States Green Building Council (or an equivalent rating); or

(B) an improved or higher rating standard, as identified by the Committee;

(3) identifies inconsistencies, as reported to the Committee, in Federal law with respect to product acquisition guidelines and high-performance product guidelines;

(4) recommends language for uniform standards for use by Federal agencies in environmentally responsible acquisition;

(5) in coordination with the Office of Management and Budget, reviews the budget process for capital programs with respect to alternatives for—

(A) restructuring of budgets to require the use of complete energy- and environmental-cost accounting;

(B) using operations expenditures in budget-related decisions while simultaneously incorporating productivity and health measures (as those measures can be quantified by the Office, with the assistance of universities and national laboratories);

(C) permitting Federal agencies to retain all identified savings accrued as a result of the use of life-cycle costing for future high-performance green building initiatives; and

(D) identifying short- and long-term cost savings that accrue from high-performance green buildings, including those relating to health and productivity;

(6) identifies green, self-sustaining technologies to address the operational needs of Federal facilities in times of national security emergencies, natural disasters, or other dire emergencies;

(7) summarizes and highlights development, at the State and local level, of green building initiatives, including executive orders, policies, or laws adopted promoting green building (including the status of implementation of those initiatives); and

(8) includes, for the 2-year period covered by the report, recommendations to address each of the matters, and a plan for implementation of each recommendation, described in paragraphs (1) through (6).

(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Office shall carry out each plan for implementation of recommendations under subsection (c)(7).

SEC. 103. GREEN BUILDING ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall establish a committee to be known as the ''Green Building Advisory Committee''.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Committee shall be composed of representatives of, at a minimum—

(1) each agency referred to in section 102(b)(1); and

(2) other relevant entities, as determined by the Director, including at least 1 representative of each of the following:

(A) State and local governmental green building programs.

(B) Independent green building associations or councils.

(C) Building experts, including architects, material suppliers, and construction contractors.

(D) Security advisors focusing on national security needs, natural disasters, and other dire emergency situations.

(E) Children and adult environmental health experts.

(c) MEETINGS.—The Director shall establish a regular schedule of meetings for the Committee, which shall convene a minimum of 6 times each year.

(d) DUTIES.—The Committee shall provide advice and expertise for use by the Director in carrying out the duties under this Act, including such recommendations relating to Federal activities carried out under sections 104 through 106 as are agreed to by a majority of the members of the Committee.

(e) FACA EXEMPTION.—The Committee shall not be subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.).

SEC. 104. PUBLIC OUTREACH.

The Director, in coordination with the Committee, shall carry out public outreach to inform individuals and entities of the information and services available Government-wide by—

(1) establishing and maintaining a national high-performance green building clearinghouse, including on the Internet, that—

(A) identifies existing similar efforts and coordinates activities of common interest; and

(B) provides information relating to high-performance green buildings, including

hyperlinks to Internet sites that describe the activities, information, and resources of—

(i) the Federal Government;

(ii) State and local governments;

(iii) the private sector (including nongovernmental and nonprofit entities and organizations); and

(iv) international organizations;

(2) identifying and recommending educational resources for implementing high-performance green building practices, including security and emergency benefits and practices;

(3) providing access to technical assistance on using tools and resources to make more cost-effective, energy-efficient, health-protective, and environmentally beneficial decisions for constructing high-performance green buildings, particularly tools available to conduct life-cycle costing and life-cycle assessment;

(4) providing information on application processes for certifying a high-performance green building, including certification and commissioning; and

(5) providing technical information, market research, or other forms of assistance or advice that would be useful in planning and constructing high-performance green buildings; and

(6) using such other methods as are determined by the Director to be appropriate.

SEC. 105. RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director, in coordination with the Committee, shall—

(1)(A) survey existing research and studies relating to high-performance green buildings; and

(B) coordinate activities of common interest;

(2) develop and recommend a high-performance green building research plan that—

(A) identifies information and research needs, including the relationships between health, occupant productivity, and each of—

(i) pollutant emissions from materials and products in the building;

(ii) natural day lighting;

(iii) ventilation choices and technologies;

(iv) heating, cooling, and system control choices and technologies;

(v) moisture control and mold;

(vi) maintenance, cleaning, and pest control activities;

(vii) acoustics; and

(viii) other issues relating to the health, comfort, productivity, and performance of occupants of the building; and

(B) promotes the development and dissemination of high-performance green building measurement tools that, at a minimum, may be used—

(i) to monitor and assess the life-cycle performance of facilities (including demonstration projects) built as high-performance green buildings; and

(ii) to perform life-cycle assessments;

(3) assist the budget and life-cycle costing functions of the Office under section 106;

(4) study and identify potential benefits of green buildings relating to security, natural disaster, and emergency needs of the Federal Government; and

(5) support other research initiatives determined by the Office.

(b) INDOOR AIR QUALITY.—The Director, in consultation with the Committee, shall develop and implement a comprehensive indoor air quality program for all Federal facilities to ensure the safety of Federal workers and facility occupants—

(1) during new construction and renovation of facilities; and

(2) in existing facilities.

SEC. 106. BUDGET AND LIFE-CYCLE COSTING AND CONTRACTING.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Director, in coordination with the Committee, shall—

(1) identify, review, and analyze current budget and contracting practices that affect achievement of high-performance green buildings, including the identification of barriers to green building life-cycle costing and budgetary issues;

(2) develop guidance and conduct training sessions with budget specialists and contracting personnel from Federal agencies and budget examiners to apply life-cycle cost criteria to actual projects;

(3) identify tools to aid life-cycle cost decisionmaking; and

(4) explore the feasibility of incorporating the benefits of green buildings, such as security benefits, into a cost-budget analysis to aid in life-cycle costing for budget and decision making processes.

SEC. 107. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title $4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2012, to remain available until expended.

TITLE II—HEALTHY HIGH-PERFORMANCE SCHOOLS

SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) HIGH-PERFORMANCE SCHOOL.—The term ''high-performance school'' has the meaning given the term ''healthy, high-performance school building'' in section 5586 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7277e).

(2) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term ''local educational agency'' has the meaning given the term in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(3) STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY.—The term ''State educational agency'' has the meaning given the term in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

SEC. 202. GRANTS FOR HEALTHY SCHOOL ENVIRONMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Secretary of Education and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, may provide grants to State and local educational agencies for use in—

(1) providing technical assistance for programs of the Environmental Protection Agency (including the Tools for Schools Program and the Healthy School Environmental Assessment Tool) to schools for use in addressing environmental issues; and

(2) development of State school environmental quality plans, in partnership with the Environmental Protection Agency, that include—

(A) standards for healthy high-performance school building design, construction, and renovation;

(B) identification of ongoing school building environmental problems in the State, including assessment of information on the exposure of children to environmental hazards in school facilities, as provided by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency;

(C) proposals for the systematic improvement (including benchmarks and timelines) of environmental conditions in schools throughout the State, including—

(i) school building siting, construction, and maintenance;

(ii) indoor air quality;

(iii) pest control;

(iv) radon contamination;

(v) lead contamination;

(vi) environmentally preferable purchasing of products for classroom instruction and for maintenance;

(vii) hazard identification and remediation; and

(viii) modes of transportation available to students and staff;

(D) recommendations for improvements in the capacity of the State to track child and adult health complaints relating to schools; and

(E) plans for operation as an emergency, self-sustaining evacuation center.

(b) OTHER GRANTS.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may provide grants to qualified, nonprofit organizations to assist in community and public education on healthy school environments.

(c) COST SHARING.—

(1) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of a project or activity carried out using funds from a grant under subsection (a) shall not exceed 90 percent.

(2) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of a project or activity carried out using funds from a grant under subsection (a) may be provided in the form of cash or in-kind goods and services.

(d) GRANT PRIORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In providing grants under this section for use in carrying out the program referred to in subsection (a)(1), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, shall give priority to school districts with need for environmental improvement as identified in the school environmental plans described in this section.

(2) RESPONSIBILITY OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES.—

(A) SCHOOL DISTRICTS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, each school district that receives funds from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to carry out a program described in subsection (a) shall submit to the State educational agency with jurisdiction over the school district a report that includes—

(i) a list of schools in the districts that, as of the date of the report, have accepted funds or other assistance from the Environmental Protection Agency for use in carrying out this section; and

(ii) an overview of the impact of the funds, including—

(I) general data regarding measures of student health and attendance rates before and after grant intervention; and

(II) descriptions of toxic or hazardous cleaning, maintenance, or instructional products eliminated or reduced in use as part of the promotion or remediation of the indoor air quality of schools within the school district; and

(iii) basic information on the potential influence of other factors (such as the installation of carpet and HVAC systems and similar activities) on air quality.

(B) STATE EDUCATIONAL AGENCY REPORTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which each State educational agency has received the annual reports under subparagraph (A) from all participating school districts, the State educational agency shall submit to the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and Congress a consolidated report of all information received from the school districts.

SEC. 203. FEDERAL GUIDELINES FOR SITING OF SCHOOL FACILITIES.

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Secretary of Education and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall develop school site selection guidelines that account for—

(1) the special vulnerability of children to hazardous substances or pollution exposures in any case in which the potential for contamination at a potential school site exists, as determined by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Secretary of Education;

(2) modes of transportation available to students and staff; and

(3) the potential use of a school at the site as an emergency shelter.

SEC. 204. ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in consultation with the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and other relevant agencies, shall issue guidelines for use by the State in developing and implementing an environmental health program for schools that—

(1) takes into account the status and findings of Federal research initiatives established under this Act and other relevant Federal law with respect to school facilities, including relevant updates on trends in the field, such as the impact of school facility environments on student and staff—

(A) health, safety, and productivity; and

(B) disabilities or special needs;

(2) provides research using relevant tools identified or developed in accordance with section 105 to quantify the relationships between—

(A) human health, occupant productivity, and student performance; and

(B) with respect to school facilities, each of—

(i) pollutant emissions from materials and products;

(ii) natural day lighting;

(iii) ventilation choices and technologies;

(iv) heating and cooling choices and technologies;

(v) moisture control and mold;

(vi) maintenance, cleaning, and pest control activities;

(vii) acoustics; and

(viii) other issues relating to the health, comfort, productivity, and performance of occupants of the school facilities;

(3) provides technical assistance on siting, design, management, and operation of school facilities, including facilities used by students with disabilities or special needs;

(4) collaborates with federally funded pediatric environmental health centers to assist in on-site school environmental investigations;

(5) assists States and the public in better understanding and improving the environmental health of children; and

(6) provides to the Office a biennial report of all activities carried out under this title, which the Director shall include in the report described in section 102(c).

(b) PUBLIC OUTREACH.—The Director shall ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that the public clearinghouse established under section 104 receives and makes available—

(1) information from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency that is contained in the report described in subsection (a)(6); and

(2) information on the exposure of children to environmental hazards in school facilities, as provided by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

SEC. 205. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this title $10,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2007 through 2012, to remain available until expended.

TITLE III—STRENGTHENING FEDERAL LEADERSHIP

SEC. 301. INCENTIVES.

As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall identify incentives to encourage the use of green buildings and related technology in the operations of the Federal Government, including through—

(1) the provision of recognition awards; and

(2) the maximum feasible retention of financial savings in the annual budgets of Federal agencies for use in reinvesting in future green building initiatives.

SEC. 302. FEDERAL PROCUREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy, in consultation with the Director and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, shall promulgate revisions of the applicable acquisition regulations, to take effect as of the date of promulgation of the revisions—

(1) to direct any Federal procurement executives involved in the acquisition, construction, or major renovation (including contracting for the construction or major renovation) of any facility—

(A) to employ integrated design principles;

(B) to improve site selection for environmental and community benefits;

(C) to optimize building and systems energy performance;

(D) to protect and conserve water;

(E) to enhance indoor environmental quality; and

(F) to reduce environmental impacts of materials and waste flows; and

(2) to direct Federal procurement executives involved in leasing buildings, to give preference to the lease of facilities that—

(A) are energy-efficient; and

(B) to the maximum extent practicable, have applied contemporary high-performance and sustainable design principles during construction or renovation.

(b) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 90 days after the date of promulgation of the revised regulations under subsection (a), the Director shall issue guidance to all Federal procurement executives providing direction and instructions to renegotiate the design of proposed facilities, renovations for existing facilities, and leased facilities to incorporate improvements that are consistent with this section.

SEC. 303. FEDERAL GREEN BUILDING PERFORMANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than October 31 of each of the 2 fiscal years following the fiscal year in which this Act is enacted, and at such times thereafter as the Comptroller General of the United States determines to be appropriate, the Comptroller General of the United States shall, with respect to the fiscal years that have passed since the preceding report—

(1) conduct an audit of the implementation of this Act; and

(2) submit to the Office, the Committee, the Administrator, and Congress a report describing the results of the audit.

(b) CONTENTS.—An audit under subsection (a) shall include a review, with respect to the period covered by the report under subsection (a)(2), of—

(1) budget, life-cycle costing, and contracting issues, using best practices identified by the Comptroller General of the United States and heads of other agencies in accordance with section 106;

(2) the level of coordination among the Office, the Office of Management and Budget, and relevant agencies;

(3) the performance of the Office in carrying out the implementation plan;

(4) the design stage of high-performance green building measures;

(5) high-performance building data that were collected and reported to the Office; and

(6) such other matters as the Comptroller General of the United States determines to be appropriate.

(c) CONSULTATION.—The Director shall consult with the Committee to enhance and assist the implementation of the Environmental Stewardship Scorecard announced at the White House Summit on Federal sustainable buildings in January 2006, to measure the implementation by each Federal agency of sustainable design and green building initiatives.

TITLE IV—DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

SEC. 401. COORDINATION OF GOALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall establish guidelines to implement a demonstration project to contribute to the research goals of the Office.

(b) PROJECTS.—In accordance with guidelines established by the Director under subsection (a) and the duties of the Director described in title I, the Director shall carry out—

(1) for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2013, 1 demonstration project in a Federal building selected by the Director in accordance with relevant agencies and described in subsection (c)(1), that—

(A) provides for the evaluation of the information obtained through the conduct of projects and activities under this Act; and

(B) achieves a platinum rating, as defined by the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design Building Rating System standard established by the United States Green Building Council (or equivalent rating); and

(2) no fewer than 4 demonstration projects at 4 universities, that, as competitively selected by the Director in accordance with subsection (c)(2), have—

(A) appropriate research resources and relevant projects to meet the goals of the demonstration project established by the Office; and

(B) the ability—

(i) to serve as a model for high-performance green building initiatives, including research and education;

(ii) to identify the most effective ways to use high-performance green building and landscape technologies to engage and educate undergraduate and graduate students;

(iii) to effectively implement a high-performance green building education program for students and occupants;

(iv) to demonstrate the effectiveness of various high-performance technologies in each of the 4 climatic regions of the United States described in subsection (c)(2)(B); and

(v) to explore quantifiable and nonquantifiable beneficial impacts on public health and employee and student performance.

(c) CRITERIA.—

(1) FEDERAL FACILITIES.—With respect to the existing or proposed Federal facility at which a demonstration project under this section is conducted, the Federal facility shall—

(A) be an appropriate model for a project relating to—

(i) the effectiveness of high-performance technologies;

(ii) analysis of materials, components, systems, and emergency operations in the building, and the impact of those materials, components, and systems, including the impact on the health of building occupants;

(iii) life-cycle costing and life-cycle assessment of building materials and systems; and

(iv) location and design that promote access to the Federal facility through walking, biking, and mass transit; and

(B) possess sufficient technological and organizational adaptability.

(2) UNIVERSITIES.—With respect to the 4 universities at which a demonstration project under this section is conducted—

(A) the universities should be selected, after careful review of all applications received containing the required information, as determined by the Director, based on—

(i) successful and established public-private research and development partnerships;

(ii) demonstrated capabilities to construct or renovate buildings that meet high indoor environmental quality standards;

(iii) organizational flexibility;

(iv) technological adaptability;

(v) the demonstrated capacity of at least 1 university to replicate lessons learned among nearby or sister universities, preferably by participation in groups or consortia that promote sustainability;

(vi) the demonstrated capacity of at least 1 university to have officially-adopted, institution-wide ''green building'' guidelines for all campus building projects; and

(vii) the demonstrated capacity of at least 1 university to have been recognized by similar institutions as a national leader in sustainability education and curriculum for students of the university; and

(B) each university shall be located in a different climatic region of the United States, each of which regions shall have, as determined by the Office—

(i) a hot, dry climate;

(ii) a hot, humid climate;

(iii) a cold climate; or

(iv) a temperate climate (including a climate with cold winters and humid summers).

(d) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter through September 30, 2013—

(1) the Director shall submit to the Administrator a report that describes the status of the demonstration projects; and

(2) each University at which a demonstration project under this section is conducted shall submit to the Administrator a report that describes the status of the demonstration projects under this section.

SEC. 402. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) FEDERAL DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the Federal demonstration project described in section 401(b)(1) $10,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013, to remain available until expended.

(b) UNIVERSITY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the university demonstration projects described in section 401(b)(2) $10,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2008 through 2013, to remain available until expended.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS,
Washington, DC, June 15, 2006.

Hon. JAMES M. JEFFORDS,
U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR JEFFORDS: The American Institute of Architects has identified ''sustainability'' as the number one issue among our 75,000 members nationwide. We are concerned about the effects that America's pattern of energy use is having on the world's climate. And we are particularly concerned about the adverse effects that thoughtlessly designed buildings can have on the natural environment.

We believe that it is currently possible to design and operate buildings of all types in ways that conserve resources and drastically reduce their environmental impact. For that reason, we strongly support incentives to create more sustainable architecture.

The High Performance Green Buildings Act of 2006, which you are sponsoring, is an excellent start toward moving the federal government in the direction of sustainable architecture. The bill will create a specific Office of High Performance Green Buildings within the General Services Administration as well as an Advisory Committee of green building experts to assist that office in advancing the cause of sustainability within the federal government.

The bill will also mandate the consideration of life-cycle costing in the design and procurement of federal buildings; a concept long supported by the AIA. The bill will create a grants program for high performance and healthy schools, as well as health-based guidelines for school construction. It is a matter of great concern to the AIA that our Nation's school facilities are in a degraded condition and that significant improvement in student health and productivity could be achieved through upgrading the structures that now house our next generations.

The AIA is particularly supportive of the provisions of the bill that call for revisions to the Federal Acquisition Regulations to incorporate green design criteria into Federal contracting for construction or renovation of Federal buildings.

The AIA commends you for your leadership in taking on these complex issues that are closely intertwined with the Nation's environmental, energy and educational future. The AIA supports your efforts, supports your bill and would like to work with you to get it passed into law.

Sincerely,

CHRISTINE W. MCENTEE,
Executive Vice President/CEO.

HEALTHY SCHOOLS NETWORK, INC.,
June 23, 2006.

Support for High-Performance Green Buildings Act of 2006.

Hon. JAMES JEFFORDS,
U.S. Senate, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR JEFFORDS: Children do better with a little fresh air and sunshine, indoors and out. The call for healthier schools is a ''back to basics'' drive, recalling neighborhood schools with high ceilings and tall windows that captured natural light and ventilation and with durable floors and walls that were easy to maintain.

Healthy Schools Network, Inc. is a national environmental health not for profit representing parent, environment, health, and education groups and individuals who are dedicated to ensuring that every child and school employee has an environmentally healthy school. Our reports, informational services, and advocacy have shaped new policies, laws, regulations, and funds for school facilities in New York and Federally, and fostered local and state coalitions Nationwide. We were honored to receive a US EPA Children's Health Protection Award in 2005 for our Healthy Schools/Healthy Kids Clearinghouse that has helped parents, schools, and nonprofits in every state.

We support the High-Performance Green Buildings Act of 2006 and the creation of an Office of High-Performance Green Buildings. We strongly support the Act's *Title II Healthy High Performance Schools provisions to improve our nation's school facilities and our children's health and learning.*

Title II authorizes U.S. EPA, advised by Education and Health and Human Services, to make grants to the *states to develop school environmental quality plans*, including state standards for school design that incorporate energy efficiency, indoor air quality, and low-emission interior finishes and products, as well as resource conservation. This one step alone will allow each state to adapt design protocols for use by local schools, as well as to consider how best to ''mix and match'' public and private resources for implementation. In addition, the creation of systematic state plans could identify ongoing school environmental problems and propose locally appropriate and system-wide improvements for siting, indoor air quality, lead contamination and pest problems, ''green'' purchasing, and outline plans for using schools as emergency centers.

The Act also authorizes U.S. EPA to develop Federal guidelines for the siting of schools, taking into account the special vulnerability of children to hazardous substances, modes of transportation, and the potential use of schools as emergency shelters. U.S. EPA and the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry have collected data on schools sited near or adjacent to hazardous facilities.

In addition, Title II authorizes US EPA, advised by Education and Health and Human Services, to issue guidelines for use by states in developing and implementing an environmental health program for schools. This program would provide research on children's health and school facilities and provide technical assistance on siting, design, management, and operation of schools; collaborate with the Federally sponsored pediatric environmental health specialty units to assist with any onsite environmental investigations; and assist states and the public in understanding and improving the environmental health of children.

This Nation has a long way to go to ensure that our children have healthy learning places. In 1996, the US GAO estimated that the poor condition of schools daily eroded the health of 14 million children. US EPA estimates that half of the nation's 120,000 schools have compromised indoor environmental quality. Indoor air pollution is a top-five human health hazard; asthma is the leading cause of absenteeism and the leading occupational disease among teachers. In 2004, the US Department of Education Office of the Under Secretary published its Congressionally mandated National Priority Study A Summary of Scientific Findings on Adverse Effects of Indoor Environments on Students' Health, Academic Peiformance and Attendance (http://www.iehinc.com/PDF / effects%20on%20students.pdf), finding that the evidence suggested that poor environments adversely influences student health, performance, and attendance. In the national report Lessons Learned (2006), which presents state by state data analyses and stories of sick or injured children, our office and our two dozen organizational collaborators estimated the number of children at high risk at 32 million of the 54 million enrolled. (See http://www.healthyschools.org/guides materials.html)

The need for healthier schools is now. At a time when our nation is demanding a better performance from every child and from every school, we need to ensure that every child has an environmentally healthy school. Healthier school facilities, designed, built, and cleaned and maintained as healthy high performance facilities—often at no additional local cost—are known to positively affect children's performance and attendance and teacher productivity. They are also associated with lower suspension rates. Designing more energy efficient facilities or replacing old heating and ventilating systems with up to date efficient systems or systems using renewable energy resources could save schools and their taxpayers billions of dollars annually.

We commend you for your leadership on these important issues and look forward to working with you and the sponsors towards the timely enactment and funding for this important legislation.

Sincerely,

CLAIRE L. BARNETT,
Executive Director.

ENVIRONMENTAL AND ENERGY
STUDY INSTITUTE,
Washington, DC, June 27, 2006.

Hon. JAMES M. JEFFORDS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR JEFFORDS: The Environmental and Energy Study Institute (EESI) strongly supports the High-Performance Green Buildings Act of 2006 you are introducing to advance the development of green building facilities for both federal agencies and schools. This legislation will:

—increase U.S. competitiveness in the increasingly global green building market

—accelerate expansion of the green building market within the United States through widespread Federal procurement, expanded research, and establishment of a green building information clearinghouse

—improve student and worker health and productivity through better indoor air quality

—increase U.S. energy savings

—support the growth of domestic recycled and biobased product markets that can help reduce the country's reliance on imported oil and

—reduce the environmental impacts of the country's built environment.

The General Services Administration (GSA) owns and operates more than 500,000 buildings with over 3 billion square feet, making it the largest landlord in the United States. With this amount of owned space, the GSA has the influence to ensure that Federal buildings across the country are shining examples of smart building design. Through incentives laid out in this legislation, the Federal Government can lead the country by example in incorporating green building designs that save buildings money in operational costs. That is good government!

Furthermore, green buildings have improved indoor air quality; this too saves the Federal Government money due to reduced sickness and absenteeism among its workforce. The American Lung Association estimates that indoor air pollution costs businesses more than $100 billion a year due to death, sick days, direct medical costs, loss of productivity, and damage to materials and equipment. The Environmental Protection Agency projects that 3,500 to 6,500 premature deaths per year are the result of the effects of indoor air pollutants.

Due to the heightened susceptibility of children to airborne pollutants because of their less developed immune systems, EESI applauds your bill's provisions to provide schools grant assistance as well as technical assistance in developing green building design. In fact, 20 percent of the U.S. population, nearly 55 million people, are in U.S. elementary and secondary schools, 110,000 of which were reported to have unsatisfactory indoor air quality in the 1990s. Without grants like those outlined in your bill, most school districts would not be able to fund green building projects. EESI's previous work on this topic has found that schools need Federal studies. They need a clearinghouse to provide information, and they need grants to implement these projects and realize their far-reaching benefits.

EESI strongly supports the use of recycled and biobased products as components of the bill's green building design. Fabricated from renewable domestic crops, biobased products do not ''offgas'' or emit airborne toxins like their petroleum-based counterparts which can aggravate respiratory systems and negatively affect health. Biobased products, along with improvements in ventilation, enhance indoor air quality and improve occupant health. They are also biodegradable and therefore not harmful to the environment. Furthermore, biobased products can be produced domestically; providing evermore economic opportunities to every state's agricultural sector.

Even as U.S. Federal agencies and schools face tightening budgets, many green building measures can be incorporated with minimal up-front costs while yielding enormous savings during a building's lifetime. Your bill's provision to establish an Office of High Performance Green Buildings would elevate attention to this issue and would play an essential role as provider/distributor of solid information so that agencies can pursue ''greening'' of buildings more easily, efficiently and economically.

Demonstration projects can engage undergraduate and graduate students—the leaders of tomorrow—who will learn first-hand about these innovations and take the experience with them in their careers. These projects also will incorporate smart siting and planning so that commuters can access them through many modes of transportation including mass transit, biking and walking. By incorporating these concerns, these projects not only address the energy consumed by the buildings themselves but the energy consumed in our transportation sector.

U.S. buildings consume about 40 percent of the country's annual primary energy use. Because the Federal Government is the country's largest energy consumer, your bill truly helps the Federal Government lead by example.

Sincerely,

CAROL WERNER,
Executive Director, Environmental and Energy Study Institute.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. DODD, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HARKIN, Mrs. CLINTON, and Mr. LIEBERMAN):

S. 3593 A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide additional support to students; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is a privilege to join my colleagues in introducing the Student Debt Relief Act to lower college expenses for millions of families and help ensure that cost is not a barrier to a college education.

Earlier today, my colleagues and I released a report on ''The College Cost Crunch,'' which contains detailed information showing that students and their families in every State are struggling with skyrocketing college costs and rising student loan debt.

The report makes clear that the American dream is at risk unless college becomes more affordable. Parents and students know how important a college education is in our rapidly changing world, and they're willing to make immense sacrifices in order to afford it. But that sacrifice is getting harder and harder as college costs go up and as student debt increases as well.

It is unacceptable in this era when higher education in the United States is becoming more important, that it is also becoming more and more expensive. As the report shows, the cost of attending a public 4-year college has increased 32 percent since 2000, while median family incomes have increased by only 6 percent over the same time period.

Today, the cost of attendance is over $12,000 at public colleges and over $26,000 at private colleges, and federal student aid has not kept pace with these rising costs. The maximum Pell grant covered 51 percent of the cost of college in 1986, but it covered only 35 percent of the cost last year.

As a result, families and students are borrowing more than ever from the federal government and from private banks to finance higher education. Sixty-two percent of undergraduates at 4-year colleges are borrowing to finance their educations. The average student graduates with over $19,000 in student loan debt.

We need to solve this debt crisis now before it spirals even farther out of control.

Ensuring access to college is key to our opportunity, our economy, and to our values as a nation.

It affects opportunity, because each year 400,000 qualified students do not go to a 4-year college, because they cannot afford to do so.

It affects our economy, because we need to equip all of our citizens with a college education to compete effectively in the global economy.

It affects our values, because high college costs and high student debt are discouraging young Americans from taking lower paying public service jobs, from buying homes, and even from getting married and starting a family.

On July 1, to make matters even worse, students and families face one of the biggest student loan interest rate hikes in the history of the program—almost 2 percentage points in a single year.

Our bill deals with these issues in several ways.

First, it provides mandatory funding for an immediate increase in the maximum Pell grant from $4,050 to $5,100, with additional increases each year.

The bill also reforms the current student loan programs and uses the savings to pay for additional increases in need-based aid. This proposal—known as the Student Aid Reward Act, or the STAR Act—generates $13 billion over 10 years for new Pell grants—at zero cost to the government and taxpayers—by encouraging schools to use the more efficient Direct Loan Program instead of the guaranteed loan program.

The bill cuts student loan interest rates in half—to 3.4 percent for students and 4.25 percent for parents. This change will save average borrowers nearly $4,000 in interest payments over the life of their loans.

The bill gives borrowers the option to help keep loan payments manageable by tying the payments to income level and capping the payments at 15 percent of a borrower's income. This provision will enable young people to pursue their passions in public service careers such as teaching and social work, without worrying about making ends meet as they repay their debt.

The bill also extends and expands a popular college tuition tax deduction,

which Republicans allowed to expire at the end of last year. The IRS estimates that nearly 4.7 million students and families took advantage of the deduction in 2004, which allowed them to deduct up to $4,000 in tuition expenses from their taxes.

In Massachusetts, these changes would help thousands of students. If the Pell grant is increased to $5,100, Massachusetts would receive $63 million in new Pell grant aid. 4,700 additional students would receive grants, and the average grant would increase by more than $620—from $2,329 to $2,950. If student loan interest rates are cut in half, students in Massachusetts would save $3,470 over the life of their loans.

With more options to make loan payments contingent on income, new teachers in Massachusetts, who earn $34,000 a year, would have a reduction of 22 percent in their monthly loan payments, and after 10 years, their loans would be forgiven.

Congress needs to act now to make education a priority and do more to help struggling students and families.

But the administration and the Republican Congress have other priorities. Earlier this year, they perpetrated the biggest raid on student aid in the history of the program—stripping $12 billion from the program to offset tax giveaways for the wealthiest Americans.

If we returned tax rates for the wealthiest Americans to their levels when President Bush took office, we could pay for this entire proposal, and pay for other priorities for struggling middle class families as well.

Some of these proposals pay for themselves by cutting wasteful bank subsidies from the student loan programs and directing those funds to help students afford college. Report after report has shown that the Direct Loan Program saves taxpayer money. It is time for the Republican Congress to stand up to their friends in the lending industry and do what's right for students and families and the Nation.

We also need new investments in education if we are serious about reviving the American dream of a college education.

When Congress passed the G.I. bill after World War II, the Nation reaped a benefit of $7 for every $1 invested in sending our returning troops to college.

We need that kind of investment again to assure prosperity for our families and our Nation in the years ahead. The Student Debt Relief Act is a good step in the right direction, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I ask unanimous consent that our report and the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3593

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Student Debt Relief Act of 2006''.

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN FEDERAL PELL GRANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 401(b)(2)(A) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070a(b)(2)(A)) is amended by striking clauses (i) through (v) and inserting the following:

''(i) $5,100 for academic year 2007–2008;

''(ii) $5,400 for academic year 2008–2009;

''(iii) $5,700 for academic year 2009–2010;

''(iv) $6,000 for academic year 2010–2011; and

''(v) $6,300 for academic year 2011–2012,''.

(b) ADDITIONAL FUNDS.—For an academic year, in the case in which discretionary amounts appropriated to carry out the Federal Pell Grant program under subpart 1 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070a et seq.) for such academic year are sufficient to fund a maximum Federal Pell Grant award of $4,050, then there are authorized to be appropriated, and there are appropriated, additional amounts to carry out the amendment made by subsection (a) as follows:

(1) For academic year 2007–2008, $4,310,000,000.

(2) For academic year 2008–2009, $5,563,000,000.

(3) For academic year 2009–2010, $6,982,000,000.

(4) For academic year 2010–2011, $8,398,000,000.

(5) For academic year 2011–2012, $9,831,000,000.

SEC. 3. STUDENT AID REWARD PROGRAM.

Part G of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1088 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 489 the following:

''SEC. 489A. STUDENT AID REWARD PROGRAM.

''(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary shall carry out a Student Aid Reward Program to encourage institutions of higher education to participate in the student loan program under this title that is most cost-effective for taxpayers.

''(b) PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—In carrying out the Student Aid Reward Program, the Secretary shall—

''(1) provide to each institution of higher education participating in the student loan program under this title that is most cost-effective for taxpayers, a Student Aid Reward Payment, in an amount determined in accordance with subsection (c), to encourage the institution to participate in that student loan program;

''(2) require each institution of higher education receiving a payment under this section to provide student loans under such student loan program for a period of 5 years after the date the first payment is made under this section;

''(3) where appropriate, require that funds paid to institutions of higher education under this section be used to award students a supplement to such students' Federal Pell Grants under subpart 1 of part A;

''(4) permit such funds to also be used to award need-based grants to lower- and middle-income graduate students; and

''(5) encourage all institutions of higher education to participate in the Student Aid Reward Program under this section.

''(c) AMOUNT.—The amount of a Student Aid Reward Payment under this section shall be not less than 50 percent of the savings to the Federal Government generated by the institution of higher education's participation in the student loan program under this title that is most cost-effective for taxpayers instead of the institution's participation in the student loan program that is not most cost-effective for taxpayers.

''(d) TRIGGER TO ENSURE COST NEUTRALITY.—

''(1) LIMIT TO ENSURE COST NEUTRALITY.—Notwithstanding subsection (c), the Secretary shall not distribute Student Aid Reward Payments under the Student Aid Reward Program that, in the aggregate, exceed the Federal savings resulting from the implementation of the Student Aid Reward Program.

''(2) FEDERAL SAVINGS.—In calculating Federal savings, as used in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall determine Federal savings on loans made to students at institutions of higher education that participate in the student loan program under this title that is most cost-effective for taxpayers and that, on the date of enactment of this section, participated in the student loan program that is not most cost-effective for taxpayers, resulting from the difference of—

''(A) the Federal cost of loan volume made under the student loan program under this title that is most cost-effective for taxpayers; and

''(B) the Federal cost of an equivalent type and amount of loan volume made, insured, or guaranteed under the student loan program under this title that is not most cost-effective for taxpayers.

''(3) DISTRIBUTION RULES.—If the Federal savings determined under paragraph (2) is not sufficient to distribute full Student Aid Reward Payments under the Student Aid Reward Program, the Secretary shall—

''(A) first make Student Aid Reward Payments to those institutions of higher education that participated in the student loan program under this title that is not most cost-effective for taxpayers on the date of enactment of this section; and

''(B) with any remaining Federal savings after making Student Aid Reward Payments under subparagraph (A), make Student Aid Reward Payments to the institutions of higher education eligible for a Student Aid Reward Payment and not described in subparagraph (A) on a pro-rata basis.

''(4) DISTRIBUTION TO STUDENTS.—Any institution of higher education that receives a Student Aid Reward Payment under this section—

''(A) shall distribute, where appropriate, part or all of such payment among the students of such institution who are Federal Pell Grant recipients by awarding such students a supplemental grant; and

''(B) may distribute part of such payment as a supplemental grant to graduate students in financial need.

''(5) ESTIMATES, ADJUSTMENTS, AND CARRY OVER.—

''(A) ESTIMATES AND ADJUSTMENTS.—The Secretary shall make Student Aid Reward Payments to institutions of higher education on the basis of estimates, using the best data available at the beginning of an academic or fiscal year. If the Secretary determines thereafter that loan program costs for that academic or fiscal year were different than such estimate, the Secretary shall adjust by reducing or increasing subsequent Student Aid Reward Payments rewards paid to such institutions of higher education to reflect such difference.

''(B) CARRY OVER.—Any institution of higher education that receives a reduced Student Aid Reward Payment under paragraph (3)(B), shall remain eligible for the unpaid portion of such institution's financial reward payment, as well as any additional financial reward payments for which the institution is otherwise eligible, in subsequent academic or fiscal years.

''(e) DEFINITION.—In this section:

''(1) STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM UNDER THIS TITLE THAT IS MOST COST-EFFECTIVE FOR TAXPAYERS.—The term 'student loan program under this title that is most cost-effective for taxpayers' means the loan program under part B or D of this title that has the lowest

overall cost to the Federal Government (including administrative costs) for the loans authorized by such parts.

''(2) STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM UNDER THIS TITLE THAT IS NOT MOST COST-EFFECTIVE FOR TAXPAYERS.—The term 'student loan program under this title that is not most cost-effective for taxpayers' means the loan program under part B or D of this title that does not have the lowest overall cost to the Federal Government (including administrative costs) for the loans authorized by such parts.''.

SEC. 4. REDUCTION IN INTEREST RATES.

(a) FFEL.—Section 427A(l) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1077a(l)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''or 428C'' and inserting '', 428C, or 428H'';

(B) by striking ''6.8 percent'' and inserting ''3.4 percent''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following: ''Notwithstanding subsection (h), with respect to any loan under section 428H for which the first disbursement is made on or after July 1, 2006, the applicable rate of interest shall be 6.8 percent on the unpaid principal balance of the loan.''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''8.5 percent'' and inserting ''4.25 percent''.

(b) DIRECT LOANS.—Section 455(b)(7) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(b)(7)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking ''and Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loans'';

(B) by striking ''6.8 percent'' and inserting ''3.4 percent''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following: ''Notwithstanding the preceding paragraphs of this subsection, for Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loans for which the first disbursement is made on or after July 1, 2006, the applicable rate of interest shall be 6.8 percent on the unpaid principal balance of the loan.''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''7.9 percent'' and inserting ''4.25 percent''.

SEC. 5. IN-SCHOOL CONSOLIDATION.

Section 428(b)(7)(A) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1078(b)(7)(A)) is amended by striking ''shall begin'' and all that follows through the period and inserting ''shall begin—

''(i) the day after 6 months after the date the student ceases to carry at least one-half the normal full-time academic workload (as determined by the institution); or

''(ii) on an earlier date if the borrower requests and is granted a repayment schedule that provides for repayment to commence at an earlier date.''.

SEC. 6. CONSOLIDATION LOAN CHANGES.

Section 428C(a)(3) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1078–3(a)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE BORROWER.—For the purpose of this section, the term 'eligible borrower' means a borrower who—

''(A) is not subject to a judgment secured through litigation with respect to a loan under this title or to an order for wage garnishment under section 488A; and

''(B) at the time of application for a consolidation loan—

''(i) is in repayment status as determined under section 428(b)(7)(A);

''(ii) is in a grace period preceding repayment; or

''(iii) is a defaulted borrower who has made arrangements to repay the obligation on the defaulted loans satisfactory to the holders of the defaulted loans.''.

SEC. 7. REDUCTION OF DIRECT LOAN ORIGINATION FEES.

Section 455(c) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''4.0 percent'' and inserting ''3.0 percent''; and

(B) by striking ''shall'' and inserting ''is authorized to''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking '' '3.0 percent' for '4.0 percent' '' and inserting '' '2.0 percent' for '3.0 percent' '';

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking '' '2.5 percent' for '4.0 percent' '' and inserting '' '1.5 percent' for '3.0 percent' '';

(C) in subparagraph (C), by striking '' '2.0 percent' for '4.0 percent' '' and inserting '' '1.0 percent' for '3.0 percent' '';

(D) in subparagraph (D), by striking '' '1.5 percent' for '4.0 percent' '' and inserting '' '0.5 percent' for '3.0 percent' ''; and

(E) in subparagraph (E), by striking '' '1.0 percent' for '4.0 percent' '' and inserting '' '0.0 percent' for '3.0 percent' ''.

SEC. 8. ELIMINATION OF EXCEPTIONAL PERFORMER STATUS FOR LENDERS.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 428I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1078–9) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C.1070 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 428(c)(1)—

(A) by striking subparagraph (D); and

(B) by redesignating subparagraphs (E) through (H) as subparagraphs (D) and (G), respectively; and

(2) in section 438(b)(5), by striking the matter following subparagraph (B).

SEC. 9. SCHOOLS AS LENDERS.

Section 435(d) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1085(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(C), by inserting ''Federal or'' after ''not to supplant,''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(7) ELIGIBLE LENDER TRUSTEE USE BY ELIGIBLE INSTITUTION.—In the case of an eligible institution that uses an eligible lender trustee for the purpose of qualifying as an eligible lender under paragraph (2), such eligible lender trustee shall be subject to the requirements of paragraphs (2) through (5).''.

SEC. 10. ADMINISTRATIVE ACCOUNT FOR DIRECT LOAN PROGRAM.

Section 458 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087h) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting the following:

''(2) MANDATORY FUNDS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2007 THROUGH 2011.—Each fiscal year there shall be available to the Secretary, from funds not otherwise appropriated, funds to be obligated for—

''(A) administrative costs under this part and part B, including the costs of the direct student loan programs under this part; and

''(B) account maintenance fees payable to guaranty agencies under part B and calculated in accordance with subsection (b),

not to exceed (from such funds not otherwise appropriated) $904,000,000 in fiscal year 2007, $943,000,000 in fiscal year 2008, $983,000,000 in fiscal year 2009, $1,023,000,000 in fiscal year 2010, $1,064,000,000 in fiscal year 2011, and $1,106,000,000 in fiscal year 2012.'';

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(C) in paragraph (3) (as redesignated in subparagraph (B)), by striking ''paragraph (3)'' and inserting ''paragraph (2)''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''(a)(3)'' and inserting ''(a)(2)''.

SEC. 11. INCOME CONTINGENT REPAYMENT FOR PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES.

Section 455(e) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(7) REPAYMENT PLAN FOR PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall forgive the balance due on any loan made under this part or section 428C(b)(5) for a borrower—

''(i) who has made 120 payments on such loan pursuant to income contingent repayment; and

''(ii) who is employed, and was employed for the 10-year period in which the borrower made the 120 payments described in clause (i), in a public sector job.

''(B) PUBLIC SECTOR JOB.—In this paragraph, the term 'public sector job' means a full-time job in emergency management, government, public safety, law enforcement, public health, education (including early childhood education), or public interest legal services (including prosecution or public defense).

''(8) RETURN TO STANDARD REPAYMENT.—A borrower who is repaying a loan made under this part pursuant to income contingent repayment may choose, at any time, to terminate repayment pursuant to income contingent repayment and repay such loan under the standard repayment plan.''.

SEC. 12. DEFINITIONS OF PARTIAL FINANCIAL HARDSHIP AND ECONOMIC HARDSHIP.

(a) PARTIAL FINANCIAL HARDSHIP.—Section 435 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1085) is amended by inserting after subsection (m) the following:

''(n) PARTIAL FINANCIAL HARDSHIP.—For purposes of this part and part E, the term 'partial financial hardship' means the amount by which the borrower's annual Federal educational debt burden exceeds 15 percent of the difference between—

''(1) the borrower's adjusted gross income; and

''(2) the poverty line applicable to the borrower's family size as determined under section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act.''.

(b) ECONOMIC HARDSHIP.—Section 435(o) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1085(o)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking ''100 percent of the poverty line for a family of 2'' and inserting ''150 percent of the poverty line applicable to the borrower's family size'';

(B) by striking subparagraph (B); and

(C) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B); and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''(1)(C)'' and inserting ''(1)(B)''.

SEC. 13. DEFERRALS.

(a) FISL.—Section 427(a)(2)(C) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1077(a)(2)(C)) is amended to read as follows:

''(C) provides that—

''(i) periodic installments of principal need not be paid, but interest shall accrue and be paid, during any period—

''(I) during which the borrower—

''(aa) is pursuing at least a half-time course of study as determined by an eligible institution; or

''(bb) is pursuing a course of study pursuant to a graduate fellowship program approved by the Secretary, or pursuant to a rehabilitation training program for individuals with disabilities approved by the Secretary,

except that no borrower shall be eligible for a deferment under this clause, or a loan made under this part (other than a loan made under section 428B or 428C), while serving in a medical internship or residency program;

''(II) not in excess of 3 years during which the borrower is seeking and unable to find full-time employment; or

''(III) during which the borrower has, or will have, an economic hardship described in

section 435(o), as determined by the lender in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary under such section; and

''(ii) during any period during which a borrower has, or will have, a partial financial hardship defined in section 435(n), as determined by the lender in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary under such section, the borrower—

''(I) need only pay the portion of the periodic installments of principal and interest that exceeds the borrower's partial financial hardship for such period; and

''(II) may defer the remaining amount of principal and interest (which interest shall continue to accrue) for such period,

and provides that any such period shall not be included in determining the 10-year period described in subparagraph (B);''.

(b) INTEREST SUBSIDIES.—Section 428(b)(1)(M) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1078(b)(1)(M)) is amended to read as follows:

''(M) provides that—

''(i) periodic installments of principal need not be paid, but interest shall accrue and be paid by the Secretary, during any period—

''(I) during which the borrower—

''(aa) is pursuing at least a half-time course of study as determined by an eligible institution, except that no borrower, notwithstanding the provisions of the promissory note, shall be required to borrow an additional loan under this title in order to be eligible to receive a deferment under this clause; or

''(bb) is pursuing a course of study pursuant to a graduate fellowship program approved by the Secretary, or pursuant to a rehabilitation training program for disabled individuals approved by the Secretary,

except that no borrower shall be eligible for a deferment under this clause, or loan made under this part (other than a loan made under 428B or 428C), while serving in a medical internship or residency program;

''(II) not in excess of 3 years during which the borrower is seeking and unable to find full-time employment, except that no borrower who provides evidence of eligibility for unemployment benefits shall be required to provide additional paperwork for a deferment under this clause;

''(III) not in excess of 3 years during which the borrower—

''(aa) is serving on active duty during a war or other military operation or national emergency; or

''(bb) is performing qualifying National Guard duty during a war or other military operation or national emergency; or

''(IV) during which the borrower has, or will have, an economic hardship described in section 435(o), as determined by the lender in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary under such section; and

''(ii) during any period during which a borrower has, or will have, a partial financial hardship defined in section 435(n), as determined by the lender in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary under such section, a portion of the periodic installments of principal and interest need not be paid as follows:

''(I) the Secretary shall first pay the portion of the periodic installments of interest due that does not exceed the borrower's partial financial hardship for such period, and any amount of interest due in excess of the borrower's partial financial hardship for such period shall be paid by the borrower; and

''(II) the borrower shall pay the periodic installments of principal due for such period, reduced by the difference between the partial financial hardship and the amount of interest paid under subclause (I);''.

(c) DIRECT LOANS.—Section 455(f) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(D), by striking ''not in excess of 3 years''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) PARTIAL FINANCIAL HARDSHIP DEFERMENT.—During any period during which a borrower has, or will have, a partial financial hardship defined in section 435(n), as determined by the Secretary in accordance with regulations prescribed under such section, a portion of the periodic installments of principal and interest need not be paid as follows:

''(A) In the case of a Federal Direct Stafford Loan, a Federal Direct Consolidation Loan that consolidated only Federal Direct Stafford Loans, or a combination of such loans and Federal Stafford Loans for which the student borrower received an interest subsidy under section 428—

''(i) the amount of interest for such period that does not exceed the borrower's partial financial hardship shall not accrue, and any amount of interest due in excess of the borrower's partial financial hardship shall be capitalized or be paid by the borrower; and

''(ii) the borrower shall pay the periodic installments of principal due for such period, reduced by the difference between the partial financial hardship and the amount of interest paid under clause (i).

''(B) In the case of a Federal Direct PLUS Loan, a Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loan, or a Federal Direct Consolidation Loan not described in subparagraph (A)—

''(i) the amount of interest and principal that equals the borrower's partial financial hardship for such period need not be paid but may be deferred or capitalized by the borrower; and

''(ii) any amount of interest or principal due in excess of the borrower's partial financial hardship for such period shall be paid by the borrower.''.

(d) PERKINS.—Section 464(c) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087dd(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2)(A)(iv) and inserting the following:

''(iv) during which the borrower has, or will have, an economic hardship described in section 435(o), as determined by the lender in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary under such section; or''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(8) PARTIAL FINANCIAL HARDSHIP DEFERMENT.—During any period during which a borrower has, or will have, a partial financial hardship defined in section 435(n), as determined by the lender in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary under such section, a portion of the periodic installments of principal and interest need not be paid as follows:

''(A) the Secretary shall first pay the periodic installments of interest due for such period that does not exceed the borrower's partial financial hardship, and any amount of interest due in excess of the borrower's partial financial hardship shall be paid by the borrower; and

''(B) the borrower shall pay the periodic installments of principal due reduced by the difference between the partial financial hardship and the amount of interest paid under subparagraph (A).''.

SEC. 14. MAXIMUM REPAYMENT PERIOD.

Section 455(e) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(e)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(7) MAXIMUM REPAYMENT PERIOD.—In calculating the extended period of time for which an income contingent repayment plan under this subsection may be in effect for a borrower, the Secretary shall include all time periods during which a borrower of loans under part B, part D, or part E—

''(A) is not in default on any loan that is included in the income contingent repayment plan; and

''(B)(i) qualifies for economic hardship described in section 435(o);

''(ii) has a partial financial hardship defined in section 435(n);

''(iii) makes payments under a standard repayment plan described in section 428(b)(9)(A)(i) or 455(d)(1)(A), or

''(iv) makes payments under an extended repayment plan described in section 428(b)(9)(A)(iv) or 455(d)(1)(C).''.

SEC. 15. INCREASE IN CONSOLIDATION LOAN LENDER FEES.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (2) of section 438(d) (20 U.S.C. 1087–1(d)) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) AMOUNT OF LOAN FEES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), with respect to any loan made under this part for which the first disbursement was made on or after October 1, 1993, the amount of the loan fee that shall be deducted under paragraph (1) shall be equal to 0.50 percent of the principal amount of the loan.

''(B) CONSOLIDATION LOANS.—With respect to any loan made under section 428C on or after April 1, 2006, the amount of the loan fee that shall be deducted under paragraph (1) shall be equal to 1.0 percent of the principal amount of the loan.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to any loan made, insured, or guaranteed under part B of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1071 et seq.) for which the first disbursement is made on or after April 1, 2006.

SEC. 16. COLLEGE TUITION DEDUCTION AND CREDIT FOR INTEREST ON HIGHER EDUCATION LOANS.

(a) EXPANSION OF DEDUCTION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION EXPENSES.—

(1) AMOUNT OF DEDUCTION.—Subsection (b) of section 222 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to deduction for qualified tuition and related expenses) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) LIMITATIONS.—

''(1) DOLLAR LIMITATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amount allowed as a deduction under subsection (a) with respect to the taxpayer for any taxable year shall not exceed the applicable dollar limit.

''(B) APPLICABLE DOLLAR LIMIT.—The applicable dollar limit for any taxable year shall be determined as follows:

''Taxable year:	Applicable dollar amount:
2006	$8,000
2007 and thereafter	$12,000.

''(2) LIMITATION BASED ON MODIFIED ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The amount which would (but for this paragraph) be taken into account under subsection (a) shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the amount determined under subparagraph (B).

''(B) AMOUNT OF REDUCTION.—The amount determined under this subparagraph equals the amount which bears the same ratio to the amount which would be so taken into account as—

''(i) the excess of—

''(I) the taxpayer's modified adjusted gross income for such taxable year, over

''(II) $65,000 ($130,000 in the case of a joint return), bears to

''(ii) $15,000 ($30,000 in the case of a joint return).

''(C) MODIFIED ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term

'modified adjusted gross income' means the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer for the taxable year determined—

''(i) without regard to this section and sections 199, 911, 931, and 933, and

''(ii) after the application of sections 86, 135, 137, 219, 221, and 469.

For purposes of the sections referred to in clause (ii), adjusted gross income shall be determined without regard to the deduction allowed under this section.

''(D) INFLATION ADJUSTMENTS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any taxable year beginning in a calendar year after 2006, both of the dollar amounts in subparagraph (B)(i)(II) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(I) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(II) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, by substituting 'calendar year 2005' for 'calendar year 1992' in subparagraph (B) thereof.

''(ii) ROUNDING.—If any amount as adjusted under clause (i) is not a multiple of $50, such amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $50.''.

(2) QUALIFIED TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES OF ELIGIBLE STUDENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 222(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to allowance of deduction) is amended by inserting ''of eligible students'' after ''expenses''.

(B) DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE STUDENT.—Section 222(d) of such Code (relating to definitions and special rules) is amended by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (6) as paragraphs (3) through (7), respectively, and by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

''(2) ELIGIBLE STUDENT.—The term 'eligible student' has the meaning given such term by section 25A(b)(3).''.

(3) DEDUCTION MADE PERMANENT.—Title IX of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 (relating to sunset of provisions of such Act) shall not apply to the amendments made by section 431 of such Act.

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to payments made in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2005.

(b) CREDIT FOR INTEREST ON HIGHER EDUCATION LOANS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to nonrefundable personal credits) is amended by inserting after section 25D the following new section:

''SEC. 25E. INTEREST ON HIGHER EDUCATION LOANS.

''(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount equal to the interest paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year on any qualified education loan.

''(b) MAXIMUM CREDIT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the credit allowed by subsection (a) for the taxable year shall not exceed $1,500.

''(2) LIMITATION BASED ON MODIFIED ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If the modified adjusted gross income of the taxpayer for the taxable year exceeds $50,000 ($100,000 in the case of a joint return), the amount which would (but for this paragraph) be allowable as a credit under this section shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the amount which bears the same ratio to the amount which would be so allowable as such excess bears to $20,000 ($40,000 in the case of a joint return).

''(B) MODIFIED ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—The term 'modified adjusted gross income' means adjusted gross income determined without regard to sections 199, 222, 911, 931, and 933.

''(C) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—In the case of any taxable year beginning after 2006, the $50,000 and $100,000 amounts referred to in subparagraph (A) shall be increased by an amount equal to—

''(i) such dollar amount, multiplied by

''(ii) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section (1)(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, by substituting '2005' for '1992'.

''(D) ROUNDING.—If any amount as adjusted under subparagraph (C) is not a multiple of $50, such amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of $50.

''(c) DEPENDENTS NOT ELIGIBLE FOR CREDIT.—No credit shall be allowed by this section to an individual for the taxable year if a deduction under section 151 with respect to such individual is allowed to another taxpayer for the taxable year beginning in the calendar year in which such individual's taxable year begins.

''(d) LIMIT ON PERIOD CREDIT ALLOWED.—A credit shall be allowed under this section only with respect to interest paid on any qualified education loan during the first 60 months (whether or not consecutive) in which interest payments are required. For purposes of this paragraph, any loan and all refinancings of such loan shall be treated as 1 loan.

''(e) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) QUALIFIED EDUCATION LOAN.—The term 'qualified education loan' has the meaning given such term by section 221(d)(1).

''(2) DEPENDENT.—The term 'dependent' has the meaning given such term by section 152.

''(f) SPECIAL RULES.—

''(1) DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.—No credit shall be allowed under this section for any amount taken into account for any deduction under any other provision of this chapter.

''(2) MARRIED COUPLES MUST FILE JOINT RETURN.—If the taxpayer is married at the close of the taxable year, the credit shall be allowed under subsection (a) only if the taxpayer and the taxpayer's spouse file a joint return for the taxable year.

''(3) MARITAL STATUS.—Marital status shall be determined in accordance with section 7703.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 25D the following new item:

''Sec. 25E. Interest on higher education loans.''.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to any qualified education loan (as defined in section 25E(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by this section) incurred on, before, or after the date of the enactment of this Act, but only with respect to any loan interest payment due after December 31, 2005.

There being no objection, the additional material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The College Cost Crunch: A State-by-State Analysis of Rising Tuition and Student Debt

Federal student aid has not kept pace with the rising cost of attending college. As a consequence, students and parents have been forced to rely more heavily on loans to finance higher education. Now, with interest rates rising by nearly two percentage points, paying off student loans will become even more difficult. The prospect of high student loan debt can deter qualified students from pursuing or completing a college education. And for those who do graduate from college, studies show that increasing student debt is affecting professional and personal decisions, such as what career to pursue or when to buy a home. If America is to remain a land of opportunity, we must ensure that college is affordable for all and that the pursuit of higher education is determined by one's ability and hard work, not by one's bank account.

College Education: More Important, More Expensive

A college education is more important than ever in ensuring success in our increasingly competitive economy. It improves one's chances of being employed, having higher earnings, and entering the middle class. People with a bachelor's degree earn over 62 percent more on average than those with only a high school diploma. Over a lifetime, the gap in earning potential between a person with a high school diploma and a bachelor's degree is more than $1 million. (College Board, 2005)

But while a college education has become more important to economic success, the cost has become an even greater barrier to getting a degree. The cost of attending a public four-year college increased 32 percent between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years. The cost of attending a private four-year college also has risen considerably – a 21 percent increase – and has reached nearly $26,500 a year. (U.S. Department of Education, Digest of Education Statistics, 2001 and 2005) Over the same period, median family income increased less than six percent. (U.S. Census Bureau, Historical Income Tables) After financial aid is taken into account, 28 percent of the average family income is required to pay for annual college expenses at a public four-year college. (The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, Measuring Up 2004)

Paying for College: A Shift from Grants to Loans

The federal government has long recognized the personal and public benefits of making college affordable. The federal Pell Grant program, which is the nation's largest need-based grant program, has proven to be indispensable for millions of students who might not otherwise have had the financial resources to pursue a college degree. But the maximum federal Pell Grant award has not kept pace with the rising cost of attending college. While the maximum Pell Grant covered 51 percent of the cost of tuition, fees, room and board at a public four-year college during the 1986-1987 school year, it

covered only 35 percent of those costs in 2004-2005. (Analysis of Department of Education data)

Without adequate federal grants, students and their parents have had to rely increasingly on student loans to finance their college educations. More students are borrowing, and borrowing larger amounts, than ever before. The percentage of undergraduates at four-year colleges taking out loans has risen to over 60 percent, and the average amount of federal student loan debt upon graduation has increased from $8,946 in 1992-1993 to $17,400 in 2003-2004. When private loans are factored in as well, average student loan debt in 2003-2004 was over $19,000. (National Postsecondary Student Aid Study 1993 and 2004, National Center for Education Statistics)

While the amount of student loans has grown over time, the impact has been moderated in recent years by historically low interest rates. Students have minimized the effects of high debt by consolidating loans at low, fixed rates. But interest rates for Stafford loans have risen substantially over the past two years, increasing from 3.4 to 5.3 percent last year and will be rising again on July 1 – to 7.14 percent for outstanding loans and 6.8 percent on new loans. (Congressional Research Service) As a result, loan payments will be considerably higher for students taking out new loans and for those who did not consolidate their loans in recent years.

Student Debt's Impact on Attending and Completing College

Regrettably, the opportunity of a college education is not available to all qualified students. The high cost of attending college, combined with insufficient grant aid, can price students out of a college education. Even with student loans and work-study programs, students can be confronted with thousands of dollars of unmet financial need that they simply cannot afford to pay. After all aid, loans and work are taken into account, the lowest income students still face nearly $5,800 in unmet need. (Business Higher Education Forum, 2005) Consequently, each year, more than 400,000 low- and moderate-income high school graduates who are fully prepared to attend a four-year college do not do so because of financial barriers. About 170,000 of these students will attend no college at all. (Advisory Committee on Student Finance Assistance, June 2002)

The need to take out student loans can also cause students to delay starting school, prevent them from attending a more expensive college, or prevent students who begin college from graduating. Students who attempt college but leave without a degree can become burdened with an unmanageable student loan debt. About 18 percent of people who leave school without completing a degree borrow more than $20,000. (Nellie Mae Corporation, February 2003)

Student Debt's Impact on Post-Graduate Decisions

Large student debt also affects career and life decisions after graduation. A new study examined the burden of student loan debt on people who would like to pursue public service careers such as teaching and social work – careers that are low-paying yet essential to America's future and to the communities in which we live. It found that 23

percent of public college graduates and 38 percent of private college graduates would have an unmanageable level of student debt if they were to live on the salary of a starting teacher. The outlook is even bleaker for social work. Student debt would be unmanageable for 37 percent of public college graduates and 55 percent of private college graduates living on the salary of a starting social worker. (State PIRGs' Higher Education Project, April 2006)

The most recent National Student Loan Survey has found that student debt can affect other major life decisions. For the first time in fifteen years, the survey found that the probability of owning a home decreases as student debt levels increase. While student debt is not the primary determinant of home ownership, the survey found that an additional $5,000 of debt reduces the probability of owning home by about one percent. The survey also measured the perceived impact of student loan debt and found that 30 percent of respondents said they delayed buying a car because of student loan debt, 21 percent said they delayed having children because of student loan debt, and 14 percent said they delayed getting married because of student loan debt. (Nellie Mae Corporation, February 2003)

Budget Reconciliation: A Missed Opportunity to Expand College Affordability

At the end of 2005, federal lawmakers were presented with a realistic opportunity to address college affordability. It was proposed that Congress could reduce excessive subsidies going to student loan lenders and use those savings to substantially increase need-based aid to all students eligible for Pell Grants. But the Republican-controlled Congress had other priorities. Instead of increasing grants to all Pell-eligible students, Republicans stripped $12 billion from the student loan program and used it to offset more tax breaks for the wealthy instead of more aid for students. Only a very small amount of additional savings went to student aid. This new aid program is so restrictive that the Congressional Budget Office estimates that less than ten percent of Pell eligible students will receive additional grant aid this year. To make matters worse, in the same bill, Congress also increased interest rates for PLUS loans to parents, from the previously-scheduled fixed rate of 7.9 percent to 8.5 percent.

A Need for a New Direction on College Affordability

Democrats recognize that students and their families are struggling to cover the rising cost of college and are making college affordability a top priority. Specifically, Democrats propose to:

- **Cut student loan costs and make payments manageable.** Because interest rates on new Stafford loans are set to rise to a fixed 6.8 percent on July 1, current college students will eventually have higher monthly debt payments than graduates who were able to consolidate their student loans at low fixed rates in recent years. Democrats support efforts to make student loans affordable, such as lowering interest rates or expanding options to limit loan payments to a specified percentage of the borrower's income.

- **Expand Pell Grants.** President Bush still has not followed through on his six-year-old campaign promise to increase the maximum Pell Grant to $5,100. Under his budget proposal for Fiscal Year 2007, the maximum Pell Grant would remain at $4,050 – where it has been frozen for the past four years, despite skyrocketing tuition and fees. Democrats are committed to raising the maximum Pell Grant award to $5,100.

- **Make college tuition deductible from taxes.** The Republican-controlled Congress allowed a popular tax deduction for college tuition to expire at the end of 2005. In 2003, over 3.4 million Americans benefited from this tax deduction. Preliminary data from the Internal Revenue Service shows that in 2004, 4.7 million took advantage of the deduction, which allowed qualified taxpayers to deduct up to $4,000 in tuition and fees from their taxable income. Republicans chose to include capital gains and dividends tax breaks – but not the college tuition tax deduction – in the tax reconciliation conference report approved earlier this year. Democrats support extending this tax deduction this year so taxpayers can benefit from it when filing their 2006 tax returns and have proposed increasing the deduction to $12,000. Democrats also support expanding access to the Hope and Lifetime Learning tax credits for qualified postsecondary education expenses.

Examining How States Are Affected by Rising Tuition and Student Debt

Rising tuition and student loan debt is a national problem. No state has escaped the college cost crunch. But individual states have been affected to different degrees. This report provides information on the college affordability problem in each state as well as how students and their families in each state would benefit from Democratic proposals. The following tables and individualized state reports provide information for each state on:

- The rising cost of college;
- The erosion of the value of the Pell Grant;
- The amount of student loan debt incurred by college graduates;
- The amount of family income needed to pay for college;
- The amount of savings if student loan interest rates were cut in half;
- The reduction in monthly costs if student loan payments were capped at 15 percent of a borrower's discretionary income;
- The increase in the average Pell Grant award and the number of students eligible if the maximum Pell Grant were increased to $5,100; and
- The number of students and families who are likely to benefit from re-instituting the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005.

The Rising Cost of College Threatens Access to a Degree

Tuition, Fees, Room & Board at Public Four-Year Institutions

State	2000-2001[1]	2004-2005[2]	State	2000-2001	2004-2005
Alabama	$7,338	$9,819	Montana	$7,607	$9,867
Alaska	$8,386	$9,936	Nebraska	$7,335	$10,704
Arizona	$7,872	$10,863	Nevada	$8,252	$10,464
Arkansas	$6,789	$8,734	New Hampshire	$11,717	$14,651
California	$9,592	$13,356	New Jersey	$11,998	$16,349
Colorado	$8,360	$10,243	New Mexico	$7,085	$8,675
Connecticut	$10,512	$13,824	New York	$10,254	$12,441
Delaware	$10,290	$13,353	North Carolina	$7,080	$9,450
District of Columbia[3]	$2,070	$2,070	North Dakota	$6,405	$9,011
Florida	$7,944	$9,335	Ohio	$10,449	$15,256
Georgia	$7,455	$9,439	Oklahoma	$6,000	$8,451
Hawaii	$8,286	$9,131	Oregon	$9,397	$12,177
Idaho	$6,763	$9,066	Pennsylvania	$11,087	$14,771
Illinois	$9,533	$12,803	Rhode Island	$11,104	$13,541
Indiana	$9,232	$12,240	South Carolina	$9,065	$12,165
Iowa	$7,589	$11,541	South Dakota	$6,979	$8,944
Kansas	$6,650	$9,397	Tennessee	$7,661	$9,445
Kentucky	$6,921	$9,400	Texas	$7,634	$10,233
Louisiana	$6,304	$7,973	Utah	$6,623	$8,348
Maine	$9,361	$11,826	Vermont	$12,836	$15,658
Maryland	$10,846	$14,108	Virginia	$8,744	$11,616
Massachusetts	$9,206	$13,687	Washington	$8,917	$11,902
Michigan	$9,841	$12,658	West Virginia	$7,287	$9,450
Minnesota	$8,146	$11,958	Wisconsin	$7,385	$9,872
Mississippi	$7,181	$9,019	Wyoming	$7,017	$8,514
Missouri	$8,201	$11,356	United States	$8,655	$11,441

[1] National Center for Education Statistics, "Digest of Education Statistics 2001"
[2] National Center for Education Statistics, "Digest of Education Statistics 2005"
[3] Figure Includes Tuition and Fees Only

The Rising Cost of College Threatens Access to a Degree					
Tuition, Fees, Room & Board at Private Four-Year Institutions					
State	2000-2001[4]	2004-2005[5]	State	2000-01	2004-2005
Alabama	$14,248	$17,520	**Montana**	$14,298	$17,918
Alaska	$14,378	$21,423	**Nebraska**	$16,381	$19,725
Arizona	$14,935	$19,448	**Nevada**	$17,397	$20,594
Arkansas	$13,361	$17,040	**New Hampshire**	$24,525	$29,728
California	$24,993	$30,186	**New Jersey**	$23,860	$29,751
Colorado	$23,599	$27,361	**New Mexico**	$18,985	$19,304
Connecticut	$27,818	$33,965	**New York**	$25,171	$30,907
Delaware	$14,041	$17,368	**North Carolina**	$20,169	$24,600
District of Columbia	$27,143	$31,594	**North Dakota**	$11,392	$12,525
Florida	$19,800	$23,793	**Ohio**	$21,045	$25,594
Georgia	$19,743	$24,734	**Oklahoma**	$15,397	$19,168
Hawaii	$15,997	$17,866	**Oregon**	$23,306	$27,493
Idaho	$17,783	$11,388	**Pennsylvania**	$24,779	$30,637
Illinois	$21,941	$26,966	**Rhode Island**	$26,157	$30,907
Indiana	$21,390	$26,490	**South Carolina**	$17,583	$21,237
Iowa	$19,454	$23,012	**South Dakota**	$15,398	$18,076
Kansas	$15,627	$19,736	**Tennessee**	$18,139	$22,035
Kentucky	$14,727	$19,262	**Texas**	$16,973	$22,218
Louisiana	$22,154	$26,583	**Utah**	$8,576	$10,521
Maine	$22,689	$28,371	**Vermont**	$22,312	$27,261
Maryland	$26,034	$30,515	**Virginia**	$18,700	$23,277
Massachusetts	$28,669	$35,470	**Washington**	$21,510	$26,021
Michigan	$16,040	$19,286	**West Virginia**	$18,338	$19,067
Minnesota	$21,556	$25,946	**Wisconsin**	$20,271	$24,574
Mississippi	$13,717	$16,460	**Wyoming**	N/A	N/A
Missouri	$17,852	$21,431	**United States**	$21,907	$26,489

[4] National Center for Education Statistics, "Digest of Education Statistics 2001"
[5] National Center for Education Statistics, "Digest of Education Statistics 2005"

The Declining Purchasing Power of the Pell Grant Forces Students to Borrow More[6]					
State	Percentage of College Costs of $2,100 Maximum Pell Grant in 1986-87	Percentage of College Costs of $4,050 Maximum Pell Grant in 2004-2005	State	Percentage of College Costs of $2,100 Maximum Pell Grant in 1986-87	Percentage of College Costs of $4,050 Maximum Pell Grant in 2004-2005
Alabama	62%	41%	**Montana**	51%	41%
Alaska	53%	41%	**Nebraska**	63%	38%
Arizona	55%	37%	**Nevada**	60%	39%
Arkansas	75%	46%	**New Hampshire**	46%	28%
California	40%	30%	**New Jersey**	43%	25%
Colorado	47%	40%	**New Mexico**	58%	47%
Connecticut	49%	29%	**New York**	45%	33%
Delaware	54%[7]	30%	**North Carolina**	69%	43%
District of Columbia	N/A	N/A	**North Dakota**	67%	45%
Florida	54%	43%	**Ohio**	43%	27%
Georgia	58%	43%	**Oklahoma**	72%	48%
Hawaii	49%	44%	**Oregon**	53%	33%
Idaho	56%	45%	**Pennsylvania**	41%	27%
Illinois	47%	32%	**Rhode Island**	39%	30%
Indiana	44%	33%	**South Carolina**	50%	33%
Iowa	61%	35%	**South Dakota**	62%	45%
Kansas	60%	43%	**Tennessee**	62%	43%
Kentucky	64%	43%	**Texas**	55%	40%
Louisiana	59%	51%	**Utah**	53%	49%
Maine	46%	34%	**Vermont**	30%	26%
Maryland	39%	29%	**Virginia**	42%	35%
Massachusetts	50%	30%	**Washington**	53%	34%
Michigan	44%	32%	**West Virginia**	51%	43%
Minnesota	52%	34%	**Wisconsin**	58%	41%
Mississippi	54%	45%	**Wyoming**	62%[8]	48%
Missouri	62%	36%	**United States**	51%	35%

[6] HELP Committee calculations based on cost of tuition, fees, room and board data from National Center for Education Statistics, "Digest of Education Statistics 1988" and "Digest of Education Statistics 2005" and data on maximum appropriated Pell Grant from Congressional Research Service.

[7] Based on 1986-87 tuition, fees, room and board data from Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System

[8] Based on 1986-87 tuition, fees, room and board data from Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System

More and More Students Are Graduating from College with Huge Education Debt					
State	Percent of Under-graduates with Loans[9]	Average Debt per Graduate[10]	State	Percent of Under-graduates with Loans	Average Debt per Graduate
Alabama	62%	$17,277	**Montana**	55%	$16,920
Alaska	53%	$12,948	**Nebraska**	67%	$17,356
Arizona	59%	$16,089	**Nevada**	44%	$12,818
Arkansas	55%	$17,383	**New Hampshire**	67%	$21,332
California	56%	$15,340	**New Jersey**	57%	$16,450
Colorado	55%	$16,833	**New Mexico**	51%	$12,746
Connecticut	59%	$19,093	**New York**	59%	$17,594
Delaware	46%	$15,694	**North Carolina**	62%	$16,484
District of Columbia	53%	$21,675	**North Dakota**	67%	$21,331
Florida	58%	$18,574	**Ohio**	62%	$19,665
Georgia	53%	$15,337	**Oklahoma**	55%	$16,297
Hawaii	41%	$14,716	**Oregon**	63%	$18,105
Idaho	54%	$24,527	**Pennsylvania**	72%	$19,866
Illinois	66%	$16,104	**Rhode Island**	62%	$20,826
Indiana	65%	$18,506	**South Carolina**	63%	$16,734
Iowa	77%	$22,025	**South Dakota**	72%	$18,889
Kansas	69%	$16,029	**Tennessee**	59%	$19,346
Kentucky	54%	$15,579	**Texas**	56%	$16,618
Louisiana	53%	$17,531	**Utah**	44%	$11,039
Maine	65%	$18,341	**Vermont**	69%	$20,604
Maryland	50%	$15,054	**Virginia**	63%	$16,474
Massachusetts	62%	$17,353	**Washington**	61%	$17,601
Michigan	57%	$17,941	**West Virginia**	64%	$17,697
Minnesota	67%	$19,468	**Wisconsin**	68%	$16,815
Mississippi	57%	$14,534	**Wyoming**	43%	N/A
Missouri	65%	$15,678	**United States**[11]	62%	$19,300

[9] Proportion of Student Loan Borrowers Among Full-Time First-Time Undergraduates at Four-Year Institutions. Calculations by the Project on Student Debt at the Institute for College Access and Success, based on data from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) 2004, Data Analysis System (DAS)

[10] Average Debt of Graduates from Four-Year Colleges and Universities. Calculations by the Project on Student Debt from campus data available on www.economicdiversity.org. Includes only campuses reporting total debt through the Common Data Set initiative. Averages are weighted by campus enrollment.

[11] NCES, "National Postsecondary Student Aid Study 2004," compiled by Congressional Research Service

Percent of Family Income Needed to Pay for One Year at a Four-Year Public College, After Financial Aid			
State Name	Percent of Average Family Income[12]	State Name	Percent of Average Family Income
Alabama	27%	**Montana**	31%
Alaska	21%	**Nebraska**	24%
Arizona	30%	**Nevada**	27%
Arkansas	26%	**New Hampshire**	32%
California	32%	**New Jersey**	34%
Colorado	24%	**New Mexico**	27%
Connecticut	29%	**New York**	32%
Delaware	30%	**North Carolina**	25%
District of Columbia	N/A	**North Dakota**	25%
Florida	25%	**Ohio**	36%
Georgia	24%	**Oklahoma**	23%
Hawaii	23%	**Oregon**	34%
Idaho	22%	**Pennsylvania**	35%
Illinois	30%	**Rhode Island**	35%
Indiana	29%	**South Carolina**	32%
Iowa	28%	**South Dakota**	23%
Kansas	23%	**Tennessee**	27%
Kentucky	22%	**Texas**	26%
Louisiana	23%	**Utah**	18%
Maine	34%	**Vermont**	41%
Maryland	29%	**Virginia**	26%
Massachusetts	31%	**Washington**	31%
Michigan	32%	**West Virginia**	29%
Minnesota	23%	**Wisconsin**	22%
Mississippi	26%	**Wyoming**	24%
Missouri	27%	**United States**	28%

[12] The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, "Measuring Up 2004: The National Report Card on Higher Education."

Borrowers Across the Nation Would Save Thousands from Democratic Plan to Cut Student Interest Rates			
State Name	Savings for Average Borrower of Democratic Interest Rate Cut[13]	State Name	Savings for Average Borrower of Democratic Interest Rate Cut
Alabama	$3,455	**Montana**	$3,384
Alaska	$2,588	**Nebraska**	$3,470
Arizona	$3,217	**Nevada**	$2,563
Arkansas	$3,475	**New Hampshire**	$4,265
California	$3,067	**New Jersey**	$3,289
Colorado	$3,366	**New Mexico**	$2,549
Connecticut	$3,818	**New York**	$3,518
Delaware	$3,138	**North Carolina**	$3,295
District of Columbia	$4,334	**North Dakota**	$4,265
Florida	$3,713	**Ohio**	$3,932
Georgia	$3,066	**Oklahoma**	$3,258
Hawaii	$2,942	**Oregon**	$3,620
Idaho	$4,903	**Pennsylvania**	$3,972
Illinois	$3,220	**Rhode Island**	$4,164
Indiana	$3,701	**South Carolina**	$3,346
Iowa	$4,404	**South Dakota**	$3,778
Kansas	$3,205	**Tennessee**	$3,868
Kentucky	$3,114	**Texas**	$3,323
Louisiana	$3,505	**Utah**	$2,208
Maine	$3,667	**Vermont**	$4,120
Maryland	$3,011	**Virginia**	$3,294
Massachusetts	$3,470	**Washington**	$3,520
Michigan	$3,587	**West Virginia**	$3,538
Minnesota	$3,892	**Wisconsin**	$3,361
Mississippi	$2,906	**Wyoming**	N/A
Missouri	$3,134	**United States[14]**	$3,859

[13] Calculations by HELP Committee staff based on interest rate cut from 6.8% fixed rate to 3.4% fixed rate and average student aid debt per graduate (Project on Student Debt at The Institute for College Access and Success calculations from campus data available on www.economicdiversity.org), assuming 10-year loan repayment.
[14] National average total student aid debt per graduate from NCES, "National Postsecondary Student Aid Study 2004," compiled by Congressional Research Service.

Democratic Plan to Make Debt Repayment Contingent on Income Would Significantly Reduce Monthly Loan Payments for Starting Teachers[15]				
State	Starting Teachers' Salary	State Average Debt per Graduate	Reduction in Monthly Loan Payment	Percent Reduction in Monthly Loan Payment
Alabama	$30,973	$17,277	$50	25%
Alaska	$40,027	$12,948	$22	15%
Arizona	$28,236	$16,089	$52	28%
Arkansas	$26,129	$17,383	$62	31%
California	$35,135	$15,340	$36	21%
Colorado	$31,296	$16,833	$48	25%
Connecticut	$34,462	$19,093	$47	21%
Delaware	$34,566	$15,694	$38	21%
District of Columbia	$38,566	$21,675	$42	17%
Florida	$30,969	$18,574	$54	25%
Georgia	$35,116	$15,337	$36	21%
Hawaii	$37,615	$14,716	$30	18%
Idaho	$25,908	$24,527	$89	31%
Illinois	$35,114	$16,104	$38	21%
Indiana	$29,784	$18,506	$56	26%
Iowa	$26,967	$22,025	$75	30%
Kansas	$28,530	$16,029	$51	28%
Kentucky	$28,416	$15,579	$50	28%
Louisiana	$29,655	$17,531	$53	26%
Maine	$25,901	$18,341	$66	31%
Maryland	$33,760	$15,054	$38	22%
Massachusetts	$34,041	$17,353	$43	22%
Michigan	$34,377	$17,941	$44	21%
Minnesota	$30,772	$19,468	$57	25%
Mississippi	$28,106	$14,534	$47	28%
Missouri	$28,938	$15,678	$49	27%

[15] HELP Committee estimates calculated using the U.S. Department of Education's "Income Contingent Repayment Plan Calculator" (http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSFAP/DirectLoan/RepayCalc/dlentry2.html), using average debt levels calculated by the Project on Student Debt at the Institute for College Access and Success from campus data available on www.economicdiversity.org. Calculations based on formula for current Income Contingent Repayment option in the Direct Loan Program (either 20% cap on income or income percentage factors); actual reduction in monthly payment resulting from Democratic proposal to cap payments at 15% of income might differ slightly from estimates provided. Democratic proposal also expands income contingent repayment option to all borrowers.

Democratic Plan to Make Debt Repayment Contingent on Income Would Significantly Reduce Monthly Loan Payments for Starting Teachers[16]				
State	Starting Teachers' Salary	State Average Debt per Graduate	Reduction in Monthly Loan Payment	Percent Reduction in Monthly Loan Payment
Montana	$24,032	$16,920	$67	35%
Nebraska	$28,527	$17,356	$55	28%
Nevada	$27,942	$12,818	$42	28%
New Hampshire	$27,367	$21,332	$71	29%
New Jersey	$37,061	$16,450	$35	18%
New Mexico	$31,920	$12,746	$35	24%
New York	$36,400	$17,594	$39	19%
North Carolina	$27,572	$16,484	$54	29%
North Dakota	$24,108	$21,331	$85	34%
Ohio	$28,692	$19,665	$62	27%
Oklahoma	$29,473	$16,297	$50	27%
Oregon	$33,396	$18,105	$47	22%
Pennsylvania	$34,140	$19,866	$50	22%
Rhode Island	$32,902	$20,826	$55	23%
South Carolina	$27,883	$16,734	$55	28%
South Dakota	$25,504	$18,889	$70	32%
Tennessee	$30,449	$19,346	$57	26%
Texas	$32,741	$16,618	$44	23%
Utah	$26,130	$11,039	$39	31%
Vermont	$25,819	$20,604	$75	32%
Virginia	$32,437	$16,474	$45	23%
Washington	$30,159	$17,601	$52	26%
West Virginia	$26,692	$17,697	$61	30%
Wisconsin	$23,952	$16,815	$67	35%
Wyoming[17]	$28,900	$19,300	$61	27%
United States[18]	$31,704	$19,300	$54	24%

[16] HELP Committee estimates calculated using the U.S. Department of Education's "Income Contingent Repayment Plan Calculator" (http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSFAP/DirectLoan/RepayCalc/dlentry2.html), using average debt levels calculated by the Project on Student Debt at the Institute for College Access and Success from campus data available on www.economicdiversity.org. Calculations based on formula for current Income Contingent Repayment option in the Direct Loan Program (either 20% cap on income or income percentage factors); actual reduction in monthly payment resulting from Democratic proposal to cap payments at 15% of income might differ slightly from estimates provided. Democratic proposal also expands income contingent repayment option to all borrowers.

[17] Wyoming debt data not available. Calculation based on U.S. average debt level.

[18] National average total student aid debt per graduate from NCES, "National Postsecondary Student Aid Study 2004," compiled by Congressional Research Service.

Democratic Proposal to Increase the Pell Grant to $5,100 Would Mean More Aid for Over Five Million Needy Students

	Award Year 2007-2008			Award Year 2007-2008			Award Year 2007-2008		
	$4,050 Max. Award (Current Services)*			$5,100 Max. Award*			Increase with $5,100 Max Award		
State Name	Aid Available	Recipients	Average Award	Aid Available	Recipients	Average Award	Increase in Aid Available	Increase in Recipients	Increase in Average Award
Alabama	$267,343,000	104,576	$2,556	$358,974,948	110,881	$3,237	$91,631,948	6,305	$681
Alaska	$10,851,000	4,855	$2,235	$14,570,407	5,148	$2,830	$3,719,407	293	$595
Arizona	$392,913,000	181,889	$2,160	$528,681,028	193,063	$2,738	$135,768,028	11,174	$578
Arkansas	$150,632,000	59,078	$2,550	$202,260,929	62,641	$3,229	$51,628,929	3,563	$679
California	$1,488,578,000	581,505	$2,560	$1,936,237,922	603,272	$3,210	$447,659,922	21,767	$650
Colorado	$173,257,000	74,721	$2,319	$232,640,758	79,226	$2,936	$59,383,758	4,505	$617
Connecticut	$77,322,000	35,526	$2,176	$103,823,669	37,668	$2,756	$26,501,669	2,142	$580
Delaware	$21,661,000	10,039	$2,158	$29,085,730	10,645	$2,732	$7,424,730	606	$574
District of Columbia	$39,794,000	17,073	$2,331	$53,433,167	18,103	$2,952	$13,639,167	1,030	$621
Florida	$722,888,000	303,522	$2,382	$964,104,568	318,347	$3,028	$241,216,568	14,825	$646
Georgia	$429,185,000	176,654	$2,430	$572,618,240	185,667	$3,084	$143,433,240	9,013	$654
Hawaii	$31,838,000	12,796	$2,488	$42,750,776	13,567	$3,151	$10,912,776	771	$663
Idaho	$81,477,000	31,850	$2,558	$109,403,014	33,770	$3,240	$27,926,014	1,920	$682
Illinois	$510,144,000	204,742	$2,492	$681,585,734	214,789	$3,173	$171,441,734	10,047	$681
Indiana	$238,871,000	106,682	$2,239	$320,743,800	113,115	$2,836	$81,872,800	6,433	$597
Iowa	$156,588,000	69,040	$2,268	$210,258,702	73,203	$2,872	$53,670,702	4,163	$604
Kansas	$122,213,000	52,685	$2,320	$164,102,132	55,862	$2,938	$41,889,132	3,177	$618
Kentucky	$203,884,000	83,461	$2,443	$273,765,073	88,494	$3,094	$69,881,073	5,033	$651
Louisiana	$250,917,000	96,612	$2,597	$336,918,195	102,438	$3,289	$86,001,195	5,826	$692
Maine	$45,014,000	19,123	$2,354	$60,443,034	20,276	$2,981	$15,429,034	1,153	$627
Maryland	$155,387,000	69,394	$2,239	$208,645,506	73,578	$2,836	$53,258,506	4,184	$597
Massachusetts	$183,315,000	78,701	$2,329	$246,145,707	83,446	$2,950	$62,830,707	4,745	$621
Michigan	$403,731,000	168,506	$2,396	$544,208,914	179,938	$3,024	$140,477,914	11,432	$628
Minnesota	$173,637,000	77,702	$2,235	$233,151,223	82,387	$2,830	$59,514,223	4,685	$595
Mississippi	$206,667,000	76,428	$2,704	$277,501,644	81,036	$3,424	$70,834,644	4,608	$720
Missouri	$235,124,000	101,507	$2,316	$315,712,839	107,628	$2,933	$80,588,839	6,121	$617
Montana	$47,370,000	18,711	$2,532	$63,606,712	19,839	$3,206	$16,236,712	1,128	$674
Nebraska	$69,232,000	31,072	$2,228	$92,961,621	32,946	$2,822	$23,729,621	1,874	$594
Nevada	$42,326,000	18,938	$2,235	$56,832,740	20,080	$2,830	$14,506,740	1,142	$595
New Hampshire	$30,958,000	14,244	$2,173	$41,568,934	15,103	$2,752	$10,610,934	859	$579

Democratic Proposal to Increase the Pell Grant to $5,100 Would Mean More Aid for Over Five Million Needy Students

	Award Year 2007-2008 $4,050 Max. Award (Current Services)*			Award Year 2007-2008 $5,100 Max. Award*			Award Year 2007-2008 Increase with $5,100 Max Award		
New Jersey	$251,753,000	102,172	$2,464	$338,040,630	108,333	$3,120	$86,287,630	6,161	$656
New Mexico	$102,063,000	42,448	$2,404	$137,045,257	45,008	$3,045	$34,982,257	2,560	$641
New York	$967,302,000	380,414	$2,543	$1,289,071,972	400,279	$3,220	$321,769,972	19,865	$677
North Carolina	$346,801,000	144,389	$2,402	$466,209,727	152,534	$3,056	$119,408,727	8,145	$654
North Dakota	$37,613,000	15,395	$2,443	$50,504,548	16,323	$3,094	$12,891,548	928	$651
Ohio	$467,725,000	193,244	$2,420	$629,620,211	206,565	$3,048	$161,895,211	13,321	$628
Oklahoma	$192,384,000	78,991	$2,436	$258,323,171	83,754	$3,084	$65,939,171	4,763	$648
Oregon	$148,395,000	62,218	$2,385	$199,256,933	65,969	$3,020	$50,861,933	3,751	$635
Pennsylvania	$435,876,000	182,497	$2,388	$595,196,010	196,752	$3,025	$159,320,010	14,255	$637
Rhode Island	$50,809,000	21,961	$2,314	$68,223,206	23,285	$2,930	$17,414,206	1,324	$616
South Carolina	$187,802,000	78,851	$2,382	$252,171,491	83,605	$3,016	$64,369,491	4,754	$634
South Dakota	$42,757,000	17,983	$2,378	$57,412,599	19,068	$3,011	$14,655,599	1,085	$633
Tennessee	$243,778,000	101,931	$2,392	$327,333,197	108,077	$3,029	$83,555,197	6,146	$637
Texas	$1,021,239,000	422,666	$2,416	$1,351,317,392	440,698	$3,066	$330,078,392	18,032	$650
Utah	$149,868,000	62,950	$2,381	$201,235,191	66,745	$3,015	$51,367,191	3,795	$634
Vermont	$20,612,000	9,233	$2,232	$27,677,304	9,789	$2,827	$7,065,304	556	$595
Virginia	$230,662,000	98,680	$2,337	$309,722,021	104,630	$2,960	$79,060,021	5,950	$623
Washington	$206,722,000	87,967	$2,350	$277,576,601	93,271	$2,976	$70,854,601	5,304	$626
West Virginia	$96,617,000	37,722	$2,561	$129,732,727	39,997	$3,244	$33,115,727	2,275	$683
Wisconsin	$159,212,000	70,161	$2,269	$213,781,476	74,391	$2,874	$54,569,476	4,230	$605
Wyoming	$21,679,000	9,156	$2,368	$29,109,644	9,708	$2,999	$7,430,644	552	$631
United States	$12,980,008,804	5,314,907	$2,442	$17,301,438,379	5,600,719	$3,089	$4,321,429,575	285,812	$647

*Estimate does not include any of the proposed changes to Pell in the President's FY2007 Budget.

Note: Estimates are from the PB 2007 update. United States totals include Puerto Rico and other U.S. Territories

Source: American Council on Education and HELP Committee Calculations

Millions of Students and Families Have Benefited from the College Tuition Tax Deduction			
State Name	Students and Families Benefiting from Tuition Tax Deduction[19]	State Name	Students and Families Benefiting from Tuition Tax Deduction
Alabama	39,157	Montana	11,411
Alaska	13,636	Nebraska	25,509
Arizona	74,301	Nevada	25,776
Arkansas	18,969	New Hampshire	18,336
California	475,242	New Jersey	121,775
Colorado	73,680	New Mexico	25,691
Connecticut	51,809	New York	238,254
Delaware	11,291	North Carolina	90,237
District of Columbia	8,518	North Dakota	8,706
Florida	163,345	Ohio	134,885
Georgia	90,145	Oklahoma	38,421
Hawaii	17,197	Oregon	53,264
Idaho	18,516	Pennsylvania	147,850
Illinois	181,998	Rhode Island	13,820
Indiana	73,093	South Carolina	36,364
Iowa	37,364	South Dakota	8,167
Kansas	39,948	Tennessee	51,587
Kentucky	35,720	Texas	249,008
Louisiana	45,063	Utah	34,229
Maine	14,429	Vermont	7,970
Maryland	90,237	Virginia	104,936
Massachusetts	97,107	Washington	95,236
Michigan	138,474	West Virginia	16,929
Minnesota	82,496	Wisconsin	84,346
Mississippi	21,094	Wyoming	7,551
Missouri	64,506	United States	3,642,075

[19] IRS Statistics of Income Division, Tax Year 2003, data compiled by the Senate Finance Committee

THE COLLEGE COST CRUNCH:

STATE ANALYSES

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Alabama Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Alabama increased 34%, from $7,338 to $9,819 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Alabama increased 23% from $14,248 to $17,520 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 34%, median family incomes in Alabama have increased only 3% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 27% of the average family income in Alabama is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Alabama the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 41% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 62% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Alabama, 62% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Alabama owed $17,277 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Alabama Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Alabama college graduates would save $3,455 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Alabama earning $30,973,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $17,277,[13] would see a reduction of about $50,[14] or 25%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 6,305 more Alabama college students would be eligible for $91,631,948 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Alabama would increase by $681, from $2,556 to $3,237.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 39,157 Alabama students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Alaska Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Alaska increased 18%, from $8,386 to $9,936 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Alaska increased 49% from $14,378 to $21,423 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 18%, median family incomes in Alaska have increased only 4% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 21% of the average family income in Alaska is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Alaska the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 41% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 -- down from 53% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Alaska, 53% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Alaska owed $12,948 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Alaska Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Alaska college graduates would save $2,588 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Alaska earning $40,027,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $12,948,[13] would see a reduction of about $22,[14] or 15%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 293 more Alaska college students would be eligible for $3,719,407 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Alaska would increase by $595, from $2,235 to $2,830.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 13,636 Alaska students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Arizona Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Arizona increased 38%, from $7,872 to $10,863 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Arizona increased 30% from $14,935 to $19,448 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 38%, median family incomes in Arizona have increased only 10% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 30% of the average family income in Arizona is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Arizona the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 37% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 55% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Arizona, 59% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Arizona owed $16,089 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Arizona Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Arizona college graduates would save $3,217 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Arizona earning $28,236,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $16,089,[13] would see a reduction of about $52,[14] or 28%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 11,174 more Arizona college students would be eligible for $135,768,028 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Arizona would increase by $578, from $2,160 to $2,738.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 74,301 Arizona students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Arkansas Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Arkansas increased 29%, from $6,789 to $8,734 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Arkansas increased 28% from $13,361 to $17,040 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 29%, median family incomes in Arkansas have increased only 18% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 26% of the average family income in Arkansas is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Arkansas the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 46% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 75% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Arkansas, 55% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Arkansas owed $17,383 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Arkansas Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Arkansas college graduates would save $3,475 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Arkansas earning $26,129,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $17,383,[13] would see a reduction of about $62,[14] or 31%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 3,563 more Arkansas college students would be eligible for $51,628,929 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Arkansas would increase by $679, from $2,550 to $3,229.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 18,969 Arkansas students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, California Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in California increased 39%, from $9,592 to $13,356 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in California increased 21% from $24,993 to $30,186 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 39%, median family incomes in California have increased only 5% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 32% of the average family income in California is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In California the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 30% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 40% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In California, 56% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in California owed $15,340 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help California Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, California college graduates would save $3,067 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in California earning $35,135,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $15,340,[13] would see a reduction of about $36,[14] or 21%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 21,767 more California college students would be eligible for $447,659,922 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in California would increase by $650, from $2,560 to $3,210.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 475,242 California students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Colorado Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Colorado increased 23%, from $8,360 to $10,243 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Colorado increased 16% from $23,599 to $27,361 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 23%, median family incomes in Colorado have increased only 6% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 24% of the average family income in Colorado is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Colorado the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 40% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 47% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Colorado, 55% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Colorado owed $16,833 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Colorado Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Colorado college graduates would save $3,366 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Colorado earning $31,296,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $16,833,[13] would see a reduction of about $48,[14] or 25%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 4,505 more Colorado college students would be eligible for $59,383,758 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Colorado would increase by $617, from $2,319 to $2,936.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 73,680 Colorado students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Connecticut Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Connecticut increased 32%, from $10,512 to $13,824 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Connecticut increased 22% from $27,818 to $33,965 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 32%, median family incomes in Connecticut have increased only 10% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 29% of the average family income in Connecticut is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Connecticut the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 29% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 49% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Connecticut, 59% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Connecticut owed $19,093 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Connecticut Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Connecticut college graduates would save $3,818 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Connecticut earning $34,462,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $19,093,[13] would see a reduction of about $47,[14] or 21%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 2,142 more Connecticut college students would be eligible for $26,501,669 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Connecticut would increase by $580, from $2,176 to $2,756.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 51,809 Connecticut students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Delaware Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Delaware increased 30%, from $10,290 to $13,353 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Delaware increased 24% from $14,041 to $17,368 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 30%, median family incomes in Delaware have actually decreased by 5% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 30% of the average family income in Delaware is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Delaware the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 30% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 54% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Delaware, 46% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Delaware owed $15,694 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Delaware Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Delaware college graduates would save $3,138 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Delaware earning $34,566,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $15,694,[13] would see a reduction of about $38,[14] or 21%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 606 more Delaware college students would be eligible for $7,424,730 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Delaware would increase by $574, from $2,158 to $2,732.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 11,291 Delaware students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, District of Columbia Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. In the 2004-2005 school year, the cost of tuition and fees at a four-year public college in District of Columbia was $2,070. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in District of Columbia increased 16% between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, from $27,143 to $31,594 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While college costs have increased across the nation, median family incomes in District of Columbia have increased only 5% since 2000.[2]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In District of Columbia, 53% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in District of Columbia owed $21,675 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help District of Columbia Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, District of Columbia college graduates would save $4,334 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in District of Columbia earning $38,566,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $21,675,[13] would see a reduction of about $42,[14] or 17%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 1,030 more District of Columbia college students would be eligible for $13,639,167 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in District of Columbia would increase by $621, from $2,331 to $2,952.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 8,518 District of Columbia students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Florida Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Florida increased 18%, from $7,944 to $9,335 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Florida increased 20% from $19,800 to $23,793 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 18%, median family incomes in Florida have increased only 4% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 25% of the average family income in Florida is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Florida the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 43% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 54% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Florida, 58% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Florida owed $18,574 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Florida Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Florida college graduates would save $3,713 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Florida earning $30,969,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $18,574,[13] would see a reduction of about $54,[14] or 25%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 14,825 more Florida college students would be eligible for $241,216,568 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Florida would increase by $646, from $2,382 to $3,028.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 163,345 Florida students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Georgia Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Georgia increased 27%, from $7,455 to $9,439 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Georgia increased 25% from $19,743 to $24,734 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 27%, median family incomes in Georgia have actually decreased 2% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 24% of the average family income in Georgia is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Georgia the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 43% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 58% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Georgia, 53% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Georgia owed $15,337 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Georgia Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Georgia college graduates would save $3,066 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Georgia earning $35,116,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $15,337,[13] would see a reduction of about $36,[14] or 21%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 9,013 more Georgia college students would be eligible for $143,433,240 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Georgia would increase by $654, from $2,430 to $3,084.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 90,145 Georgia students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Hawaii Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Hawaii increased 10%, from $8,286 to $9,131 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Hawaii increased 12% from $15,997 to $17,866 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 10%, median family incomes in Hawaii have just kept pace, also increasing 10% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 23% of the average family income in Hawaii is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Hawaii the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 44% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 49% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Hawaii, 41% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Hawaii owed $14,716 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Hawaii Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Hawaii college graduates would save $2,942 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Hawaii earning $37,615,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $14,716,[13] would see a reduction of about $30,[14] or 18%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 771 more Hawaii college students would be eligible for $10,912,776 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Hawaii would increase by $663, from $2,488 to $3,151.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 17,197 Hawaii students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Idaho Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Idaho increased 34%, from $6,763 to $9,066 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 34%, median family incomes in Idaho have increased only 18% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 22% of the average family income in Idaho is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Idaho the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 45% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 56% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Idaho, 54% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Idaho owed $24,527 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Idaho Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Idaho college graduates would save $4,903 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Idaho earning $25,908,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $24,527,[13] would see a reduction of about $89,[14] or 31%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 1,920 more Idaho college students would be eligible for $27,926,014 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Idaho would increase by $682, from $2,558 to $3,240.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 18,516 Idaho students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Illinois Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Illinois increased 34%, from $9,533 to $12,803 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Illinois increased 23% from $21,941 to $26,966 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 34%, median family incomes in Illinois have increased less than 1% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 30% of the average family income in Illinois is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Illinois the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 32% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 47% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Illinois, 66% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Illinois owed $16,104 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Illinois Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Illinois college graduates would save $3,220 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Illinois earning $35,114,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $16,104,[13] would see a reduction of about $38,[14] or 21%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 10,047 more Illinois college students would be eligible for $171,441,734 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Illinois would increase by $681, from $2,492 to $3,173.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 181,998 Illinois students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Indiana Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Indiana increased 33%, from $9,232 to $12,240 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Indiana increased 24% from $21,390 to $26,490 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 33%, median family incomes in Indiana have increased only 4% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 29% of the average family income in Indiana is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Indiana the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 33% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 44% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Indiana, 65% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Indiana owed $18,506 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Indiana Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Indiana college graduates would save $3,701 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Indiana earning $29,784,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $18,506,[13] would see a reduction of about $56,[14] or 26%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 6,433 more Indiana college students would be eligible for $81,872,800 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Indiana would increase by $597, from $2,239 to $2,836.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 73,093 Indiana students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Iowa Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Iowa increased 52%, from $7,589 to $11,541 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Iowa increased 18% from $19,454 to $23,012 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 52%, median family incomes in Iowa have increased only 6% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 28% of the average family income in Iowa is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Iowa the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 35% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 61% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Iowa, 77% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Iowa owed $22,025 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Iowa Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Iowa college graduates would save $4,404 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Iowa earning $26,967,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $22,025,[13] would see a reduction of about $75,[14] or 30%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 4,163 more Iowa college students would be eligible for $53,670,702 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Iowa would increase by $604, from $2,268 to $2,872.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 37,364 Iowa students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Kansas Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Kansas increased 41%, from $6,650 to $9,397 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Kansas increased 26% from $15,627 to $19,736 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 41%, median family incomes in Kansas have increased less than 1% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 23% of the average family income in Kansas is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Kansas the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 43% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 60% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Kansas, 69% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Kansas owed $16,029 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Kansas Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Kansas college graduates would save $3,205 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Kansas earning $28,530,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $16,029,[13] would see a reduction of about $51,[14] or 28%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 3,177 more Kansas college students would be eligible for $41,889,132 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Kansas would increase by $618, from $2,320 to $2,938.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 39,948 Kansas students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Kentucky Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Kentucky increased 36%, from $6,921 to $9,400 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Kentucky increased 31% from $14,727 to $19,262 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 36%, median family incomes in Kentucky have actually decreased 2% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 22% of the average family income in Kentucky is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Kentucky the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 43% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 64% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Kentucky, 54% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Kentucky owed $15,579 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Kentucky Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Kentucky college graduates would save $3,114 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Kentucky earning $28,416,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $15,579,[13] would see a reduction of about $50,[14] or 28%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 5,033 more Kentucky college students would be eligible for $69,881,073 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Kentucky would increase by $651, from $2,443 to $3,094.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 35,720 Kentucky students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Louisiana Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Louisiana increased 26%, from $6,304 to $7,973 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Louisiana increased 20% from $22,154 to $26,583 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 26%, median family incomes in Louisiana have increased only 19% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 23% of the average family income in Louisiana is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Louisiana the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 51% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 59% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Louisiana, 53% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Louisiana owed $17,531 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Louisiana Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Louisiana college graduates would save $3,505 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Louisiana earning $29,655,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $17,531,[13] would see a reduction of about $53,[14] or 26%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 5,826 more Louisiana college students would be eligible for $86,001,195 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Louisiana would increase by $692, from $2,597 to $3,289.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 45,063 Louisiana students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Maine Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Maine increased 26%, from $9,361 to $11,826 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Maine increased 25% from $22,689 to $28,371 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 26%, median family incomes in Maine have increased only 11% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 34% of the average family income in Maine is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Maine the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 34% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 46% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Maine, 65% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Maine owed $18,341 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Maine Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Maine college graduates would save $3,667 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Maine earning $25,901,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $18,341,[13] would see a reduction of about $66,[14] or 31%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 1,153 more Maine college students would be eligible for $15,429,034 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Maine would increase by $627, from $2,354 to $2,981.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 14,429 Maine students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Maryland Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Maryland increased 30%, from $10,846 to $14,108 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Maryland increased 17% from $26,034 to $30,515 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 30%, median family incomes in Maryland have increased only 5% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 29% of the average family income in Maryland is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Maryland the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 29% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 39% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Maryland, 50% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Maryland owed $15,054 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Maryland Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Maryland college graduates would save $3,011 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Maryland earning $33,760,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $15,054,[13] would see a reduction of about $38,[14] or 22%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 4,184 more Maryland college students would be eligible for $53,258,506 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Maryland would increase by $597, from $2,239 to $2,836.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 90,237 Maryland students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Massachusetts Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Massachusetts increased 49%, from $9,206 to $13,687 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Massachusetts increased 24% from $28,669 to $35,470 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 49%, median family incomes in Massachusetts have increased only 12% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 31% of the average family income in Massachusetts is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Massachusetts the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 30% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 50% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Massachusetts, 62% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Massachusetts owed $17,353 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Massachusetts Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Massachusetts college graduates would save $3,470 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Massachusetts earning $34,041,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $17,353,[13] would see a reduction of about $43,[14] or 22%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 4,745 more Massachusetts college students would be eligible for $62,830,707 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Massachusetts would increase by $621, from $2,329 to $2,950.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 97,107 Massachusetts students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Michigan Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Michigan increased 29%, from $9,841 to $12,658 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Michigan increased 20% from $16,040 to $19,286 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 29%, median family incomes in Michigan have actually decreased 7% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 32% of the average family income in Michigan is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Michigan the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 32% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 44% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Michigan, 57% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Michigan owed $17,941 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Michigan Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Michigan college graduates would save $3,587 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Michigan earning $34,377,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $17,941,[13] would see a reduction of about $44,[14] or 21%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 11,432 more Michigan college students would be eligible for $140,477,914 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Michigan would increase by $628, from $2,396 to $3,024.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 138,474 Michigan students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Minnesota Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Minnesota increased 47%, from $8,146 to $11,958 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Minnesota increased 20% from $21,556 to $25,946 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 47%, median family incomes in Minnesota have increased only 3% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 23% of the average family income in Minnesota is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Minnesota the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 34% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 52% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Minnesota, 67% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Minnesota owed $19,468 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Minnesota Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Minnesota college graduates would save $3,892 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Minnesota earning $30,772,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $19,468,[13] would see a reduction of about $57,[14] or 25%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 4,685 more Minnesota college students would be eligible for $59,514,223 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Minnesota would increase by $595, from $2,235 to $2,830.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 82,496 Minnesota students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Mississippi Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Mississippi increased 26%, from $7,181 to $9,019 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Mississippi increased 20% from $13,717 to $16,460 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 26%, median family incomes in Mississippi have increased only 2% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 26% of the average family income in Mississippi is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Mississippi the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 45% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 54% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Mississippi, 57% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Mississippi owed $14,534 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Mississippi Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Mississippi college graduates would save $2,906 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Mississippi earning $28,106,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $14,534,[13] would see a reduction of about $47,[14] or 28%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 4,608 more Mississippi college students would be eligible for $70,834,644 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Mississippi would increase by $720, from $2,704 to $3,424.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 21,094 Mississippi students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Missouri Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Missouri increased 38%, from $8,201 to $11,356 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Missouri increased 20% from $17,852 to $21,431 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 38%, median family incomes in Missouri have actually decreased 7% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 27% of the average family income in Missouri is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Missouri the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 36% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 62% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Missouri, 65% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Missouri owed $15,678 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Missouri Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Missouri college graduates would save $3,134 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Missouri earning $28,938,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $15,678,[13] would see a reduction of about $49,[14] or 27%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 6,121 more Missouri college students would be eligible for $80,588,839 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Missouri would increase by $617, from $2,316 to $2,933.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 64,506 Missouri students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Montana Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Montana increased 30%, from $7,607 to $9,867 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Montana increased 25% from $14,298 to $17,918 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 30%, median family incomes in Montana have increased only 4% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 31% of the average family income in Montana is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Montana the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 41% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 51% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Montana, 55% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Montana owed $16,920 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Montana Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Montana college graduates would save $3,384 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Montana earning $24,032,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $16,920,[13] would see a reduction of about $67,[14] or 35%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 1,128 more Montana college students would be eligible for $16,236,712 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Montana would increase by $674, from $2,532 to $3,206.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 11,411 Montana students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Nebraska Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Nebraska increased 46%, from $7,335 to $10,704 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Nebraska increased 20% from $16,381 to $19,725 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 46%, median family incomes in Nebraska have increased only 5% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 24% of the average family income in Nebraska is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Nebraska the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 38% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 63% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Nebraska, 67% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Nebraska owed $17,356 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Nebraska Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Nebraska college graduates would save $3,470 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Nebraska earning $28,527,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $17,356,[13] would see a reduction of about $55,[14] or 28%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 1,874 more Nebraska college students would be eligible for $23,729,621 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Nebraska would increase by $594, from $2,228 to $2,822.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 25,509 Nebraska students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Nevada Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Nevada increased 27%, from $8,252 to $10,464 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Nevada increased 18% from $17,397 to $20,594 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 27%, median family incomes in Nevada have increased only 3% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 27% of the average family income in Nevada is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Nevada the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 39% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 60% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Nevada, 44% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Nevada owed $12,818 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Nevada Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Nevada college graduates would save $2,563 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Nevada earning $27,942,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $12,818,[13] would see a reduction of about $42,[14] or 28%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 1,142 more Nevada college students would be eligible for $14,506,740 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Nevada would increase by $595, from $2,235 to $2,830.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 25,776 Nevada students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, New Hampshire Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in New Hampshire increased 25%, from $11,717 to $14,651 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in New Hampshire increased 21% from $24,525 to $29,728 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 25%, median family incomes in New Hampshire have increased only 12% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 32% of the average family income in New Hampshire is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In New Hampshire the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 28% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 46% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In New Hampshire, 67% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in New Hampshire owed $21,332 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help New Hampshire Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, New Hampshire college graduates would save $4,265 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in New Hampshire earning $27,367,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $21,332,[13] would see a reduction of about $71,[14] or 29%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 859 more New Hampshire college students would be eligible for $10,610,934 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in New Hampshire would increase by $579, from $2,173 to $2,752.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 18,336 New Hampshire students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, New Jersey Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in New Jersey increased 36%, from $11,998 to $16,349 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in New Jersey increased 25% from $23,860 to $29,751 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 36%, median family incomes in New Jersey have increased only 10% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 34% of the average family income in New Jersey is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In New Jersey the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 25% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 43% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In New Jersey, 57% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in New Jersey owed $16,450 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help New Jersey Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, New Jersey college graduates would save $3,289 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in New Jersey earning $37,061,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $16,450,[13] would see a reduction of about $35,[14] or 18%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 6,161 more New Jersey college students would be eligible for $86,287,630 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in New Jersey would increase by $656, from $2,464 to $3,120.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 121,775 New Jersey students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, New Mexico Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in New Mexico increased 22%, from $7,085 to $8,675 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in New Mexico increased 2% from $18,985 to $19,304 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 22%, median family incomes in New Mexico have increased only 12% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 27% of the average family income in New Mexico is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In New Mexico the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 47% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 58% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In New Mexico, 51% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in New Mexico owed $12,746 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help New Mexico Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, New Mexico college graduates would save $2,549 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in New Mexico earning $31,920,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $12,746,[13] would see a reduction of about $35,[14] or 24%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 2,560 more New Mexico college students would be eligible for $34,982,257 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in New Mexico would increase by $641, from $2,404 to $3,045.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 25,691 New Mexico students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, New York Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in New York increased 21%, from $10,254 to $12,441 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in New York increased 23% from $25,171 to $30,907 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 21%, median family incomes in New York have increased only 10% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 32% of the average family income in New York is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In New York the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 33% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 45% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In New York, 59% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in New York owed $17,594 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help New York Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, New York college graduates would save $3,518 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in New York earning $36,400,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $17,594,[13] would see a reduction of about $39,[14] or 19%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 19,865 more New York college students would be eligible for $321,769,972 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in New York would increase by $677, from $2,543 to $3,220.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 238,254 New York students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, North Carolina Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in North Carolina increased 33%, from $7,080 to $9,450 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in North Carolina increased 22% from $20,169 to $24,600 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 33%, median family incomes in North Carolina have increased only 5% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 25% of the average family income in North Carolina is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In North Carolina the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 43% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 69% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In North Carolina, 62% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in North Carolina owed $16,484 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help North Carolina Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, North Carolina college graduates would save $3,295 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in North Carolina earning $27,572,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $16,484,[13] would see a reduction of about $54,[14] or 29%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 8,145 more North Carolina college students would be eligible for $119,408,727 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in North Carolina would increase by $654, from $2,402 to $3,056.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 90,237 North Carolina students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, North Dakota Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in North Dakota increased 41%, from $6,405 to $9,011 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in North Dakota increased 10% from $11,392 to $12,525 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 41%, median family incomes in North Dakota have increased only 9% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 25% of the average family income in North Dakota is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In North Dakota the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 45% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 67% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In North Dakota, 67% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in North Dakota owed $21,331 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help North Dakota Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, North Dakota college graduates would save $4,265 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in North Dakota earning $24,108,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $21,331,[13] would see a reduction of about $85,[14] or 34%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 928 more North Dakota college students would be eligible for $12,891,548 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in North Dakota would increase by $651, from $2,443 to $3,094.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 8,706 North Dakota students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Ohio Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Ohio increased 46%, from $10,449 to $15,256 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Ohio increased 22% from $21,045 to $25,594 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 46%, median family incomes in Ohio have increased less than 1% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 36% of the average family income in Ohio is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Ohio the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 27% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 43% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Ohio, 62% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Ohio owed $19,665 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Ohio Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Ohio college graduates would save $3,932 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Ohio earning $28,692,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $19,665,[13] would see a reduction of about $62,[14] or 27%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 13,321 more Ohio college students would be eligible for $161,895,211 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Ohio would increase by $628, from $2,420 to $3,048.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 134,885 Ohio students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Oklahoma Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Oklahoma increased 41%, from $6,000 to $8,451 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Oklahoma increased 24% from $15,397 to $19,168 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 41%, median family incomes in Oklahoma have increased only 22% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 23% of the average family income in Oklahoma is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Oklahoma the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 48% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 72% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Oklahoma, 55% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Oklahoma owed $16,297 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Oklahoma Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Oklahoma college graduates would save $3,258 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Oklahoma earning $29,473,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $16,297,[13] would see a reduction of about $50,[14] or 27%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 4,763 more Oklahoma college students would be eligible for $65,939,171 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Oklahoma would increase by $648, from $2,436 to $3,084.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 38,421 Oklahoma students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Oregon Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Oregon increased 30%, from $9,397 to $12,177 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Oregon increased 18% from $23,306 to $27,493 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 30%, median family incomes in Oregon have actually decreased 3% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 34% of the average family income in Oregon is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Oregon the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 33% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 53% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Oregon, 63% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Oregon owed $18,105 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Oregon Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Oregon college graduates would save $3,620 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Oregon earning $33,396,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $18,105,[13] would see a reduction of about $47,[14] or 22%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 3,751 more Oregon college students would be eligible for $50,861,933 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Oregon would increase by $635, from $2,385 to $3,020.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 53,264 Oregon students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Pennsylvania Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Pennsylvania increased 33%, from $11,087 to $14,771 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Pennsylvania increased 24% from $24,779 to $30,637 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 33%, median family incomes in Pennsylvania have increased only 5% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 35% of the average family income in Pennsylvania is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Pennsylvania the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 27% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 41% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Pennsylvania, 72% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Pennsylvania owed $19,866 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Pennsylvania Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Pennsylvania college graduates would save $3,972 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Pennsylvania earning $34,140,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $19,866,[13] would see a reduction of about $50,[14] or 22%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 14,255 more Pennsylvania college students would be eligible for $159,320,010 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Pennsylvania would increase by $637, from $2,388 to $3,025.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 147,850 Pennsylvania students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Rhode Island Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Rhode Island increased 22%, from $11,104 to $13,541 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Rhode Island increased 18% from $26,157 to $30,907 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 22%, median family incomes in Rhode Island have increased only 14% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 35% of the average family income in Rhode Island is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Rhode Island the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 30% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 39% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Rhode Island, 62% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Rhode Island owed $20,826 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Rhode Island Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Rhode Island college graduates would save $4,164 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Rhode Island earning $32,902,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $20,826,[13] would see a reduction of about $55,[14] or 23%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 1,324 more Rhode Island college students would be eligible for $17,414,206 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Rhode Island would increase by $616, from $2,314 to $2,930.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 13,820 Rhode Island students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, South Carolina Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in South Carolina increased 34%, from $9,065 to $12,165 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in South Carolina increased 21% from $17,583 to $21,237 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 34%, median family incomes in South Carolina have increased only 3% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 32% of the average family income in South Carolina is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In South Carolina the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 33% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 50% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In South Carolina, 63% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in South Carolina owed $16,734 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help South Carolina Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, South Carolina college graduates would save $3,346 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in South Carolina earning $27,883,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $16,734,[13] would see a reduction of about $55,[14] or 28%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 4,754 more South Carolina college students would be eligible for $64,369,491 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in South Carolina would increase by $634, from $2,382 to $3,016.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 36,364 South Carolina students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, South Dakota Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in South Dakota increased 28%, from $6,979 to $8,944 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in South Dakota increased 17% from $15,398 to $18,076 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 28%, median family incomes in South Dakota have increased only 13% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 23% of the average family income in South Dakota is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In South Dakota the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 45% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 62% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In South Dakota, 72% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in South Dakota owed $18,889 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help South Dakota Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, South Dakota college graduates would save $3,778 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in South Dakota earning $25,504,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $18,889,[13] would see a reduction of about $70,[14] or 32%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 1,085 more South Dakota college students would be eligible for $14,655,599 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in South Dakota would increase by $633, from $2,378 to $3,011.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 8,167 South Dakota students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Tennessee Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Tennessee increased 23%, from $7,661 to $9,445 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Tennessee increased 21% from $18,139 to $22,035 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 23%, median family incomes in Tennessee have increased only 12% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 27% of the average family income in Tennessee is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Tennessee the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 43% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 62% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Tennessee, 59% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Tennessee owed $19,346 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Tennessee Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Tennessee college graduates would save $3,868 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Tennessee earning $30,449,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $19,346,[13] would see a reduction of about $57,[14] or 26%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 6,146 more Tennessee college students would be eligible for $83,555,197 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Tennessee would increase by $637, from $2,392 to $3,029.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 51,587 Tennessee students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Texas Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Texas increased 34%, from $7,634 to $10,233 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Texas increased 31% from $16,973 to $22,218 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 34%, median family incomes in Texas have increased only 7% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 26% of the average family income in Texas is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Texas the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 40% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 55% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Texas, 56% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Texas owed $16,618 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Texas Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Texas college graduates would save $3,323 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Texas earning $32,741,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $16,618,[13] would see a reduction of about $44,[14] or 23%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 18,032 more Texas college students would be eligible for $330,078,392 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Texas would increase by $650, from $2,416 to $3,066.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 249,008 Texas students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Utah Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Utah increased 26%, from $6,623 to $8,348 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Utah increased 23% from $8,576 to $10,521 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 26%, median family incomes in Utah have increased only 7% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 18% of the average family income in Utah is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Utah the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 49% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 53% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Utah, 44% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Utah owed $11,039 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Utah Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Utah college graduates would save $2,208 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Utah earning $26,130,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $11,039,[13] would see a reduction of about $39,[14] or 31%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 3,795 more Utah college students would be eligible for $51,367,191 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Utah would increase by $634, from $2,381 to $3,015.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 34,229 Utah students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Vermont Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Vermont increased 22%, from $12,836 to $15,658 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Vermont also increased 22%, from $22,312 to $27,261 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 22%, median family incomes in Vermont have increased only 20% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 41% of the average family income in Vermont is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Vermont the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 26% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 30% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Vermont, 69% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Vermont owed $20,604 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Vermont Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Vermont college graduates would save $4,120 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Vermont earning $25,819,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $20,604,[13] would see a reduction of about $75,[14] or 32%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 556 more Vermont college students would be eligible for $7,065,304 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Vermont would increase by $595, from $2,232 to $2,827.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 7,970 Vermont students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Virginia Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Virginia increased 33%, from $8,744 to $11,616 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Virginia increased 24% from $18,700 to $23,277 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 33%, median family incomes in Virginia have increased only 9% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 26% of the average family income in Virginia is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Virginia the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 35% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 42% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Virginia, 63% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Virginia owed $16,474 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Virginia Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Virginia college graduates would save $3,294 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Virginia earning $32,437,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $16,474,[13] would see a reduction of about $45,[14] or 23%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 5,950 more Virginia college students would be eligible for $79,060,021 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Virginia would increase by $623, from $2,337 to $2,960.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 104,936 Virginia students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Washington Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Washington increased 33%, from $8,917 to $11,902 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Washington increased 21% from $21,510 to $26,021 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 33%, median family incomes in Washington have increased only 17% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 31% of the average family income in Washington is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Washington the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 34% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 53% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Washington, 61% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Washington owed $17,601 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Washington Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Washington college graduates would save $3,520 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Washington earning $30,159,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $17,601,[13] would see a reduction of about $52,[14] or 26%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 5,304 more Washington college students would be eligible for $70,854,601 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Washington would increase by $626, from $2,350 to $2,976.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 95,236 Washington students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, West Virginia Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in West Virginia increased 30%, from $7,287 to $9,450 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in West Virginia increased 4% from $18,338 to $19,067 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 30%, median family incomes in West Virginia have increased only 13% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 29% of the average family income in West Virginia is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In West Virginia the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 43% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 51% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In West Virginia, 64% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in West Virginia owed $17,697 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help West Virginia Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, West Virginia college graduates would save $3,538 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in West Virginia earning $26,692,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $17,697,[13] would see a reduction of about $61,[14] or 30%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 2,275 more West Virginia college students would be eligible for $33,115,727 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in West Virginia would increase by $683, from $2,561 to $3,244.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 16,929 West Virginia students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Wisconsin Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public colleges in Wisconsin increased 34%, from $7,385 to $9,872 for tuition, fees, room and board. The cost of attendance at four-year private colleges in Wisconsin increased 21% from $20,271 to $24,574 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 34%, median family incomes in Wisconsin have increased only 2% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 22% of the average family income in Wisconsin is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Wisconsin the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 41% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 58% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Wisconsin, 68% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7] The average student graduating from a four-year college in Wisconsin owed $16,815 on graduation day in 2004.[8]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Wisconsin Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Wisconsin college graduates would save $3,361 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Wisconsin earning $23,952,[12] who graduate with the state average student loan debt of $16,815,[13] would see a reduction of about $67,[14] or 35%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 4,230 more Wisconsin college students would be eligible for $54,569,476 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Wisconsin would increase by $605, from $2,269 to $2,874.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 84,346 Wisconsin students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

A NEW DIRECTION FOR AMERICA

Bush Republicans Take Us in the Wrong Direction, Wyoming Students Pay the Price

Despite the critical need to boost affordable college opportunities for all Americans, the Republican-led Congress continues to put college even further out of reach for millions of students. Each year millions of hardworking American families and students continue to struggle to cover college costs. But five years of Republican policies have resulted in stagnant federal grant aid, increasing numbers of students and their families falling further into debt to finance a college education, and fewer options for college graduates.

The Cost of College Has Soared. Between the 2000-2001 and 2004-2005 school years, the cost of attendance at four-year public college in Wyoming increased 21%, from $7,017 to $8,514 for tuition, fees, room and board.[1]

Median Family Incomes Have Remained Stagnant. While public college costs have increased 21%, median family incomes in Wyoming have increased only 15% since 2000.[2] After financial aid is taken into account, 24% of the average family income in Wyoming is needed to pay for tuition at a four-year public college.[3]

Federal Student Aid Has Eroded Over Time. In Wyoming the maximum Pell grant, which has remained at $4,050 for the past four years, covered only 48% of the average public four-year college tuition, fees, room and board in 2004-2005 – down from 62% in 1986-1987.[4] In 1975-1976, 77% of federal aid going to students nationally was in the form of grants, and only 20% was loans. In 2004-2005, it was 70% loans, 20% grants.[5]

Students Have Taken on More Debt to Pay for College. More students are leaving college in debt. In 2004, nearly two-thirds of all four-year college graduates nationwide had loan debt, compared with less than one-third of graduates in 1993.[6] In Wyoming, 43% of undergraduates took out loans to finance their college education.[7]

Increased Debt Levels Are Impacting Students' Career and Life Choices. Nationally, nearly a quarter of public four-year college graduates and over a third of private four-year college graduates have too much debt to manage on a starting teacher's salary.[9] Debt levels are also causing students to delay buying a home or a car and postpone marriage or having children.[10]

To Reverse these Trends, Democrats Propose a New Direction to Help Wyoming Students.

- Democrats opposed recent Republican efforts to raise student loan interest rates, and have called for a reduction in interest rates. If interest rates were cut in half, Wyoming college graduates who graduate with student loan debt equal to the national average could save $3,859 over the ten-year life of their loans.[11]
- Democrats have also called for debt relief for college graduates with excessive loan burdens. If federal student loan payments were capped at 15% of a borrower's discretionary income, starting teachers in Wyoming earning $28,900,[12] who graduate with the national average student loan debt of $19,300,[13] would see a reduction of about $61,[14] or 27%, in their monthly loan payments. For individuals who continue in public service careers for 10 years, student loan debt would be forgiven.
- Democrats have called for increasing the maximum Pell Grant from $4,050 to $5,100. With an increase in the Pell Grant, 552 more Wyoming college students would be eligible for $7,430,644 in additional need-based grant aid.[15] The average grant in Wyoming would increase by $631, from $2,368 to $2,999.[16]
- Democrats have also called for an extension of the college tuition tax deduction, which expired at the end of 2005, and have proposed increasing the allowable deduction to $12,000. In the 2003 tax year, 7,551 Wyoming students and families benefited from the tuition tax deduction.[17]

Sources for State Pages:

[1] National Center for Education Statistics, "Digest of Education Statistics 2001" and "Digest of Higher Education Statistics 2005."
[2] HELP Committee calculations based on data from US Census Bureau, Historical Income Tables.
[3] The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, "Measuring Up 2004: The National Report Card on Higher Education."
[4] HELP Committee Calculations based on cost of attendance data from National Center for Education Statistics, "Digest of Education Statistics 1988" and "Digest of Education Statistics 2005"; and maximum Pell Grant data from Congressional Resource Service. Data for Delaware and Wyoming from Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System ("Digest of Education Statistics 1988" data incomplete for those states)
[5] College Board, 2006.
[6] State PIRGs' Higher Education Project "Paying Back, Not Giving Back: Student Debt's Negative Impact on Public Service Career Opportunities," April 2006.
[7] Proportion of Student Loan Borrowers Among Full-Time First-Time Undergraduates at Four-Year Institutions. Calculations by the Project on Student Debt at the Institute for College Access and Success based on data from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), 2004, Data Analysis System (DAS).
[8] Average Debt of Graduates from Four-Year Colleges and Universities. Calculations by the Project on Student Debt at the Institute for College Access and Success from campus data available on www.economicdiversity.org. Includes only campuses reporting total debt through the Common Data Set initiative. Averages are weighted by campus enrollment.
[9] State PIRGs' Higher Education Project "Paying Back, Not Giving Back: Student Debt's Negative Impact on Public Service Career Opportunities," April 2006.
[10] Nellie Mae Corporation, "College on Credit: How Borrowers Perceive Their Education Debt – Results of the 2002 National Student Loan Survey," February 2003.
[11] HELP Committee Calculations using the U.S. Department of Education's "Standard, Extended and Graduated Repayment Calculator" (http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSFAP/DirectLoan/RepayCalc/dlentry1.html), using average debt levels calculated by the Project on Student Debt at the Institute for College Access and Success from campus data available on www.economicdiversity.org. Average debt data not available for Wyoming.
[12] American Federation of Teachers, "Survey and Analysis of Teacher Salary Trends 2004."
[13] Calculations by the Project on Student Debt at the Institute for College Access and Success from campus data available on www.economicdiversity.org. Includes only campuses reporting total debt through the Common Data Set initiative. Averages are weighted by campus enrollment.
[14] HELP Committee estimates calculated using the U.S. Department of Education's "Income Contingent Repayment Plan Calculator" (http://www.ed.gov/offices/OSFAP/DirectLoan/RepayCalc/dlentry2.html), using average debt levels calculated by the Project on Student Debt at the Institute for College Access and Success from campus data available on www.economicdiversity.org. Calculations based on formula for current Income Contingent Repayment option in the Direct Loan Program (either 20% cap on income or income percentage factors); actual reduction in monthly payment resulting from Democratic proposal to cap payments at 15% of income might differ slightly from estimates provided. Democratic proposal also expands income contingent repayment option to all borrowers.
[15] American Council on Education.
[16] HELP Committee calculations based on data provided by American Council on Education.
[17] IRS Statistics of Income Division, Tax Year 2003, data compiled by the Senate Finance Committee.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 3594. A bill to help protect the public against the threat of attacks targeting nuclear power plants; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Secure Nuclear Facilities Act of 2006, which addresses an unacceptable gap in our Nation's homeland security. My bill would hold commercial nuclear powerplants to the same high security standards to which government nuclear facilities are subject.

There are currently 104 nuclear powerplants licensed to operate in the United States, including two plants, with two reactors each, in my home state of California.

These plants are potential targets for terrorists, and we are not doing enough to ensure they are protected. The 9/11 Commission report, issued on July 22, 2004, stated that nuclear powerplants were among the targets considered in the original plan for the September 11, 2001, attacks.

An attack on a nuclear plant would be disastrous. The meltdown of a nuclear powerplant's nuclear reactor core, release of the spent nuclear fuel located at the site, removal from the site of radioactive materials, or other violation of the plant's security would greatly endanger public health and safety. Unfortunately, there are reports of nuclear plant operators' failure to effectively address vital security issues, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's failure to hold them sufficiently accountable.

To make matters worse, commercial nuclear plant operators are not currently required to defend their plants against theft and diversion of nuclear material. Nonweapon nuclear facilities operated by the government, on the other hand, are required to defend against not only direct attacks, but also theft and diversion of nuclear material. This double standard makes no sense.

Commercial nuclear plants contain materials that terrorists might attempt to steal, just like government nuclear facilities. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission, NRC, concedes that terrorists might use these highly radioactive materials in a radiological bomb or, with the right equipment, reprocess it into weapons-grade material. But according to the NRC, it is not reasonable to expect a private facility to cope with this threat, because private facilities do not have the same resources as government facilities.

The NRC's argument is deeply flawed. If nuclear plant owners and operators cannot address the full spectrum of terrorist threats they face, then they should not be in business. There is too much at stake in terms of the dangers posed by these threats for us to allow continued low security standards for commercial nuclear plants.

My bill would require commercial nuclear plants to defend against the same potential threats as government nuclear facilities, including threat and diversion of nuclear materials. The bill would also strengthen State and local responders' ability to aid nuclear plants in case of an attack by terrorists. It offers grants to State and local responders to facilitate evacuations and medical treatment, as well as interoperable communications among first responders and plant operators.

The Secure Nuclear Facilities Act of 2006 would make our country safer by ensuring better security at commercial nuclear plants. I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. LIEBERMAN, and Mr. CARPER):

S. 3595. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the United States Emergency Management Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3595

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''United States Emergency Management Authority Act of 2006''.

SEC. 2. UNITED STATES EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY.

Title V of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 311 et seq.) is amended by—

(1) striking the title heading and inserting the following:

''TITLE V—NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE'';

(2) striking sections 501 through 503;

(3) striking sections 506 and 507;

(4) redesignating sections 504, 505, 508, and 509 as sections 519, 520, 521, and 522, respectively;

(5) redesignating section 510 (relating to procurement of security countermeasures for the strategic national stockpile) as section 523;

(6) redesignating section 510 (relating to urban and other high risk area communications capabilities) as section 524; and

(7) inserting before section 519, as so redesignated by this section, the following:

''SEC. 501. DEFINITIONS.

''In this title—

''(1) the term 'all-hazards-plus' means an approach to preparedness, response, recovery, and mitigation that emphasizes the development of capabilities that are common to natural and man-made disasters, while also including the development of capabilities that are uniquely relevant to specific types of disasters;

''(2) the term 'Authority' means the United States Emergency Management Authority established under section 502;

''(3) the term 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the Authority;

''(4) the term 'Federal coordinating officer' means a Federal coordinating officer as described in section 302 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5143);

''(5) the term 'National Advisory Council' means the National Advisory Council on Emergency Preparedness and Response established under section 508;

''(6) the term 'National Incident Management System' means the National Incident Management System as described in the National Response Plan;

''(7) the term 'National Response Plan' means the National Response Plan prepared under Homeland Security Presidential Directive 5 or any presidential directive meant to replace or augment that directive;

''(8) the term 'Nuclear Incident Response Team' means a resource that includes—

''(A) those entities of the Department of Energy that perform nuclear or radiological emergency support functions (including accident response, search response, advisory, and technical operations functions), radiation exposure functions at the medical assistance facility known as the Radiation Emergency Assistance Center/Training Site (REAC/TS), radiological assistance functions, and related functions; and

''(B) those entities of the Environmental Protection Agency that perform such support functions (including radiological emergency response functions) and related functions;

''(9) the term 'Regional Advisory Council' means a Regional Advisory Council on Preparedness and Response established under section 503;

''(10) the term 'Regional Administrator' means a Regional Administrator for Preparedness and Response appointed under section 507;

''(11) the term 'Regional Office' means a Regional Office established under section 507; and

''(12) the term 'surge capacity' means the ability to rapidly and substantially increase the provision of search and rescue capabilities, food, water, medicine, shelter and housing, medical care, evacuation capacity, staffing, including disaster assistance employees, and other resources necessary to save lives and protect property during a catastrophic incident, or other natural or man-made disaster.

''SEC. 502. UNITED STATES EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Department the United States Emergency Management Authority, headed by an Administrator.

''(b) MISSION.—The mission of the Authority is to—

''(1) lead the Nation's efforts to prepare for, respond to, recover from, and mitigate the risks of natural and man-made disasters, including catastrophic incidents;

''(2) partner with State and local governments and emergency response providers, with other Federal agencies, with the private sector, and with nongovernmental organizations to build a national system of emergency management that can effectively and efficiently utilize the full measure of the Nation's resources to respond to a catastrophic incident or other natural or man-made disaster;

''(3) develop a Federal response capability that, when necessary and appropriate, can act effectively, rapidly, and proactively to deliver assistance essential to saving lives or protecting or preserving property or public health and safety in a natural or man-made disaster;

''(4) fuse the Department's emergency response, preparedness, recovery, mitigation, and critical infrastructure assets into a new, integrated organization that can effectively confront the challenges of a natural or man-made disaster;

''(5) develop and maintain robust Regional Offices that will work with State and local

governments and emergency response providers to identify and address regional priorities;

''(6) under the leadership of the Secretary, coordinate with the Commandant of the Coast Guard, the Director of Customs and Border Protection, the Director of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and the National Operations Center, and other agencies and offices in the Department to take full advantage of the substantial range of resources in the Department that can be brought to bear in preparing for and responding to a natural or man-made disaster;

''(7) carry out the provisions of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.);

''(8) provide funding, training, exercises, technical assistance, planning, and other assistance, to build local, State, regional, and national capabilities, including communications capabilities, necessary to respond to a potential natural or man-made disaster;

''(9) implement an all-hazards-plus strategy for preparedness that places priority on building those common capabilities necessary to respond to both terrorist attacks and natural disasters while also building the unique capabilities necessary to respond to specific types of incidents that pose the greatest risk to our Nation; and

''(10) promote, plan for, and facilitate the security of critical infrastructure and key resources, including cyber infrastructure, against a natural or man-made disaster, and the post-disaster restoration of such critical infrastructure and key resources.

''(c) ADMINISTRATOR.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

''(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—The Administrator shall have not less than 5 years of executive leadership and management experience in the public or private sector and a demonstrated ability to manage a substantial staff and budget.

''(3) REPORTING.—The Administrator shall report to the Secretary, without being required to report through any other official of the Department.

''(4) PRINCIPAL ADVISOR ON EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator is the principal emergency preparedness and response advisor to the President, the Homeland Security Council, and the Secretary.

''(B) ADVICE AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In presenting advice with respect to any matter to the President, the Homeland Security Council, or the Secretary, the Administrator shall, as the Administrator considers appropriate, inform the President, the Homeland Security Council, or the Secretary, as the case may be, of the range of emergency mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery options with respect to that matter.

''(ii) ADVICE ON REQUEST.—The Administrator, as an emergency preparedness and response advisor, shall provide advice to the President, the Homeland Security Council, or the Secretary on a particular matter when the President, the Homeland Security Council, or the Secretary requests such advice.

''(iii) RECOMMENDATIONS TO CONGRESS.—After informing the Secretary, the Administrator may make such recommendations to Congress relating to emergency preparedness and response as the Administrator considers appropriate.

''(C) RETENTION OF AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as affecting the authority of the Secretary under this Act.

''SEC. 503. AUTHORITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall provide Federal leadership necessary to prepare for and respond to a natural or man-made disaster, including—

''(1) carrying out the mission to reduce the loss of life and property and protect the Nation from all hazards by leading and supporting the Nation in a comprehensive, risk-based emergency preparedness and response program of—

''(A) mitigation, by taking sustained actions to reduce or eliminate long-term risk to people and property from hazards and their effects;

''(B) preparedness, by planning, training, and building the emergency preparedness and response workforce to prepare effectively for, mitigate against, respond to, and recover from any hazard;

''(C) response, by conducting emergency operations to save lives and property through positioning emergency equipment, personnel, and supplies, through evacuating potential victims, through providing food, water, shelter, and medical care to those in need, and through restoring critical public services;

''(D) recovery, by rebuilding communities so individuals, businesses, and governments can function on their own, return to normal life, and protect against future hazards; and

''(E) critical infrastructure protection, by establishing an inventory of, and protections for, public and private sector critical infrastructure, including cyber and communications assets;

''(2) increasing efficiencies, by coordinating efforts relating to mitigation, preparedness, response, recovery, and infrastructure protection;

''(3) helping to ensure the effectiveness of emergency response providers in responding to a natural or man-made disaster;

''(4) providing the Federal Government's response to a natural or man-made disaster, including—

''(A) managing such response;

''(B) directing the Domestic Emergency Support Team, the National Disaster Medical System, and (when operating as an organizational unit of the Department under this title) the Nuclear Incident Response Team;

''(C) overseeing the Metropolitan Medical Response System; and

''(D) coordinating other Federal response resources, including requiring deployment of the Strategic National Stockpile, in the event of a natural or man-made disaster;

''(5) working with Federal, State, and local government personnel, agencies, and authorities to build a comprehensive national incident management system to respond to a natural or man-made disaster;

''(6) with respect to the Nuclear Incident Response Team (regardless of whether it is operating as an organizational unit of the Department under this title)—

''(A) establishing standards and certifying when those standards have been met;

''(B) conducting joint and other exercises and training and evaluating performance; and

''(C) providing funds to the Department of Energy and the Environmental Protection Agency, as appropriate, for homeland security planning, exercises and training, and equipment;

''(7) helping to ensure that emergency response providers acquire interoperable and sustainable technology;

''(8) assisting the President in carrying out the functions under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.);

''(9) administering homeland security emergency management, first responder, and other preparedness grants;

''(10) monitoring, evaluating, and ensuring the readiness of each emergency support function under the National Response Plan;

''(11) coordinating with the National Advisory Council;

''(12) ensuring the protection of critical infrastructure by—

''(A) carrying out the responsibilities under paragraphs (2) through (6) of section 201(d);

''(B) helping ensure the protection and resiliency of key resources and critical infrastructure, including cyber infrastructure, against a natural or man-made disaster; and

''(C) planning for, assisting with, and facilitating, the restoration of key resources and critical infrastructure, including cyber infrastructure, in the event of a natural or man-made disaster;

''(13) establishing in each Regional Office a Regional Advisory Council on Preparedness and Response, to advise the Regional Administrator of that Regional Office on emergency preparedness and response issues specific to the region; and

''(14) otherwise carrying out the mission of the Authority as described in section 502(b).

''(b) ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES RELATED TO CATASTROPHIC INCIDENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary and other senior Department officials, shall develop a national emergency management system that is capable of responding to catastrophic incidents.

''(2) IDENTIFICATION OF RESOURCES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall develop and submit to Congress annually an estimate of the resources of the Authority and other Federal agencies needed for and devoted specifically to developing local, State, and national capabilities necessary to respond to a catastrophic incident.

''(B) CONTENTS.—Each estimate under subparagraph (A) shall include the resources both necessary for and devoted to—

''(i) planning;

''(ii) training and exercises;

''(iii) Regional Office enhancements;

''(iv) staffing, including for surge capacity during a catastrophic event;

''(v) additional logistics capabilities;

''(vi) other responsibilities under the Catastrophic Incident Annex of the National Response Plan; and

''(vii) State and local catastrophic preparedness.

''(c) ALL-HAZARDS-PLUS APPROACH.—In carrying out this section, the Administrator shall implement an all-hazards-plus strategy that places priority on building those common capabilities necessary to prepare for, respond to, recover from, and mitigate the risks of terrorist attacks and natural disasters, while also building the unique capabilities necessary to prepare for, respond to, recover from, and mitigate the risks of specific types of incidents that pose the greatest risk to the Nation.

''SEC. 504. AUTHORITY COMPONENTS.

''There are transferred to the Authority the following:

''(1) The Federal Emergency Management Agency, including the functions of the Under Secretary for Federal Emergency Management relating thereto.

''(2) The Directorate of Preparedness, as constituted on June 1, 2006, including the functions of the Under Secretary for Emergency Preparedness relating to the Directorate, as constituted on that date.

''SEC. 505. PRESERVING THE UNITED STATES EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY.

''(a) DISTINCT ENTITY.—The Authority shall be maintained as a distinct entity within the Department.

''(b) REORGANIZATION.—Section 872 shall not apply to the Authority, including any function or organizational unit of the Authority.

''(c) PROHIBITION ON CHANGES TO MISSIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may not substantially or significantly reduce the authorities, responsibilities, or functions of the Authority or the capability of the Authority to perform those responsibilities, except as otherwise specifically provided in an Act enacted after the date of enactment of the United States Emergency Management Authority Act of 2006.

''(2) CERTAIN TRANSFERS PROHIBITED.—No asset, function or mission of the Authority may be diverted to the principal and continuing use of any other organization, unit, or entity of the Department, except for details or assignments that do not reduce the capability of the Authority to perform its missions.

''SEC. 506. DIRECTORS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There shall be in the Authority a Director for Preparedness and a Director for Response and Recovery, each of whom shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall report to the Administrator.

''(b) QUALIFICATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A Director shall have—

''(A) not less than 5 years of—

''(i) executive leadership and management experience in the public or private sector; and

''(ii) significant experience in crisis management or another relevant field; and

''(B) a demonstrated ability to manage a substantial staff and budget.

''(2) CONCURRENT EXPERIENCE.—Service during any period of time may be used in meeting the requirements under both clause (i) and (ii) of paragraph (1)(A).

''(c) INITIAL DIRECTORS.—The individual serving as the Under Secretary for Emergency Preparedness and the individual serving as the Under Secretary for the Federal Emergency Management Agency on the effective date of the United States Emergency Management Authority Act of 2006 may serve as the Director for Preparedness and the Director of Response and Recovery, respectively, until a Director for Preparedness or a Director of Response and Recovery, as the case may be, is appointed under subsection (a).

''SEC. 507. REGIONAL OFFICES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) REGIONAL OFFICES.—The Administrator shall establish 10 Regional Offices of the Authority.

''(2) ADDITIONAL OFFICE.—In additon to the Regional Offices established under paragraph (1), the Administrator may designate the Office for National Capital Region Coordination under section 882 as a Regional Office.

''(b) MANAGEMENT OF REGIONAL OFFICES.—

''(1) REGIONAL ADMINISTRATOR.—Each Regional Office shall be headed by a Regional Administrator for Preparedness and Response, who shall be appointed by the Secretary. Each Regional Administrator for Emergency Preparedness and Response shall report directly to the Administrator.

''(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—Each Regional Office shall be headed by an individual in the Senior Executive Service qualified to act as a senior Federal coordinating officer to provide strategic oversight of incident management when needed.

''(c) RESPONSIBILITIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Regional Administrator shall work in partnership with State and local governments, emergency managers, emergency response providers, medical providers, the private sector, nongovernmental organizations, multijurisdictional councils of governments, and regional planning commissions and organizations in the geographical area served by the Regional Office to carry out the responsibilities of a Regional Administrator under this section.

''(2) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The responsibilities of a Regional Administrator include—

''(A) ensuring effective, coordinated, and integrated regional preparedness, mitigation, response, and recovery activities and programs for natural and man-made disasters (including planning, training, exercises, and professional development);

''(B) coordinating and integrating regional preparedness, mitigation, response, and recovery activities and programs for natural and man-made disasters (including planning, training, exercises, and professional development), which shall include—

''(i) providing regional and interstate planning assistance;

''(ii) organizing, in consultation with the Administrator, regional training and exercise programs;

''(iii) providing support and coordination officers for State and local government training and exercises;

''(iv) participating in emergency preparedness and planning activities by State, regional, and local governments;

''(v) assisting in the development of regional capabilities needed for a national catastrophic response system; and

''(vi) helping to coordinate and develop interstate agreements;

''(C) establishing and overseeing 1 or more strike teams within the region under subsection (e), which shall serve as the focal point of the Federal Government's initial response efforts for a natural or man-made disaster within that region, and otherwise building Federal response capabilities to respond to a natural or man-made disaster within that region;

''(D) working with the private sector to assess weaknesses in critical infrastructure protection in the region and to design and implement programs to address those weaknesses;

''(E) coordinating all activities conducted under this section with other Federal departments and agencies; and

''(F) performing such other duties relating to such responsibilities as the Administrator may require.

''(d) AREA OFFICES.—The Administrator shall establish an Area Office for the Pacific and an Area Office for the Caribbean, as components in the appropriate Regional Offices.

''(e) REGIONAL OFFICE STRIKE TEAMS.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—In coordination with other relevant Federal agencies, each Regional Administrator shall establish multiagency strike teams that shall consist of—

''(A) a designated Federal coordinating officer;

''(B) personnel trained in incident management;

''(C) public affairs, response and recovery, and communications support personnel;

''(D) a defense coordinating officer;

''(E) liaisons to other Federal agencies;

''(F) such other personnel as the Administrator or Regional Administrator determines appropriate; and

''(G) individuals from the agencies with primary responsibility for each of the emergency support functions in the National Response Plan, including the following:

''(i) Transportation.

''(ii) Communications.

''(iii) Public works and engineering.

''(iv) Emergency management.

''(v) Mass care.

''(vi) Housing and human services.

''(vii) Public health and medical services.

''(viii) Urban search and rescue.

''(ix) Public safety and security.

''(x) External affairs.

''(2) LOCATION OF MEMBERS.—The members of each Regional Office strike team, including representatives from agencies other than the Department, shall be based primarily at the Regional Office that corresponds to that strike team.

''(3) COORDINATION.—Each Regional Office strike team shall coordinate the training and exercises of that strike team with the State and local governments and private sector and nongovernmental entities which the strike team shall support when a natural or man-made disaster occurs.

''(4) PREPAREDNESS.—Each Regional Office strike team shall be trained, equipped, and staffed to be well prepared to respond to natural and man-made disasters, including catastrophic incidents.

''(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as necessary to carry out this subsection.

''SEC. 508. NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of the United States Emergency Management Authority Act of 2006, the Secretary shall establish an advisory body under section 871(a), to be known as the National Advisory Council on Emergency Preparedness and Response.

''(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The National Advisory Council shall advise the Administrator on all aspects of emergency preparedness and response.

''(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The members of the National Advisory Council shall be appointed by the Administrator, and shall, to the extent practicable, represent a geographic (including urban and rural) and substantive cross section of State and local government officials and emergency managers, and emergency response providers, from State and local governments, the private sector, and nongovernmental organizations, including as appropriate—

''(A) members selected from the emergency preparedness and response fields, including fire service, law enforcement, hazardous materials response, emergency medical services, and emergency preparedness and response personnel;

''(B) health scientists, emergency and inpatient medical providers, and public health professionals;

''(C) experts representing standards setting organizations;

''(D) State and local government officials with expertise in terrorism preparedness and emergency preparedness and response;

''(E) elected State and local government executives;

''(F) experts in public and private sector infrastructure protection, cybersecurity, and communications;

''(G) representatives of the disabled and other special needs populations; and

''(H) such other individuals as the Administrator determines to be appropriate.

''(d) APPLICABILITY OF FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 871(a) and subject to paragraph (2), the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.), including subsections (a), (b), and (d) of section 10 of such Act, and section 552b(c) of title 5, United States Code, shall apply to the Advisory Council.

''(2) TERMINATION.—Section 14(a)(2)(B) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Advisory Council.

"SEC. 509. NATIONAL INCIDENT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM INTEGRATION CENTER.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There is in the Authority a National Incident Management System Integration Center.

''(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator, through the National Incident Management System Integration Center, and in consultation with other Federal departments and agencies and the National Advisory Council, shall ensure ongoing management and maintenance of the National Incident Management System, the National Response Plan, any other document or tool in support of Homeland Security Presidential Directive 5, or any other Homeland Security Presidential Directive relating to incident management and response.

''(2) SPECIFIC RESPONSIBILITIES.—The National Incident Management System Integration Center shall—

''(A) periodically review, and revise, as appropriate, the National Incident Management System and the National Response Plan;

''(B) review other matters relating to the National Incident Management System and the National Response Plan, as the Administrator may require;

''(C) develop and implement a national program for National Incident Management System and National Response Plan education and awareness;

''(D) oversee all aspects of the National Incident Management System, including the development of compliance criteria and implementation activities at Federal, State, and local government levels;

''(E) provide guidance and assistance to States and local governments and emergency response providers, in adopting the National Incident Management System; and

''(F) perform such other duties relating to such responsibilities as the Administrator may require.

"SEC. 510. NATIONAL OPERATIONS CENTER.

''(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'situational awareness' means information gathered from a variety of sources that, when communicated to emergency preparedness and response managers and decision makers, can form the basis for incident management decisionmaking.

''(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Department a National Operations Center.

''(c) PURPOSE.—The purposes of the National Operations Center are to—

''(1) coordinate the national response to any natural or man-made disaster, as determined by the Secretary;

''(2) provide situational awareness and a common operating picture for the entire Federal Government, and for State and local governments as appropriate, for an event described in paragraph (1);

''(3) collect and analyze information to help deter, detect, and prevent terrorist acts;

''(4) disseminate terrorism and disaster-related information to Federal, State, and local governments;

''(5) ensure that critical terrorism and disaster-related information reaches government decision-makers; and

''(6) perform such other duties as the Secretary may require.

''(d) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The National Operations Center shall carry out the responsibilities of the Homeland Security Operations Center, the National Response Coordination Center, and the Interagency Incident Management Group, as constituted on the date of enactment of the United States Emergency Management Authority Act of 2006.

"SEC. 511. CHIEF MEDICAL OFFICER.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There is in the Authority a Chief Medical Officer, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Chief Medical Officer shall report directly to the Administrator.

''(b) QUALIFICATIONS.—The individual appointed as Chief Medical Officer shall possess a demonstrated ability in and knowledge of medicine and public health.

''(c) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Chief Medical Officer shall have the primary responsibility within the Department for medical issues related to natural and man-made disasters, including—

''(1) serving as the principal advisor to the Secretary and the Administrator on medical and public health issues;

''(2) coordinating the biosurveillance and detection activities of the Department;

''(3) ensuring internal and external coordination of all medical preparedness and response activities of the Department, including training, exercises, and equipment support;

''(4) serving as the Department's primary point of contact with the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Defense, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Transportation, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other Federal departments or agencies, on medical and public health issues;

''(5) serving as the Department's primary point of contact for State and local government, the medical community, and others within and outside the Department, with respect to medical and public health matters;

''(6) discharging, in coordination with the Under Secretary for Science and Technology, the responsibilities of the Department related to Project Bioshield;

''(7) establishing doctrine and priorities for the National Disaster Medical System, consistent with the National Response Plan and the National Incident Management System, supervising its medical components, and exercising predeployment operational control, including—

''(A) determining composition of the teams;

''(B) overseeing credentialing of the teams; and

''(C) training personnel of the teams;

''(8) establishing doctrine and priorities for the Metropolitan Medical Response System, consistent with the National Response Plan and the National Incident Management System;

''(9) managing the Metropolitan Medical Response System, including developing and overseeing standards, plans, training, and exercises and coordinating with the Office of Grants and Training on the use and distribution of Metropolitan Medical Response grants;

''(10) assessing and monitoring long-term health issues of emergency managers and emergency response providers;

''(11) developing and updating, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, guidelines for State and local governments for medical response plans for chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, or explosive weapon attacks;

''(12) developing, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, appropriate patient tracking capabilities to execute domestic patient movement and evacuations, including a system that has the capacity of electronically maintaining and transmitting the health information of hospital patients;

''(13) establishing and providing oversight for the Department's occupational health and safety program, including workforce health; and

''(14) performing such other duties relating to such responsibilities as the Secretary or the Administrator may require.

''(d) LONG-TERM HEALTH ASSESSMENT PROGRAM.—The Chief Medical Officer, in consultation with the Director of the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, shall establish a program to assess, monitor, and study the health and safety of emergency managers and emergency response providers, following Incidents of National Significance declared by the Secretary under the National Response Plan.

"SEC. 512. PUBLIC AND COMMUNITY PREPAREDNESS.

''The Administrator shall promote public and community preparedness.

"SEC. 513. SAVER PROGRAM.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Department there is a System Assessment and Validation for Emergency Responders Program to provide impartial evaluations of emergency response equipment and systems.

''(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The program established under subsection (a) shall—

''(1) provide impartial, practitioner relevant, and operationally oriented assessments and validations of emergency response provider equipment and systems that have not already been third-party certified to a standard adopted by the Department, including—

''(A) commercial, off-the-shelf emergency response provider equipment and systems in all equipment list categories of the Standardized Equipment List published by the Interagency Board for Equipment Standardization and Interoperability; and

''(B) such other equipment or systems as the Secretary determines are appropriate;

''(2) provide information that enables decision-makers and emergency response providers to better select, procure, use, and maintain emergency response provider equipment or systems;

''(3) assess and validate the performance of products within a system and subsystems; and

''(4) provide information and feedback to emergency response providers through the Responder Knowledge Base of the National Memorial Institute for the Prevention of Terrorism, or other appropriate forum.

''(c) ASSESSMENT AND VALIDATION PROCESS.—The assessment and validation of emergency response provider equipment and systems shall use multiple evaluation techniques, including—

''(1) operational assessments of equipment performance on vehicle platforms;

''(2) technical assessments on a comparative basis of system component performance across makes and models under controlled conditions; and

''(3) integrative assessments on an individual basis of system component interoperability and compatibility with other system components.

''(d) PERSONAL PROTECTIVE EQUIPMENT.—To the extent practical, the assessment and validation of personal protective equipment under this section shall be conducted by the National Personal Protective Technology Laboratory of the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health.

"SEC. 514. NATIONAL SEARCH AND RESCUE RESPONSE SYSTEM.

''(a) NATIONAL SEARCH AND RESCUE RESPONSE SYSTEM.—There is established in the Authority an emergency response system known as the National Search and Rescue Response System that provides a national network of standardized search and rescue resources to assist State and local governments in responding to any natural or man-made disaster.

''(b) ADMINISTRATION OF THE SYSTEM.—

''(1) TASK FORCE PARTICIPATION.—The Administrator shall select eligible search and rescue teams that are sponsored by State

and local government entities to participate as task forces in the National Search and Rescue Response System. The Administrator shall determine the criteria for such participation.

''(2) AGREEMENTS WITH SPONSORING AGENCIES.—The Administrator shall enter into an agreement with the State or local government entity that sponsors each search and rescue team selected under paragraph (1) with respect the team's participation as a task force in the National Search and Rescue Response System.

''(3) MANAGEMENT AND TECHNICAL TEAMS.—The Administrator shall maintain such management and other technical teams as are necessary to administer the National Search and Rescue Response System.

''SEC. 515. METROPOLITAN MEDICAL RESPONSE SYSTEM.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There is in the Authority a Metropolitan Medical Response System. Under the Metropolitan Medical Response System, the Assistant Secretary for Grants and Planning, in coordination with the Chief Medical Officer, shall administer grants to develop, maintain, and enhance medical preparedness systems that are capable of responding effectively to a public health crisis or mass-casualty event caused by a natural or man-made disaster.

''(b) USE OF FUNDS.—The Metropolitan Medical Response System shall make grants to local governments to enhance any of the following activities:

''(1) Medical surge capacity.

''(2) Mass prophylaxis.

''(3) Chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, and explosive detection, response, and decontamination capabilities.

''(4) Emergency communications capabilities.

''(5) Information sharing and collaboration capabilities.

''(6) Regional collaboration.

''(7) Triage and pre-hospital treatment.

''(8) Medical supply management and distribution.

''(9) Fatality management.

''(10) Such other activities as the Secretary may provide.

''SEC. 516. EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT ASSISTANCE COMPACT AUTHORIZATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Administrator, may make grants for the purposes of administering and improving the Emergency Management Assistance Compact consented to by the Joint Resolution entitled 'Joint Resolution granting the consent of Congress to the Emergency Management Assistance Compact' (Public Law 104–321; 110 Stat. 3877).

''(b) USES.—A grant under this section shall be used to—

''(1) carry out recommendations identified in after-action reports for the 2004 and 2005 hurricane season issued under the Emergency Management Assistance Compact;

''(2) coordinate with the Department and other Federal Government agencies;

''(3) coordinate with State and local government entities and their respective national associations;

''(4) assist State and local governments with credentialing emergency response providers and the typing of emergency response resources; or

''(5) administer the operations of the Emergency Management Assistance Compact.

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section $4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2007 through 2010. Amounts appropriated under this section shall remain available for 3 fiscal years after the date on which such funds are appropriated.

''SEC. 517. OFFICE FOR THE PREVENTION OF TERRORISM.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Department an Office for the Prevention of Terrorism, which shall be headed by a Director.

''(b) DIRECTOR.—

''(1) REPORTING.—The Director of the Office for the Prevention of Terrorism shall report directly to the Secretary.

''(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—The Director of the Office for the Prevention of Terrorism shall have an appropriate background with experience in law enforcement, intelligence, or other anti-terrorist functions.

''(c) ASSIGNMENT OF PERSONNEL.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall assign to the Office for the Prevention of Terrorism permanent staff and other appropriate personnel detailed from other components of the Department to carry out the responsibilities under this section.

''(2) LIAISONS.—The Secretary shall designate senior employees from each component of the Department that has significant antiterrorism responsibilities to act a liaison between that component and the Office for the Prevention of Terrorism.

''(d) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Director of the Office for the Prevention of Terrorism shall—

''(1) coordinate policy and operations between the Department and State and local government agencies relating to preventing acts of terrorism within the United States;

''(2) serve as a liaison between State and local law enforcement agencies and the Department;

''(3) in coordination with the Office of Intelligence, develop better methods for the sharing of intelligence with State and local law enforcement agencies;

''(4) coordinate with the Office of Grants and Training to ensure that homeland security grants to State and local government agencies are adequately focused on terrorism prevention activities; and

''(5) coordinate with the Authority, the Department of Justice, the National Institute of Justice, law enforcement organizations, and other appropriate entities to develop national voluntary consensus standards for training and personal protective equipment to be used in a tactical environment by law enforcement officers.

''(e) PILOT PROJECT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office for the Prevention of Terrorism, in coordination with the Director for Response, shall establish a pilot project to determine the efficacy and feasibility of establishing law enforcement deployment teams.

''(2) FUNCTION.—The law enforcement deployment teams participating in the pilot program under this subsection shall form the basis of a national network of standardized law enforcement resources to assist State and local governments in responding to a natural or man-made disaster.

''(f) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to effect the roles or responsibilities of the Department of Justice.

''SEC. 518. DEPARTMENT OFFICIALS.

''(a) CYBERSECURITY AND TELECOMMUNICATIONS.—There is in the Department an Assistant Secretary for Cybersecurity and Telecommunications.

''(b) UNITED STATES FIRE ADMINISTRATION.—The Administrator of the United States Fire Administration shall have a rank equivalent to an assistant secretary of the Department.''.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

SEC. 4. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) EXECUTIVE SCHEDULE.—

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—Section 5313 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Administrator of the United States Emergency Management Authority.''.

(2) DIRECTORS.—Section 5314 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Directors, United States Emergency Management Authority.''.

(3) FEMA OFFICERS.—

(A) FEDERAL INSURANCE ADMINISTRATOR.—Section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Federal Insurance Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency.''.

(B) INSPECTOR GENERAL.—Section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Inspector General, Federal Emergency Management Agency.''.

(C) CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER.—Section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Chief Information Officer, Federal Emergency Management Agency.''.

(b) OFFICERS OF THE DEPARTMENT.—Section 103(a) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 113(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

''(5) An Administrator of the United States Emergency Management Authority.'';

(2) by striking paragraph (2); and

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (10) (as amended by this subsection) as paragraphs (2) through (9), respectively.

(c) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 et seq.) is amended by striking the items relating to title V and sections 501 through 509 and inserting the following:

''TITLE V—NATIONAL PREPAREDNESS AND RESPONSE

''Sec. 501. Definitions.
''Sec. 502. United States Emergency Management Authority.
''Sec. 503. Authorities and responsibilities.
''Sec. 504. Authority components.
''Sec. 505. Preserving the United States Emergency Management Authority.
''Sec. 506. Directors.
''Sec. 507. Regional Offices.
''Sec. 508. National Advisory Council on Emergency Preparedness and Response.
''Sec. 509. National Incident Management System Integration Center.
''Sec. 510. National Operations Center.
''Sec. 511. Chief Medical Officer.
''Sec. 512. Public and community preparedness.
''Sec. 513. SAVER Program.
''Sec. 514. National Search and Rescue Response System.
''Sec. 515. Metropolitan Medical Response System.
''Sec. 516. Emergency Management Assistance Compact authorization.
''Sec. 517. Office for the Prevention of Terrorism Coordination.
''Sec. 518. Department officials.
''Sec. 519. Nuclear incident response.
''Sec. 520. Conduct of certain public health-related activities.
''Sec. 521. Use of national private sector networks in emergency response.
''Sec. 522. Use of commercially available technology, goods, and services.
''Sec. 523. Procurement of security countermeasures for strategic national stockpile.
''Sec. 524. Urban and other high risk area communications capabilities.''.

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall take effect on January 1, 2007.

Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I thank Chairman COLLINS who has been good enough to allow me to speak for a few moments first because I have an engagement I am supposed to be at around noon.

I am pleased to join with Chairman COLLINS today to both introduce and speak in favor of this legislation to reinvent and rebuild FEMA into an agency capable of responding efficiently and effectively to a catastrophe the size and scope of Hurricane Katrina, but also to the natural disasters that in the normal course of events have affected and will affect the American people.

The Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee spent 7 months last year and into this year investigating the failed Government response to Hurricane Katrina. Our report recounts a double tragedy of epic proportions, a tragedy caused, in the first instance, by nature, and then a tragedy compounded by human folly and the failure of leadership, including the failure of preparation.

We found that government at all levels—from the Federal Government to the local government, from the White House to FEMA to the Governor's office in Louisiana to the mayor's office in New Orleans—were unprepared, even though the hurricane and its effect on the New Orleans levee system had long been predicted. Likewise, all levels of government were unequipped to deal with the human suffering that followed the storm's landfall and galvanized the attention that ultimately produced the enormous embarrassment and anger of the American people as we watched our fellow Americans suffering in New Orleans and throughout the gulf coast without the support and help they have a right to expect from their government at all levels in a time of disaster.

These failings were caused by negligence, lack of resources, lack of capability, and a lack of leadership. Though we can legislate requirements for those in positions of leadership—and we do in the legislation we are introducing—we cannot legislate leadership. That is a personal quality. But we can legislate bold changes at the Federal level that are critical for our Nation to develop the capacity necessary to protect our people in times of disaster, whether natural or terrorist.

So in the aftermath of our report, we made a number of recommendations about what we believed on a bipartisan basis was needed to improve our preparations, response, and recovery the next time disaster strikes, as it surely will.

One of our recommendations—perhaps the key recommendation—is to rebuild FEMA into a more powerful, better managed, better integrated, better supported organization. Our recommendation was to give the reinvented FEMA, probably for the first time in its history, the authority and muscle to respond to natural disasters and to catastrophes—which is what Katrina was—in the way the American people have a right to expect their Government to respond—with speed, with efficiency, and with effect.

Today we introduce legislation that will do that. We call this new organization the U.S. Emergency Management Authority, U.S.–EMA. But no matter what we call it, this organization, we have concluded, must be in the Department of Homeland Security; in fact, must be at the core of that Department, just as FEMA was originally intended to do when we proposed the new Department in 2002 based on the recommendations of the Hart-Rudman Commission which said that the new Department must be centered around FEMA.

The legislation we are introducing today is the first step in this process. Chairman COLLINS and I expect soon to introduce a broader bill that will encompass all of our report's key recommendations. But we begin today by reaffirming how important it is to keep this critical national emergency management function in the Department of Homeland Security and how critical it is to strengthen it and rejoin the functions of disaster response with disaster preparedness.

Our investigation of Hurricane Katrina made it clear to us that preparedness and response are two sides of the same coin. In the years before Katrina, FEMA, the agency charged with coordinating our Nation's response to terrorist attacks or natural disasters, too often was out of the loop when critical decisions about how to prepare—such as how to spend billions of dollars in grants—were made. Exercises were designed and held without serious input by FEMA. FEMA's ability to respond was crippled because it was not central to preparedness, and thus did not have the close relationships needed with state and local officials on the front lines. The preparers and the responders need to be working hand in hand with State and local officials, other Federal agencies, and the private and non-profit sectors if both functions are to work as well as we expect them to.

Our legislation first and foremost will ensure that our preparedness efforts are closely linked, inseparable from the capabilities we need to respond.

Our investigation also made clear that part of FEMA's problem during Hurricane Katrina was that it was an agency weakened by years of budget and staff cuts. At the time the hurricane made landfall, FEMA had been operating with a 15-percent vacancy rate for over a year. And it had a senior political management largely without emergency management experience.

We address these problems by giving the new authority a special status within the Department of Homeland Security—the same special status the Coast Guard and Secret Service now have. With this status, changes to the agency's functions and assets can only be made through statute. Furthermore, we would require that the Administrator and other key officials have the necessary experience and qualifications to get the job done. U.S.–EMA will not be plagued by unqualified appointees like FEMA has been.

The chairman and I also believe FEMA is too Washington-oriented and too disconnected from the real work of preparing for disasters where they actually occur, so we envision a rebuilt agency with robust regional offices to focus on preparedness and response coordination with local and State agencies. Each regional office would house a permanent ''strike team'' that would include representatives from other Federal agencies involved in emergency response to ensure the feds are familiar with regional threats and with state and local emergency personnel.

I know some of my colleagues believe FEMA should be removed from DHS and given the full independent status it once had. But Senator COLLINS and I know this is not the solution. Removing the agency from the Department will only create additional problems. It would be like removing the Army from the Department of Defense.

The U.S.–EMA, the Government's chief response agency, must have access to the vast resources of the Department of Homeland Security and it needs to work seamlessly with the other agencies that have critical roles to play during catastrophes. The Coast Guard, which performed so admirably during Katrina, might need to be activated. The Department's communications capabilities, law enforcement, intelligence offices, and infrastructure protection will all be needed in response to a catastrophe. In other words, the Federal response must be integrated and that will occur if all agencies have a history of working together within the same Department, if the officials know one another, and if they ultimately serve the same Secretary of Homeland Security.

Furthermore, taking FEMA out of DHS would create more and duplicative bureaucracy. DHS would have to develop its own response capabilities. FEMA would have to develop its own preparedness capabilities. And both would need to have tools for obtaining situational awareness. We do not have the resources to waste on that kind of duplication.

Returning FEMA to an independent agency is not a guarantee that it will be competent. Even when it was independent, FEMA never did develop the capabilities needed to respond to a catastrophe like Katrina. In fact, its response to Hurricane Andrew in 1992—a much smaller storm, killing about 50 people compared to Katrina's 1,500—was a disaster in itself, leading the Government Accounting Office to conclude that it had ''serious doubts about whether FEMA is capable of responding to catastrophic disasters.'' The agency did improve subsequent to Hurricane

Andrew but never had the ability to respond to a storm such as Katrina.

The desperate conditions of gulf coast communities in the week after Katrina's landfall shocked the country. There are many other American communities that are similarly vulnerable—whether to a natural disaster or to terrorist attack. The next catastrophe is coming. We know that. We also know there are significant flaws in the Nation's readiness. We can't afford another response like the one to Katrina.

Our proposal is not about fiddling with bureaucratic flow charts or rebranding, or rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic. It is about plugging the gash in the hull and building a better deck. It is about saving people's lives by bringing together the skills, resources, missions, and authority for effective preparedness and response to catastrophes when local and State agencies are overwhelmed by a terror attack or a natural disaster.

I ask my colleagues for their support of this legislation.

Mr. President, I yield to Chairman COLLINS for the rest of the introduction of this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am very pleased to join my friend and colleague, Senator LIEBERMAN, in introducing a bill that addresses an urgent challenge facing our Nation: the need to ensure a strong and effective capability to deal with natural and manmade disasters, whether they are hurricanes and ice storms or terrorist attacks and pandemic diseases.

The U.S. Emergency Management Authority Act is intended to remedy many of the glaring deficiencies that we all saw in the preparation and response to Hurricane Katrina. The U.S.-EMA bill reflects the evidence that the Senate Homeland Security Committee examined during the course of an exhaustive and bipartisan 7-month investigation. The committee convened 22 hearings, heard testimony from 85 witnesses, conducted more than 325 formal interviews, and examined more than 838,000 pages of documents.

The result is a 737-page report that contains 88 recommendations for improving our emergency management system at all levels of government.

Our legislation is an important first step toward implementing the committee's major recommendations for reforming FEMA. We will, as my colleague, Senator LIEBERMAN, indicated, be introducing subsequent legislation to implement other recommendations.

The four key features of the bill that we introduce today will, first, give the new authority statutory protection against actions that could diminish its capabilities and effectiveness, such as departmental reorganizations; second, ensure that the administrator of U.S.-EMA has direct access to the President; third, reunite preparedness functions with response capabilities while expanding U.S.-EMA's authority over other key functions; and fourth, strengthen the authority's regional focus with Federal strike teams for faster, more coordinated and effective responses.

Senator LIEBERMAN and I strongly believe that the best way to achieve the goal of improving the Federal Government's ability to protect American citizens from disaster, to mitigate the impacts, and to promote recovery is to strengthen and expand the Federal Emergency Management Agency, which we have proposed to rename the U.S. Emergency Management Authority. As we saw so starkly and so tragically demonstrated last year, FEMA simply must be made far more effective.

We believe FEMA needs special status within the Department of Homeland Security. Our bill would extend to the reconstituted FEMA the same kinds of statutory protections against departmental reorganizations and raids on resources that currently shield the Coast Guard and the Secret Service. I acknowledge the critical role played by the Senator from Mississippi, Mr. LOTT, in helping us draft this portion of the bill.

FEMA would also require more regional focus and closer coordination with local State entities, as well as with our nongovernmental partners. They are the first line of response in a disaster. Our legislation bolsters the role of FEMA's regional centers by authorizing the creation of multiagency strike teams to ensure rapid and effective cooperation with first responders and public officials in disaster areas. These strike teams would comprise representatives from all of the Federal agencies that play a role in responding to the disasters. They would train and exercise with their State and local counterparts.

I was struck by the fact that during our investigation, we learned that FEMA sent officials from region I—New England—down to help out in New Orleans. Often they were the lead officials. These were trained and dedicated people, but just think how much more effective they could have been if they had been stationed in the region and working regularly with the public officials in that region and with the first responders.

We believe FEMA needs top-level access and visibility. The administrator of the new U.S. Emergency Management Authority would be designated by our bill as the principal adviser to the President on matters of emergency management and would have direct access to the President. This would establish the administrator in a capacity that is analogous to that of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In addition, the administrator would be authorized to communicate any recommendations, any needs and requirements directly to Congress.

Our intention to keep the strengthened FEMA as part of DHS has stirred more debate than perhaps any other of our recommendations emerging from the Katrina investigation. Some Members of this Chamber, as well as proponents of a bill introduced in the House, insist that FEMA must be extracted from the Department of Homeland Security and restored to independent status. We share the view that the actions of both FEMA and DHS officials before and during the Katrina disaster revealed troubling and, at times, shocking lapses in awareness, agility, and judgment. But we also believe that both logic and practical realities point to reform, not amputation, as the best approach to improved protection for our citizens.

Please recall that it was only 5 years ago—before the 9/11 terror attacks—that the distinguished panel chaired by two of our former colleagues, Senator Hart and Senator Rudman, recommended that America establish a single agency to plan, coordinate, and integrate homeland security operations. The Commission correctly deduced that FEMA was the ''necessary core'' of that new department, and Congress agreed. The logic of that decision stands intact. The Department of Homeland Security's mission extends to all types of hazards and to preparation and mitigation as well as to response. DHS needs FEMA's capabilities and would have to re-create many of them at great cost and with great duplication of effort if FEMA were to be removed from the Department.

Even if that re-creation could somehow be done economically—and the evidence is that it would cost billions of dollars—the result would be new problems for State and local officials who direct first responders. Bifurcated, competing preparedness systems would force State and local officials to engage one system to prepare for natural disasters and another to prepare for terrorist attacks. That does not make sense. Many of the response capabilities are exactly the same whether the catastrophe is caused by a natural disaster such as a hurricane or whether it is the result of a terrorist attack. We know planning and response capabilities are already far too weak in many States. DHS's recent survey of the States proves that. We should not make the problem worse.

For those who argue that FEMA simply cannot thrive, cannot be successful within DHS, an obvious and telling question arises: How, then, did the U.S. Coast Guard, also a unit within DHS, emerge as the universally acclaimed hero of the Katrina response? Everyone believes the Coast Guard was the stellar performer, yet the Coast Guard is part of the Department of Homeland Security. So clearly FEMA's problem does not lie in its placement within DHS. Unlike FEMA, however, the Coast Guard has congressionally mandated protections, and our legislation would extend that exact same protection to FEMA's successor agency.

The temptation to think that the answer is simply to remove FEMA is

strong, but it is wrong. Just as not all motion is forward, not every change is progress. Emergency management expert Professor Donald Kettl of the University of Pennsylvania put it well when he told our committee:

It is tempting to send a strong signal by pulling FEMA out of DHS. But that would only undermine its ability to accomplish its mission. Breaking these pieces apart—separating response to terrorism from response to natural disasters, separating preparedness from response, separating FEMA from DHS—would inevitably bring problems.

I would suggest these are just a few of the serious implications that severing FEMA from DHS would cause.

First, coordination and reaction time would suffer. David Paulison, the new Director of FEMA, says that he closely coordinates with the Coast Guard, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, Border Patrol, and the Secret Service through weekly meetings. In times of disaster, he can simply make a request to these fellow DHS units; he doesn't have to go through a bureaucratic, formal process. They are all parts of the same department.

Second, training and preparedness would suffer. ADM Thad Allen of the Coast Guard testified before the committee that having FEMA within DHS has allowed much closer working ties and a 350-percent increase in joint training exercises.

Third, DHS's mission capability would suffer. The Homeland Security Act specifies that part of DHS's mission was to act as the focal point for natural and manmade emergencies and for emergency planning. As the Comptroller General has said:

Removing FEMA from DHS might impact the ability of the department and its remaining components and FEMA itself in fully addressing the close links between preparedness, prevention, response, and recovery from all hazards.

Fourth, State and local governments would suffer. If preparedness functions for natural disasters and terrorist attacks were divided, State and local governments would have to deal with two primary points of contact, two sets of regulations, two sources of funding, and two sets of officials. It greatly complicates their tasks.

Fifth, I strongly believe that FEMA would suffer. Removed from DHS, FEMA would lose many of the working relationships I have already described as well as the direct access to the information-gathering and analysis capabilities of other DHS agencies. This would degrade FEMA's ability to plan and train for both natural and manmade disasters and to make efficient use of grant-making authority.

To me, it is clear that a strengthened—a much strengthened—FEMA still belongs in DHS, that the necessary reforms can be carried out while it remains in DHS, and that severing FEMA from DHS would create a host of new problems, resulting in considerable extra expense and duplication, without securing any significant benefits. It is worth noting that America's largest group of first responders has come to the same conclusion. The president of the 274,000-member International Association of Firefighters has written us to say:

Removing FEMA would hinder—rather than help—efforts to reform our Nation's emergency response system. Having both a DHS and an independent FEMA would create confusion among local response personnel and lead to an unproductive duplication of efforts and turf battles.

Having summarized what I see as compelling arguments for strengthening and protecting FEMA as a component of DHS, let me outline some of the key provisions of our U.S.-EMA bill.

First, the bill establishes a strong position for the Administrator of the U.S. Emergency Management Authority. Once nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, the Administrator will have the standing of a Deputy Secretary, and will operate on a reporting and chain of command model like that of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Day to day, the Administrator will report to the DHS Secretary, but the bill explicitly provides a direct line of communication between the President and the Administrator during a catastrophe. In addition, the Administrator may make whatever recommendations to Congress that he or she deems appropriate.

The bill provides for directors, nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate, to provide the Administrator with highly qualified professionals in Preparedness and Mitigation, Response, and Recovery. Apart from bolstering the organization, authorizing these posts would send a clear signal to the Nation's Governors and mayors that they will have people of stature with whom to work and confer.

Besides providing the Administrator of U.S.-EMA with an advisory link to the President, the bill specifically tasks the Administrator with providing the federal leadership necessary to prepare for and respond to a disaster, whether man-made or natural. It gives the Administrator responsibility for administering preparedness grant programs, and for monitoring and evaluating the readiness of each of the emergency support functions under the national response plan. These are critical steps for ensuring close cooperation and oversight of preparedness at all levels of government.

The bill specifies that U.S.-EMA is a distinct entity and protects it from reorganization without explicit Congressional approval. This gives U.S.-EMA security identical to that of the Coast Guard.

Another critical element of the bill authorizes a strong regional structure for U.S.-EMA and creates regionally based federal strike teams for rapid response. This will ensure that U.S.-EMA officials are familiar with the people, the vulnerabilities, and the resources of the regions they protect, and will not be introducing themselves to strangers on unfamiliar ground when disaster strikes.

Further recognizing the importance of mult-level government coordination, the bill creates a national advisory council on emergency preparedness and response—made up of State and local officials and emergency management professionals from public, private and NGO sectors—to advise the Administrator of U.S.-EMA.

Our bill provides a statutory basis for chief medical officer to advise the DHS Secretary on medical and public-health issues. Other sections promote public and community preparedness; evaluate the effectiveness of equipment for first responders; reauthorize and expand the emergency management assistance compact; and create an office of terrorism prevention at DHS.

Mr. President, the U.S. Emergency Management Authority Act is not a symbolic gesture, or a quick fix for our problems. It is a thoroughly researched, carefully drafted collection of reforms that will lay the foundation for years of hard work.

The result, we firmly believe, will be a significantly more effective national system of preparedness, mitigation, response, and recovery against natural disasters and terror attacks. Building on the insights of the Hart-Rudman Commission and on the important advances embodied in the Homeland Security Act, the U.S.-EMA bill will greatly improve the protections that American citizens need, and deserve.

Mr. President, my statement has outlined the reforms we are making to this new agency. They are considerable. They are going to make a real difference, and I hope we can pass legislation before the end of this year to greatly strengthen and improve FEMA and our emergency response system and preparedness on all levels of government.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 107—CONGRATULATING DONALD ANDREW HALL FOR HIS SELECTION BY THE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS AS THE 14TH POET LAUREATE OF THE UNITED STATES AND FOR HIS GREAT ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN PROSE AND ESSAYS FOCUSING ON NEW ENGLAND RURAL LIVING, BASEBALL, AND HOW WORK CONVEYS MEANING TO ORDINARY LIFE

Mr. GREGG (for himself and Mr. SUNUNU) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Whereas Donald Hall attended the prestigious Bread Loaf Writers' Conference at age of 16 on account of his prose and short story writing;

Whereas Donald Hall served as literary editor of Isis, the Oxford Poetry Society's journal, and won Oxford University's prestigious Newdigate Prize for ''Exile'';

Whereas Donald Hall served as the poetry editor of The Paris Review;

Whereas Donald Hall has held Stanford's Creative Writing Fellowship, a position in

Harvard's Society of Fellows, and a faculty position at Harvard for 18 years;

Whereas Donald Hall held the position of New Hampshire Poet Laureate from 1984 to 1989;

Whereas Donald Hall has published 15 books of poetry, including ''The One Bad'' (1988), ''The Happy Man'' (1986), and ''Exiles and Marriages'' (1955);

Whereas Donald Hall has also written 20 books of prose, children's books, and plays;

Whereas Donald Hall's most recent work is ''White Apples and the Taste of Stone: Selected Poems 1946-2006'';

Whereas Donald Hall has received numerous awards including 2 Guggenheim Fellowships, the Poetry Society of America's Robert Frost Silver Medal, a Lifetime Achievement Award from the New Hampshire Writers and Publisher Project, the Ruth Lilly Prize for Poetry, the National Book Critics Circle Award, the Los Angeles Times Book Prize, the Lenore Marshall Poetry Prize, and the Academy's Lamont Poetry Selection;

Whereas Donald Hall has been nominated for a Pulitzer Prize;

Whereas Donald Hall has won a Caldecott Medal for his children's book, ''The Ox-Cart Man'';

Whereas Donald Hall is a member of the Academy of Arts and Letters; and

Whereas recurring themes in Donald Hall's writings include New England rural life, baseball, and ordinary life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress congratulates Donald Andrew Hall for his selection by the Librarian of Congress as the 14th Poet Laureate of the United States and for his great accomplishments in prose and essays focusing on New England rural living, baseball, and how work conveys meaning to ordinary life.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been postponed before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing originally scheduled for Thursday, June 29, 2006 at 10 a.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Building has been postponed and will be rescheduled for a date to be announced.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on H.R. 5254, the Refinery Permit Process Schedule Act.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, Washington, DC 20510–6150.

For further information, please contact John Peschke at (202) 224–4797 Shannon Ewan at (202) 224–7555.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 28, 2006, at 3:15 p.m., in closed session, for a discussion on training and equipping Iraqi security forces.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 28, 2006, immediately following the first rollcall vote of the day's session, to vote on the nomination of Mr. James S. Simpson, of New York, to be Federal Transit Administrator, Department of Transportation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be allowed to meet at 10 a.m. on Wednesday, June 28, 2006, to consider H.R. 5252.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 28, 2006, at 10:30 a.m. The purpose of this meeting is to consider the nomination of Marc Spitzer, of Arizona, to be a member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for the term expiring June 30, 2011, vice Nora Mead Brownell, resigned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, June 28, 2006, at 9:30 a.m., the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to hold an oversight hearing on EPA regional inconsistencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session on Wednesday, June 28, 2006, at 10 a.m., in 215 Dirksen Senate Office Building, to consider S. 1321, the Telephone Excise Tax Repeal Act of 2005, and an amendment that incorporates S. 832, the Taxpayer Protection and Assistance Act of 2005. Pending the introduction of a bill, the Chairman also intends to hold a markup of legislation to implement the U.S.-Oman Free Trade Agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 28, 2006, at 2:30 p.m. to hold a hearing on nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet in executive session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 28, 2006, at 10 a.m., followed by a full committee hearing commencing at 10:30 a.m. Both the executive session and full committee hearing are scheduled to be held in SD–430.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet on Wednesday, June 28, 2006, at 10 a.m., to consider the nominations of Mickey D. Barnett, Katherine C. Tobin, and Ellen C. Williams to be Governors, U.S. Postal Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet on Wednesday, June 28, 2006, at 9:30 a.m. in Room 485 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct an oversight hearing on Native American Housing Programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a hearing on ''Hedge Funds and Independent Analysts: How Independent Are Their Relationships?'' on Wednesday, June 28, 2006 at 9:30 a.m. in Dirksen Senate Office Building room 226.

Witness list

Panel I: The Honorable Matt Friedrich Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Crime Division, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC; The Honorable Richard Blumenthal, Attorney General, State of Connecticut, Hartford, CT.

Panel II: Gary Aguirre, Former Investigator, Securities Exchange Commission, Washington, DC; Marc Kasowitz, Senior Partner, Kasowitz, Benson, Torres & Friedman LLP, Alliance for Investment Transparency, New York, NY; Joseph McLaughlin, Partner, Sidley & Austin LLP, Managed Fund Association, New York, NY;

Kim Blickenstaff, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Biosite, Inc., San Diego, CA; Owen Lamont, Professor of Finance, Yale School of Management, New Haven, CT; Demetrios Anifantis, Former Employee, Camelback Research Alliance, Inc., Scottsdale, AZ; Howard Schillit, Chief Executive Officer and Founder, Center for Financial Research and Analysis [CFRA, LLC], Rockville, MD; Jonathan Boersma, Director, Standards of Practice CFA Centre for Financial Market Integrity, Charlottesville, VA.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet to conduct a hearing on ''Judicial Nominations'' on Wednesday, June 28, 2006, at 2 p.m. in Dirksen Senate Office Building Room 226.

Witness list

Panel I: (Members of Congress).

Panel II: Kimberly Ann Moore to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit; Bobby E. Shepherd to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Water and power of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 28, 2006, at 2:30 p.m.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive testimony on S. 1812, to amend the reclamation projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 to provide for the conjunctive use of surface and ground water in Juab County, Utah; S. 1965, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain buildings and lands of the Yakima Project, Washington, to the Yakima-Tieton irrigation district; S. 2129, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land and improvements of the Gooding division of the Minidoka Project, Idaho; S. 2470, to authorize early repayment of obligations to the Bureau of Reclamation within the A&B irrigation district in the State of Idaho; S. 2502, to provide for the modification of an amendatory repayment contract between the Secretary of the Interior and the North Unit Irrigation District, and for other purposes; S. 3404, a bill to preauthorize the MNI Wiconi rural water supply project; H.R. 2383, to predesignate the facility of the Bureau of Reclamation located at 19550 Kelso Road in Byron, California, as the ''C.W. 'Bill' Jones Plumbing Plant''; and H.R. 4204, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer ownership of the American River pump station project and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 3590

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk. I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3590) to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to delay the effective date of the amendments made by the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 requiring documentation evidencing citizenship or nationality as a condition for receipt of medical assistance under the Medicaid program.

Mr. FRIST. I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read a second time on the next legislative day.

RURAL HEALTH CARE CAPITAL ACCESS ACT OF 2006

Mr. FRIST. I ask unanimous consent the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 4912, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4912) to amend section 242 of the National Housing Act to extend the exemption for critical access hospitals under the FHA program for mortgage insurance for hospitals.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. FRIST. I ask unanimous consent the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 4912) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 29, 2006

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, June 29. I further ask unanimous consent that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved, and the Senate then begin a period of morning business for up to 2 hours with the first 30 minutes under the control of the majority leader or his designee, the next 30 minutes under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee, to be followed by 30 minutes under the control of the majority leader or his designee, and the final 30 minutes under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee; provided further that following morning business, the Senate proceed to S. 3569, the Oman Free Trade Agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, today Hank Paulson was confirmed by the Senate to be Secretary of the Treasury. I commend Chairman GRASSLEY and Senator BAUCUS for expediting this important Cabinet position and I, once again, wish through this body to thank Hank Paulson for his service.

Tomorrow we will consider the United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement. Since we do not expect to use all 20 hours that is allowed under the statute, we can anticipate a vote tomorrow afternoon. We will inform Senators as to when that vote will occur once it is scheduled.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. FRIST. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:26 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, June 29, 2006, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 28, 2006:

THE JUDICIARY

DEBRA ANN LIVINGSTON, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT, VICE JOHN M. WALKER, JR., RETIRING.

KENT A. JORDAN, OF DELAWARE, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT, VICE JANE R. ROTH, RETIRED.

RAYMOND M. KETHLEDGE, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT, VICE JAMES L. RYAN, RETIRED.

STEPHEN JOSEPH MURPHY III, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT, VICE SUSAN BIEKE NEILSON, DECREASED.

JOHN PRESTON BAILEY, OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA, VICE FREDERICK P. STAMP, JR., RETIRING.

MARY O. DONOHUE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, VICE FREDERICK J. SCULLIN, JR., RETIRED.

JOHN ALFRED JARVEY, OF IOWA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA, VICE RONALD E. LONGSTAFF, RETIRING.

ROBERT JAMES JONKER, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN, VICE GORDON J. QUIST, RETIRED.

PAUL LEWIS MALONEY, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN, VICE RICHARD ALAN ENSLEN, RETIRED.

JANET T. NEFF, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN, VICE DAVID W. MCKEAGUE, ELEVATED.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

SEAN T. CONNAUGHTON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE MARITIME ADMINISTRATION, VICE WILLIAM SCHUBERT, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

JAY M. COHEN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, DEPARTMENT

OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE CHARLES E. MCQUEARY, RESIGNED.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR LITERACY

TIMOTHY SHANAHAN, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR LITERACY ADVISORY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING NOVEMBER 25, 2007, VICE JEAN OSBORN, TERM EXPIRED.

PATRICIA MATHES, OF TEXAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR LITERACY ADVISORY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING NOVEMBER 25, 2007, VICE MARK G. YUDOF, RESIGNED.

CARMEL BORDERS, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR LITERACY ADVISORY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING NOVEMBER 25, 2008. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DONALD D. DESHLER, OF KANSAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR LITERACY ADVISORY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 30, 2008, VICE PHYLLIS C. HUNTER, TERM EXPIRED.

ELIZA MCFADDEN, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR LITERACY ADVISORY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 30, 2009, VICE DOUGLAS CARNINE, TERM EXPIRED.

BLANCA E. ENRIQUEZ, OF TEXAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR LITERACY ADVISORY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 30, 2009. (REAPPOINTMENT)

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate Wednesday, June 28, 2006:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

HENRY M. PAULSON, JR., OF NEW YORK, TO BE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

THE ABOVE NOMINATION WAS APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE NOMINEE'S COMMITMENT TO RESPOND TO REQUESTS TO APPEAR AND TESTIFY BEFORE ANY DULY CONSTITUTED COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING NATHAN RICHARD DUDA FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Nathan Richard Duda, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 98, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Nathan has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Nathan has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Nathan Richard Duda for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CORPORAL ANDY D. ANDERSON

HON. TOM DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Corporal Andy D. Anderson one of the true heroes of the conflict in Iraq, and to recognize his service to our Nation.

Corporal Anderson, a longtime resident of Falls Church, VA, graduated from J.E.B. Stuart High School in 2001. While at Stuart, he enjoyed a prolific athletic career. He was a leader of the football team and was among the leading scorers in the county in basketball. After a year of college, he followed in his father's footsteps and enlisted in the Army, in which he was assigned to the Army's B Company, 46th Engineer Battalion at Fort Rucker, AL.

Just a few weeks ago, Cpl. Anderson had been home to visit his family in Vienna, VA. He proposed to his high school sweetheart and impressed friends and relatives with his self-assurance.

Corporal Anderson was ambitious and selfless, hoping to make the Army a career. Tragically, on June 6, 2006, Cpl. Anderson gave his last full measure for our Nation, when he was killed by mortar fire in Ar Ramadi, Iraq.

Corporal Anderson is survived by his father, Harold Anderson, mother Xiomara Mena, and his brothers Rafael and Randall.

Words cannot express the gratitude we feel toward those who have made the ultimate sacrifice for our country. This is a debt that can never be repaid. I hope the family of Cpl. Anderson, who are suffering in the wake of the loss, will take some solace in knowing that we will never forget Cpl. Anderson's sacrifice or the sacrifices made by other patriots like him in the defense of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues to remember in our minds and in our hearts the bravery and sacrifice of Cpl. Andy D. Anderson, as well as that of all the men and women of the armed services who honorably protect the American people.

INTRODUCTION OF THE NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2006

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce the No Child Left Behind Improvements Act of 2006. This legislation will improve accountability for the academic performance of children enrolled in the nation's public schools. My bill builds on the major reforms of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 signed into law on January 8, 2002 and offers improvements that address many of the unintended consequences of the federal legislation while holding states and school districts accountable.

As a former teacher, I am committed to providing our nation's children with the best possible education. I firmly believe in the original goals of NCLB but I understand that a ''one size fits all'' approach to student achievement is not possible. Alaska is more than two times the size the state of Texas, yet only has a population of 660,000 compared to the 22.9 million residents of Texas. As you can see, providing education services in Alaska can be difficult as 190,000 Alaskan students are literally scattered over 572,000 square miles.

Alaska has approximately 500 public schools and they are organized into 53 school districts. These include 34 city and borough school districts and 19 Regional Educational Attendance Areas which serve students living in towns and villages in politically unorganized areas of rural Alaska.

Alaska schools vary greatly in size. High schools in Anchorage, the state's largest city, may serve more than 2,000 students. Schools in other urban areas such as Juneau, Fairbanks, the Kenai Peninsula, or the Matanuska-Susitna Valley may serve hundreds and are similar to schools in small cities in the rest of the United States. However, many schools in rural areas are small, some with 20 or fewer students at a variety of grade levels. They may be many miles from population centers and services, and accessible only by aircraft or boat. In remote villages, schools often serve as centers of community activity.

In addition to the geographic barriers, Alaska, like many other states is faced with cultural obstacles. There are 20 different Alaska Native languages spoken in the state and during the 2004–2005 school year, students in the Anchorage School District spoke 95 different languages. Roughly 42 percent of students are from ethnic minority groups including Native Alaskan, Asian and Pacific Islander, Hispanic, and African American.

Alaska is not alone in having to face unique challenges as it struggles to educate its children. Each state in this country one has geographic, economic or cultural barriers that impede its schools from reaching a level of success as mandated by NCLB. My bill will establish an improved framework for accountability that fairly and accurately assesses student, school, and school district performance. As a result, states and local school districts will be able to more strategically use their resources to bring about meaningful and measurable results.

This legislation contains more than 40 provisions that focus on five areas: Assessments, Measuring Adequate Yearly Progress, Sanctions, State Flexibility by the U.S. Department of Education and Non-Public Schools. Specifically the bill provides the following:

Assessments. The bill offers greater flexibility to states in the use of alternate assessments for students with disabilities based on the individual education program (IEP) and authorizes states and school districts to count the scores in the calculation of AYP. The bill also offers states the flexibility to use alternate assessments for students who are not proficient in English. In both categories of students the assessment instruments must be valid and reliable in measuring the performance based on the specific needs of the student. The bill would also grant states the flexibility to assess students more than once within the full academic year, and to use the higher scores in calculating the performance of subgroups.

Measuring Adequate Yearly Progress. The bill would authorize states to expand their AYP measurement systems to include gain score approaches like value-added and give partial credit for meeting basic proficient targets. Additionally, states would be permitted greater flexibility in using alternate methods of measuring AYP as long as the ultimate goals of NCLB are achieved. Use of these specific flexibilities would require approval by the U.S. Department of Education. Further, the bill would authorize school districts and schools with diverse student populations to calculate AYP in a way that more accurately reflects subgroup and school performance.

Sanctions: Public School Choice and Supplemental Services. The bill would strengthen the use of sanctions by applying such sanctions only when AYP is not met by the ''same group'' for two or more consecutive years in the same subject on the same indicator rather than applying sanctions when different groups or different indicators are involved from year to year in that subject. Additionally, the bill offers greater flexibility to states and school districts in the sequence of offering supplemental services and public school choice. Finally, the bill

● This ''bullet'' symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

requires more effective use of local funds by limiting the options of public school choice and supplemental services only to those students within the subgroup that failed to meet their AYP targets in the same subject for two or more years—not all the students in the school.

The bill would also remove restrictions from the current law that prohibit local school districts from providing supplemental services solely because the school district did not make AYP or is in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring status. However, the state would have to grant such authority to local school districts.

Restructuring. With respect to requiring schools or school districts to implement certain broad restructuring provisions, the total number of students not scoring proficient or above would have to exceed 35% of the enrollment, and Congress would be required to appropriate an increase for Title I of at least $2.5 billion over the previous year, and appropriate at the authorized levels contained in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004.

State Flexibility. The bill would grant authority to the Secretary of Education to (1) approve state accountability plans that vary from the federal framework to align with effective state accountability systems, (2) grant statutory and regulatory waivers that are unnecessarily burdensome or duplicative of state requirements, and (3) make public any approved amendments to state accountability plans. Further, the bill would require that any waivers of the state's plan approved by the Secretary would be available to any state on a case-by-case determination provided the state or agency meets any requirements issued by the Secretary applicable to such waivers.

Non-Public Schools. The bill authorizes students enrolled in non-public schools who receive Title I services to be given the same assessments as public school students; and gives states the option to withhold Title I support to the non-public schools if their Title I students do not make AYP and perform at lower levels than their counterparts in the area's public schools for three years or more.

I am pleased to be working with the National School Boards Association and am looking forward to pushing this important legislation through the House and Senate. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support the No Child Left Behind Improvements Act of 2006.

SENIOR INDEPENDENCE ACT OF 2006

SPEECH OF

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 21, 2006

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 5293, the ''Senior Independence Act of 2006,'' reauthorizing the Older Americans Act. This is an important measure for our Nation's seniors in delivering nutrition services, supportive services, and caregiver services. I am particularly appreciative of the bipartisan manner in which this measure was crafted by Chairman TIBERI and Ranking Member HINOJOSA, and thank them specifically for improvements in the law which would help to target individuals with limited English proficiency.

Though the bill offers valuable resources for our Nation's seniors, one area where I believe we can continue to make strides is in capitalizing on the experience older Americans can share with their communities. I have introduced legislation to establish a ''Silver Scholarship'' program—H.R. 5275—based on President Bush's 2001 proposal to reward seniors for their volunteer service. The Silver Scholarship program would provide an educational award to any senior, age 55 and older, who dedicates a set number of hours each year to volunteering in their communities. The educational award, or ''Silver Scholarship,'' would be fully transferable to a family member or any other deserving individual to help them pursue postsecondary education.

The first of the 77 million baby boomers turn 60 this year. This new ''senior'' population is the largest, healthiest, best educated population of older Americans in our history. Baby boomers are pioneers in a new stage spanning the decades between middle and late life, and represent an extraordinary pool of social and human capital. This initiative would foster senior service and invest in the education of the next generation of America's workforce.

While I understand this provision was not included in the reported version of H.R. 5293, I look forward to working with my colleagues as the process moves forward in the hopes that this worthy bipartisan initiative be promoted through our efforts.

RECOGNIZING JUSTIN SMITH FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Justin Smith, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 98, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Justin has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Justin has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Justin Smith for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

CONGRATULATIONS TO RYAN MILLER

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mr. Ryan Miller of Arlington, Virginia, on being awarded the Air Force Association's DW Steele Chapter ''Teacher of the Year Award.''

Mr. Miller teaches Astronomy and International Baccalaureate-level Environmental Science at Washington-Lee High School in Arlington. Mr. Miller opens up the often demanding field of math and the sciences through his challenging, but innovative, lab experiments and lessons. Furthermore, his expertise and exuberance for science has significantly contributed to an improved curriculum for Earth and Space Sciences, as well as the enrollment of more students into his science classes. Also as part of his responsibilities, Mr. Miller assists students in science fair competitions at Washington-Lee and in regional competitions.

Ryan's selfless dedication to public service plays a significant role in shaping our future economy. The United States is facing increasing competition in the workplace from foreign nations that are investing heavily in math and science studies. Science and technology related jobs are among the fastest growing fields in our economy, and studies have indicated that our Nation is falling behind compared to the investment of foreign nations. Mr. Miller's use of the latest technology available to students, his interesting and motivating experiences, and his passion for science have genuinely assisted in helping our Nation narrow this gap.

When he is not dedicating his time to improving the minds of his students, Mr. Miller is spending his spare time on his own education. He is currently enrolled at George Washington University, taking classes for his doctorate in Curriculum and Instruction.

Mr. Miller is truly an asset to the students he inspires and the lives he shapes in the 8th District of Virginia. I congratulate him on being awarded this great honor.

TRIBUTE TO REV. THOMAS BYRON COLLINS

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Rev. Thomas Byron Collins, who recently passed away on June 17, 2006. He was an instrumental part of Georgetown University, and was involved in a number of projects that helped raise the fundraising prowess of the university in securing funds for campus projects.

Father Byron Collins was born in the town of Bradford in the State of Pennsylvania on August 16, 1920. He attended Holy Cross College in Worcester, Massachusetts, until the death of his father in 1938. He then returned back to Bradford where he entered the Society of Jesus at the Novitiate of St. Isaac Jogues in Wernersville, Pennsylvania. This was the start of a lifetime service as a Jesuit priest. Father Collins was appointed to Georgetown University in 1954, and in his first five years, he was the plant administrator, which included responsibility for construction on three campuses of the university. His ability in securing funds for these important projects and seeing them through was legendary. He was then appointed vice-president for business management in 1959. Georgetown University in the next 15 years saw an unprecedented rise in various campus construction projects than it had in the previous years. Georgetown became a pioneer among institutions of high

education in securing federal legislation shaped to meet its needs due to the tireless efforts of Father Collins.

Father Collins also was well-regarded in the Georgetown University community for his deep respect for all religions. He used to say that all major religions had ''a beauty and a truth.'' He never wanted religion to be a source of conflict but as a means of bringing people together. He has left behind a remarkable legacy, and without that legacy, Georgetown University would not have had the infrastructure needed to make it into one of the Nation's most prestigious centers of higher education.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have had this time to recognize the legacy of Father Thomas Byron Collins at Georgetown University.

FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM AND MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2006

SPEECH OF

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2006

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my concerns about the Flood Insurance Reform Modernization Act that the House passed today.

I support the goals of this legislation, which are to provide the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) with the resources it needs to pay its claims to the victims of Hurricane Katrina, and to reform the NFIP to place it on sustainable long-term footing, but I believe that goal cannot be done at the expense of communities and homeowners who should not be in the flood maps. Several provisions of the bill will have such a negative impact on the Western New York communities that I represent, that I am unable to lend my support to the bill.

I would have welcomed the opportunity to vote solely on the provision to increase the funding that the Federal Emergency Management Agency can borrow in order to ensure that Katrina victims receive the funds they are owed. Indeed, I have supported several efforts since Katrina to increase FEMA's borrowing authority for this purpose. I have also supported tremendous increases in community development funding for Katrina-impacted areas, and I fought hard against the Administration's ill-conceived proposal to deny workers in the reconstruction effort the benefit of federal wage protection law.

Yet Mr. Chairman for all that was right in this bill, it fails to address some of the most pressing and problematic aspects of the NFIP, such as the extent to which some areas served by the program which seldom flood and seldom receive benefits must subsidize other areas which more frequently flood and more frequently receive benefits. Additionally, I am concerned that this does nothing to cushion the blow of mandatory flood insurance premiums to low income senior citizens or other, similarly situated persons. Additionally, when floods very often hit areas which had not been designated as having significant flood hazards, and while areas which have the 100-year flood designation have never been inundated, I have serious concerns about the accuracy of current flood mapping processes and procedures. While this bill would increase funding to increase the quantity of flood mapping, it would not sufficiently improve the science to increase the quality of flood mapping.

Specific to the Buffalo-area communities in my district, I am strongly opposed to the provision directing the Comptroller General to study a mandatory purchase requirement for the natural 100-year floodplain. In the City of Buffalo, in the neighborhoods of South Buffalo and Kaisertown, an area has been designated as a 100-year floodplain by FEMA. This area is now protected by a number of man-made improvements designed expressly to protect against 100-year floods, so I am working toward the goal of having FEMA remove the 100-year floodplain designation from these areas, and with it, the concomitant burden of mandatory flood insurance premiums. In fact, in 1972 the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers said ''the area would be protected from a flood stage having a recurrence interval of 100 years,'' yet this bill would not only keep the area under 100-year designation, but would also allow the cost to no-risk homeowners to rise. For me to vote to advance legislation including the area in the 100-year floodplain designation would be inconsistent with my efforts to have the designation removed in light of the flood prevention work that has been done there.

I am further concerned with provisions in this bill which would raise the maximum amount of coverage. This provision would cause insured homeowners in low-cost housing markets, such as Buffalo, to subsidize homeowners in high-cost housing markets. This provision is regressive and contrary to the interests of my constituency.

Mr. Chairman I agree that the NFIP needs to be reformed so that those truly at risk bear the cost of flood insurance. However, by including communities that are at no or little risk of flooding, the bill has the unintended consequence of forcing struggling communities, like the one I represent, to subsidize the cost of flood insurance across the country. That is not a just outcome, and it is one I will continue to oppose until NFIP flood maps represent what really goes on in a community and until low risk communities are not forced to subsidize high risk communities.

RECOGNIZING STEVEN GLASBRENNER FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Steven Glasbrenner a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 98, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Steven has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Steven has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Steven Glasbrenner for his I accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

IN HONOR OF DENICE DEE DENTON

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and my colleagues, Representatives MICHAEL HONDA and ANNA ESHOO, I rise today to note, sadly, the tragic passing of Denice Dee Denton, Chancellor of the University of California, Santa Cruz, UCSC. We have lost a colleague of immeasurable creativity and intellect. Our hearts go out to her family and loved ones in this incomprehensible time. In her memory, we stand today to pay homage to her commitment and sacrifice and pledge to further her legacy of equity, diversity and academic excellence.

Chancellor Denton dedicated her professional and personal energy to increasing the presence of women and minorities in typically male-dominated academic fields. While pursuing four advanced degrees from Massachusetts Institute of Technology, including a Ph.D., she often encountered and fought against prevailing attitudes that were quietly or openly hostile to women in science. Remarkably, her academic career was just beginning to blossom. She held academic appointments at the University of Massachusetts, the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in Zurich, and the University of Wisconsin-Madison, where she worked from 1987, leaving as professor in the Departments of Electrical and Computer Engineering and Chemistry. Beginning in 1996, Chancellor Denton was appointed Dean of the College of Engineering and Professor of Electrical Engineering at the University of Washington, the first woman to hold the position at a National Research Council-designated Research One university.

On December 14, 2004, Denice Denton was appointed by the University of California Regents as the ninth Chancellor of UCSC. While Chancellor, Denice incorporated the philosophy of achieving excellence through diversity in her agenda. She championed causes on an international level to engage the academic community in a dialogue pursuing equity and advancement in science, math and engineering. Also, as the university's first openly gay Chancellor, Denice embraced her identity and empowered young people and professionals across many disciplines to do the same. Mr. Speaker, it is with great regret that we speak in memory of a life so full of promise and future achievement. But we do so secure in the knowledge of a life already lived so full of accomplishment. Denice Denton was just 46 years old at the time of her death. But in that short time she paved the way for so many to follow.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, due to the memorial service for PFC. Kristian Menchaca in my

district, I was unable to vote during the following rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as indicated below.

Rollcall No. 319: ''no''; Rollcall No. 320: ''yes''; Rollcall No. 321: ''yes''; Rollcall No. 322: ''no''; Rollcall No. 323: ''no''; Rollcall No. 324: ''no''; Rollcall No. 325: ''yes''; Rollcall No. 326: ''yes''; Rollcall No. 327: ''yes''; Rollcall No. 328: ''yes''; Rollcall No. 329: ''no''; Rollcall No. 330: ''yes.''

FLOOD INSURANCE REFORM AND MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2006

SPEECH OF

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2006

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, when you think of Southern California, you think of palm trees and sunshine, right? Most people do, and I'm glad they do. But today I want to remind you that in California, when it rains it pours. And my community of Orange County has a long history of destructive floods. I am particularly pleased that the House is choosing to pass the Flood Insurance Reform and Modernization Act currently before Congress.

This bipartisan bill would increase maximum flood premium rates, giving property owners the choice to pay more to receive greater coverage, including living expenses or profit loss beyond what is now covered in the flood insurance program.

The bill also makes it clear that the Federal Emergency Management Agency should listen to local communities whenever updating national flood maps.

Currently, FEMA estimates 70 percent of its flood maps are more than a decade out of date. I agree with FEMA's recent call for a speedy update of these important data sets, but haste should not take priority over accuracy.

Our local communities need time to report the most up-to-date data for inclusion in these national maps.

In California counties where FEMA has set a September 30 deadline to receive preliminary maps, FEMA should clearly grant an extension, rather than continue the flood control planning process without that critical local input.

The Army Corps of Engineers is studying flood control issues in a 90-square-mile watershed in Orange County, including Garden Grove and Santa Ana. The Corps' important work there should be taken into account as FEMA looks to draw new maps.

I applaud the bipartisan sponsors of this legislation and the bipartisan work of the Rules Committee for allowing debate on several important amendments to this bill. I urge my colleagues to cast a ''yes'' vote today.

RECOGNIZING BRIAN COMISKEY FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Brian Comiskey, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 98, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Brian has been very active with his troop, participating in many Scout activities. Over the many years Brian has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Brian Comiskey for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mrs. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, because of the storms in the Northeast and numerous flight delays over the past two days, I was not present for Rollcall No. 319, to prohibit consideration of the minimum wage increase, No. 320, the Coast Guard and Maritime Authorization Act, and No. 321, the Veterans COLA bill. Rollcall no. 319, ''nay''; rollcall No. 320, ''yea''; rollcall No. 321, ''yea.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JULIA CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my home district due to inclement weather and unable to record my rollcall votes. Had I been present I would have voted ''yes'' on votes: Rollcall vote No. 320; rollcall vote No. 321; rollcall vote No. 325; rollcall vote No. 326; rollcall vote No. 327; rollcall vote No. 328.

Had I been present I would have voted ''no'' on votes: Rollcall No. 319; rollcall vote No. 322; rollcall vote No. 323; rollcall vote No. 324; rollcall vote No. 329; rollcall vote No. 330.

RECOGNIZING DARRYL BELL, JR. FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Darryl Bell, Jr., a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 98, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Darryl has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Darryl has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Darryl Bell, Jr. for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

TRIBUTE TO CRAIG SNOW

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Mr. Craig Snow. Mr. Snow was an extraordinary advocate for all people in need in his community. He was a coach and trainer of those who work in the non-profit sector, a man who led by example as well as by instruction, and a man who inspired others to acts of philanthropy. It would be difficult to imagine Tucson today without the tireless efforts of this remarkable individual.

Craig came to Tucson in 1977, as a visiting Lecturer at the University of Arizona. He stayed on to serve as associate director of composition and then as the founding director of the Composition Board of the University. However, at the beginning of the AIDS epidemic, Craig realized that immediate action was essential, and he organized brainstorming sessions which resulted in the formation of Tucson AIDS Project. He became the director of the project and led it for 12 years on a path which provided sustenance, direction and education to the sufferers of AIDS and the community at large. He promoted understanding and compassion in a time where few had the courage to face the issues the AIDS epidemic underscored. As a result of Mr. Snow's actions and foresight, Tucson developed one of the most forward thinking AIDS support organizations in the world. As the crowning achievement of his tenure with the Tucson AIDS Project, he was instrumental in bringing several Tucson AIDS support organizations together to form the Southern Arizona AIDS Foundation.

Craig's activism went above and beyond. He also created a consulting firm, which specialized in working with non-profit, care giving organizations. His constant theme was to help the helpers of humanity to do their work better. He assisted groups as diverse as the Brewster Center for Battered Women, the Primavera Foundation for the Homeless, Child and Family Resources, the Center for Adolescent Parents, and KARE, a group that helps grandparents raising grandchildren. His vision and work helped these organizations, and many others, improve their outreach, organizational structure, and constituent services. Craig also served as a priceless facilitator among government bodies, non-profit organizations and the people they served. Craig had a wonderful manner of using every social occasion and interaction to encourage and enlighten every person he met. Then, when they

were ready, he would enlist their help in working for a cause which suited them and where they could be the most effective. No friend or acquaintance of Craig Snow's was left untouched.

Mr. Snow lost his long battle with bladder cancer this year. As a community we must celebrate Craig's life and embrace his take on life; to live fully and at every level. He will be sorely missed and as a community we must honor him by committing ourselves to providing service to those in our surrounding community.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. LOU HANDY

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mrs. Lou Handy, an exceptional lady and all around great Kentuckian. Mrs. Handy recently celebrated her 90th birthday. She has enjoyed a remarkable life and her wealth of knowledge and wisdom makes her a most treasured individual.

On behalf of myself and my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives, I want to honor Mrs. Lou Handy and wish her and her family the very best. I ask that an article that ran in the London Sentinel-Echo on Monday April 10, 2006, appear in the RECORD.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY LOU HANDY

Lou Handy celebrated her 90th birthday this past weekend. ''Mrs. Handy'' taught me English at what was then Laurel County High School. She was my favorite high school teacher. It was in her class that I first read Hemingway, Fitzgerald and Faulkner and was encouraged to write creatively. I have loved books for as long as I can remember but it was Mrs. Handy that encouraged me and gave me the confidence to believe in my ability as a writer.

When I graduated from high school and headed off to college it was because of Mrs. Handy I felt I could succeed when I first set foot on the campus at the University of Kentucky. I earned Phi Beta Kappa there, and Mrs. Handy was part of the reason for the grades that led to the honor. I finished college in three years and Mrs. Handy was part of that as well. I finished law school early and passed the bar at the age of 23, and Mrs. Handy was a contributor to that achievement.

In the years that have followed, I have tried many cases across the state and still had the time to write and publish stories and articles across the world and I thank Mrs. Handy for giving me the confidence to believe I could do those things. I'm in seminary now and every time I sit down to write another paper I think of Mrs. Handy and the encouragement she gave me to help me along the way. It has been 31 years since Mrs. Handy was my teacher yet she is still there influencing and affecting my life and the lives of others through me.

I am not a unique example of the impact Lou Handy has had on people. From my 1975 graduating class alone there are three lawyers, two doctors, two PhD's, three engineers, one record producer in Nashville, many teachers and countless successful business people and most of us had Mrs. Handy for a teacher. When you look at the years Mrs. Handy taught you realize the profound impact she has had on this community and the state as a whole. I think Mrs. Handy is proud of what her students have accomplished although I doubt she would ever take credit for what any of us have done but she deserves her share of the credit anyway.

Good teachers are a treasure for their communities and should be acknowledged as such. We are quick to point out the politics and disagreements of our public school system, and if we are not careful we can lose sight of the wonderful things that go on every day in our classrooms. Lives are being changed, young people are being awakened to the potential that lies before them and good teachers are making it happen.

A functioning school system is the bedrock of any community. When industry looks at a community to consider locating a factory or office there the quality of the school system is one of the first things the company wants to know about. A school system that is in turmoil or is underperforming or underfunded drives business away. No one wants to move their business to a community that fails to adequately educate the workforce. That is why we must stay involved with, and concerned about, our public schools. They are the great melting pot of London. Rich kids, poor kids, white, black, Asian and Hispanic kids are all there together. We learn to live together in public school so we can work together the rest of our lives. Public school can be trying at times as it struggles to meet the needs of the various constituencies that it serves but our school system cannot be allowed to fail. If we are unable to fashion a school that succeeds for our children then our community will never succeed.

When students learn to believe in themselves then the possibilities are limitless. Mrs. Handy knew that and I think that is why she was such a positive, affirming educator. Those of us who learned from her were blessed indeed.

So, if there is a teacher who made a difference in your life, who helped you get to where you are, tell them thanks. Support our public schools as they carry on the effort to educate and inspire Laurel County's children.

Thank you Mrs. Handy. Happy birthday!

Brian C. House is an attorney in London. His column appears every other Monday in The Sentinel-Echo.

RECOGNIZING RONJA WOLF

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Ronja Wolf. Ronja is a student from Merzig, Germany and she came to the United States as a part of the German Parliamentary Sponsorship Program. As a committed student, Ronja chose to come to America to diversify her education and cultural experience.

Ronja left Germany on August 2, 2005 to come to Missouri. During her time in my district, Ronja has taken advantage of the many opportunities that are available to her. Sponsored by the Thurman family, Ronja quickly improved her language skills and became an accomplished student. Among her many extracurricular activities, she participated in the Academic Bowl, math competitions, Student Council, the basketball team, and is currently on the track team.

Her experiences outside of the classroom have also been exciting. With the support of her family back in Germany and her hosts, the Thurman family, Ronja was able to experience the varied American culture. She has been taken to see the historic landmarks in St. Louis, Kansas City, and the Missouri State Capitol in Jefferson City. The Thurman family was gracious enough to take in Ronja's brother and sister for 2 weeks over Easter and will take Ronja to Florida with them on their family vacation.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in recognizing Ronja Wolf. Her time in America was an enriching experience for her and the people that she has met in her short time here. I wish her a safe journey back home and wish to see her back in Missouri once again. Ronja Wolf is an outstanding young woman with many bright years ahead of her and I ask this Congress to wish her luck in her future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO CALABOOSE AFRICAN-AMERICAN MUSEUM

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Calaboose African-American Museum in San Marcos, Texas, for its role in representing the many historical achievements and contributions of African-Americans to the State of Texas in the past century.

The Calaboose African-American Museum is located in a small, modest building that was the first jail in Hays County. The Calaboose was built in 1973 during the Reconstruction period after the Civil War as a jail, and its function changed over the years to a United Service Organization office for African-American men in the World War II period. It was designated as a museum by the San Marcos City Council through a petition drive started by Johnnie Armstead, one of the San Marcos community leaders, in 1997. The museum was established to focus on the local African-American history in San Marcos.

The museum contains several exhibits, including one on the Buffalo Soldiers, who helped settle the Texas Frontier after the Civil War. It also profiles well-known citizens of San Marcos such as Eddie Durham, who was one of the preeminent musicians in the jazz era. Mr. Durham was born in San Marcos in 1906, and grew up in San Marcos, and then spent the rest of his life traveling through the United States and Europe until his death in New York City in 1987. He was also the inventor of the amplified guitar. His instruments can be seen in his exhibit at the Calaboose African-American Museum in San Marcos.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have had this time to honor the Calaboose African-American Museum for its role in recording the history of the African-American community in the City of San Marcos in the great State of Texas.

TRIBUTE TO THE DENVILLE FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Denville Fire Department,

in the Township of Denville, Morris County, New Jersey, a patriotic community that I am proud to represent. On June 27, 2006, the good citizens of Denville will begin commemorating the 80th anniversary of their esteemed fire company with the Fire Department's Annual 5 day Carnival.

In 1926, members of the Denville Athletic Club convened to discuss the growing need for fire-protection service for the town's 1200 residents. On June 26, 1926, the Denville Fire Department's first division—the Main Street Company—was officially born, led by inaugural chief Benjamin Kinsey. The Department began with more than 20 men, starting an all-volunteer tradition that continues to this day. Among the fledgling department's first purchases was a gleaming 1926 American La France pumping engine, which today remains one of the department's most treasured heirlooms.

The Denville Fire Department responded to its first distress call on August 11, 1926, and capably extinguished a dangerous roof fire. That successful operation signaled the beginning of a long history of dependable fire protection.

Since that time, the Denville Fire Department has consistently demonstrated its commitment to protecting Denville's citizens, as well as providing mutual aid to surrounding municipalities. Currently, the department is comprised of three separate divisions—the Main Street Company, the Union Hill Company, and the Valley View Company, all of which are overseen by Chief John Egbert. Today, the Denville Fire Department boasts a membership of 70 volunteers who proudly ensure the safety of local residents.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you and my colleagues to join me in congratulating the volunteers of the Denville Fire Department on the celebration of 80 years of a rich history protecting one of New Jersey's finest municipalities!

RECOGNIZING DIXON NEAL ETHINGTON FOR ACHIEVING THE RANK OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Dixon Neal Ethington, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 98, and in earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Dixon has been very active with his troop, participating in many Scout activities. Over the many years Dixon has been involved with Scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Dixon Neal Ethington for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

TRIBUTE TO PATRICK W. MOTT

HON. C.L. "BUTCH" OTTER

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to the courageous actions of Mr. Patrick W. Mott of Rathdrum, Idaho.

On February 27, 2005, Henry W. Scheller was ice fishing on North Idaho's Lower Twin Lake approximately 700 feet from the closest bank. Mr. Scheller did not realize he was on weak ice, and he fell through, plunging into the frigid lake. Unable to pull himself from the water, he began calling out for help. His calls were heard by Patrick Mott, a 65-year-old retired logger, who was working outside his lakeside home.

As his wife called for help, Mr. Mott quickly gathered a metal dinghy and rope and set out on the ice to rescue the struggling Scheller. About 10 feet from Scheller the ice around Mott collapsed and he too fell into the water. Mott's attempts to pull himself out were unsuccessful, but firefighters arrived on the scene shortly after and were able to rescue Mott, then Scheller from the water.

Mr. Mott returned to the bank unaided, and was uninjured. Scheller received medical attention after being safely taken to shore. Although Mr. Mott did not successfully rescue Scheller, his selfless actions are a lesson to us all. Without hesitation, Mr. Mott put himself in harm's way to come to the aid of a perfect stranger.

For his heroic actions, Patrick Mott was awarded the Carnegie Medal, given to those who risk their lives while saving or attempting to save the lives of others.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the actions of Patrick Mott. May his selflessness be an example we can follow in our own lives.

HONORING THE CAREER OF POSTMASTER LARRY JACOBS OF BLOOMINGTON, IN

HON. MICHAEL E. SODREL

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. SODREL. Mr. Speaker, on June 28th, 2006, The Bloomington Post Office will lose a long-time servant to my district and in fact all of Indiana. Mr. Jacobs will retire after a 36 year long career with the United States Postal Service.

Mr. Jacobs was born and raised in Bloomington, IN where he participated in a variety of local sports. In his adult years, his community involvement only increased. He is a 17 year member of the Bloomington Kiwanis, an organization where he served as President. Additionally, he is a member of the Elks as well as the Bloomington Chamber of Commerce where he has been a member for 15 years. As an avid skier, Larry is currently serving as President of the Alpine Valley Ski Club.

On November 15, 1969, Mr. Jacobs began his career with the USPS as a clerk. Today he is retiring as the Postmaster for Bloomington, IN—a position he has held for 17 years.

Mr. Jacobs took over as Postmaster on May 20, 1989, 20 years after he began his postal service career. He rose through the ranks from clerk to supervisor of mail processing before becoming superintendent of window services. He then went on to become a labor relations representative prior to serving as Manager of Compensation and Staffing for the Greater Indiana District. Mr. Jacobs was then appointed to a detail assignment as Area Manager, Station and Branches, for the Indianapolis district before being promoted to Manager, Fleet Operation, for the Greater Indiana District. This was his final stop before becoming the Postmaster in Bloomington.

In 17 years as Postmaster, Mr. Jacobs has hosted over 20 postal customer council seminars in addition to a number of stamp ceremonies. He has served as past President for the Indiana state chapter of the National Association of Postmasters of the United States and past National Vice President of the same organization. He currently serves the organization as National Postmaster Representative.

Mr. Jacobs has been married to his wife, Nancy, for 36 years. They have two sons, Eric and Ryan.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and pleasure to celebrate the career of Mr. Jacobs. He has served our district and state honorably. After 36 years, I wish Mr. Jacobs the best in his much-deserved retirement.

RECOGNIZING DAN BRYAN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Dan Bryan of Chillicothe, Missouri. Dan is retiring after 34 years of service to the Rural Electric Program. As the CEO of the Farmers' Electric Cooperative in Chillicothe, Dan has managed a region that includes over 12,000 meters and nearly 3,800 miles of electric power lines.

Dan began his career in the Rural Electric Program in 1972 as the Director of Member Services for Mountain View Electric in Limon, Colorado. Then after a short time as the general manager of Wells Rural Electric in Wells, Nevada, Dan became the general manager at the Farmers' Electric Cooperative in 1982. During that time he has served on the boards of the Northwest Electric Power Cooperative, the Association of Missouri Electric Cooperatives, the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, and the National Food and Energy Council.

As a member the community of Chillicothe, Dan is very active. He is a member of the Chillicothe United Methodist Church, Fellowship of Christian Athletes, and the Chillicothe Rotary Club. In addition, he has been instrumental in various economic and community development projects, most notably as a member of the CITYMARK and "Let's Park It" committees.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in recognizing Dan Bryan. He has performed with excellence in his many years of service to meeting the critical energy needs of the Farmers' Electric Cooperative. I commend his record of service to the Rural Electric Program and the community of Chillicothe over the

years and I am honored to represent him in the United States Congress.

RECOGNIZING THE OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY BEAVERS AS 2006 NCAA MEN'S COLLEGE WORLD SERIES CHAMPIONS

HON. DARLENE HOOLEY

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Ms. HOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the baseball team of my alma mater, the Beavers of Oregon State University, for their victory over the storied Tar Heels of the University of North Carolina in a best-of-three series at the NCAA College World Series in Omaha, Nebraska.

The Beavers, with their 3–2 win over UNC, capped a storybook season with 50 wins to only 16 losses and became only the second team in any sport in OSU history to win a national title. It was a title for the College World Series record books as well, as the Beavers became the first team in tournament history to win six elimination games at the College World Series.

In the title game, just like during the regular season, great pitching combined with stellar defense, timely hitting and just a bit of luck carried the day for OSU. Five pitchers, including stalwarts Jonah Nickerson, Dallas Buck, and Kevin Gunderson, combined to allow only two unearned runs and just eight hits in the championship game.

Mr. Speaker, never in my life have I witnessed a team with more heart, grit, and guts than our OSU Beaver baseball team. The team showed outstanding dedication, resilience, character and sportsmanship throughout the season in achieving the highest honor in collegiate baseball.

The Beavers have brought pride to the Oregon State University, the Corvallis community, the State of Oregon and Beaver Nation. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating both teams on a hard-fought exciting series and the Beavers of Oregon State University on being the 2006 NCAA College World Series champions.

TRIBUTE TO THE COMMUNITY OF MCFARLAND, WISCONSIN

HON. TAMMY BALDWIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to announce that on July 2, 2006, the community of McFarland, Wisconsin, will celebrate its 150th anniversary. Since its founding in 1856, this lakeside community has seen tremendous growth, but has maintained the beauty and hospitality characterized by the village founders

Located just a few minutes southeast of Madison, the Village of McFarland boasts a thriving business community and commerce park, numerous service clubs and organizations, and excellent recreational facilities. The sizable volunter fire and EMS departments and the outstanding new library demonstrate the residents' dedication to service and development of their community.

This community bond stretches from generation to generation. McFarland High School has a tradition of excellence and the community regularly comes together to cheer for the McFarland Spartans.

Lake Waubesa, McFarland's most famous natural landmark, serves as a center to many outdoor activities. As the symbolic heart of the village, shops and restaurants surround it, providing a picturesque backdrop of McFarland daily life since the time of its founder, William McFarland.

In genuine McFarland fashion, the residents will be celebrating the community's sesquicentennial on Sunday, July 2 with a festival featuring an array of local foods, train rides, and the singing of the village anthem, ''On, McFarland!'' A ceremonial cutting of the village birthday cake to honor William McFarland and his descendants and to celebrate the community's 150-year milestone will also mark this landmark achievement in McFarland's history.

It is with great pride that I serve and represent the people of McFarland, Wisconsin, and I extend my deepest congratulations to them.

CONGRATULATING REVEREND KARL EASTLACK FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE WESTERN NEW YORK COMMUNITY

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in high praise of Reverend Karl Eastlack. Reverend Eastlack is the Senior Pastor of Eastern Hills Wesleyan Church in Williamsville, New York. Today, the Reverend graciously delivered the opening prayer invocation on the House of Representatives floor.

Reverend Eastlack has played an important role as a promoter of spirituality and healthy living in the Western New York community. For nearly twenty years, the Reverend has worked tirelessly to expand and enrich Eastern Hills Wesleyan Church. He first began in 1987 with a congregation of nineteen and a small worship center. Today, thousands of devout parishioners gather in a modern, technologically advanced sanctuary campus for weekly worship.

Under Reverend Eastlack's leadership, the Eastern Hills Wesleyan Church has become an epicenter of spiritual growth in my district. The Church features special programs for youth aimed at promoting religion and spirituality from an early age. Pre-school children attend Sunday morning care programs designed to teach them basic tenants of their faith. Middle and high school students enjoy summer youth camps that simultaneously entertain and educate. Plenty of quality programming serves adults as well. Parishioners attend workshops addressing a handful of topics, ranging from Biblical knowledge to personal financial management.

Reverend Eastlack is perhaps most widely known for ''Today's Encouraging Word,'' a daily radio spot broadcast throughout Western New York on WBEN News Radio 930 AM. Monday through Friday, the Reverend uses his many years of experience as a leader and religious counselor to give listeners insight into life, relationships and God.

Speaking on behalf of myself and those in my district, I would like to thank Reverend Eastlack for his selfless service to the Western New York community. We were all truly privileged this morning to be in the company of such a noble individual.

THE CHEMICAL FACILITY ANTI-TERRORISM ACT OF 2006

HON. BENNIE G. THOMPSON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, a terrorist attack takes three components: a weapon, a target, and a terrorist. Usually these three items are separate, as we saw in the 9/11 attack, the terrorist bombings in London, Madrid, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Israel, and countless other places around the world faced with terrorist attacks. In special cases, however, the weapon and the target are combined. Such is the case with a facility that produces or maintains large amounts of toxic or otherwise dangerous chemicals. If such chemicals can be released and cause harm, the target itself becomes a weapon.

While the protection of all national critical infrastructure is important, chemical plants represent a special subset of those assets which should be given the highest priority in protecting. As a country, we recognized such a danger when it came to nuclear power plants. The Department of Energy made the connection and put in place rigorous security measures. The same has not been true for chemical plants, even though they are much more vulnerable, and can have much higher consequences if successfully attacked.

Recently, however, this problem has been given the attention it deserves. Successful improvements in securing chemical facilities will take the cooperation of the administration, the Congress, and the facility owner-operators. We find ourselves in a unique situation where all three of these parties are in agreement that there is a security gap that needs to be closed, and that it will require regulation to do it.

Since the formation of the Department of Homeland Security, one of its missions has been the protection of critical infrastructure. Some 85 percent of the critical infrastructure in the country is privately owned. Neither the private sector nor the government was eager to promulgate security regulations. The hope was that in a post-9/11 world, private industry would voluntarily make necessary security improvements, aided by guidance from the Department in the form of recommendations and publication of ''best practices.''

This worked to some degree. Many members of the chemical industry stepped up their security practices voluntarily. However, many did not, and the economic disadvantage suffered by those who made investments in security practices prompted them to ask Congress and the Administration for some regulatory mechanism that would level the economic playing field by requiring all members of the chemical sector to ensure that their facilities are secure.

The Department of Homeland Security also noticed that there was a big disparity in the level of participation and cooperation to increase security across the chemical sector. Both Secretary Michael Chertoff and former Secretary Tom Ridge recognized this problem. In October 2002, then-DHS Secretary Ridge and then-EPA administrator Christie Whitman declared in a joint statement: ''Voluntary efforts alone are not sufficient to provide the level of assurance Americans deserve.''

Two and a half years later, during his appearance before the House Committee on Homeland Security in April 2005, Secretary Chertoff stated, ''In the area of chemical plants, the President has indicated that if we could not get what we need in terms of security using these various kinds of market-based incentives and best practices, that we would look to the possibility of some kind of regulation.'' He reiterated this stance in March during a forum on chemical plant security that ''free riders,'' meaning smaller plants that have not implemented voluntary security standards, need to be brought under a regulatory scheme to ensure security.

Finally, Congress, in both houses and in both parties, is ready to act. Recently, bipartisan legislation introduced by Senators COLLINS and LIEBERMAN has been marked up in the Senate. Mr. LUNGREN, myself and (whoever else) will soon mark up a bill which is quite similar and I am proud to be a part of this effort.

The Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Act of 2006 will make our country more secure by giving the authority to the Secretary of Homeland Security to regulate security practices at chemical plants. However, the bill does not take a heavy-handed, overly proscriptive approach. The bill directs the Secretary to place the country's chemical plants into tiers based on risk, and to set security performance standards which increase in rigor for higher risk tiers. By setting performance standards rather than proscribing specific actions, the scheme would seek to form a partnership between the Department of Homeland Security and the chemical plants to come up with their own creative ideas to reach the desired level of security.

The tiered structure will also provide incentives to chemical manufacturers to make their plants inherently safer and therefore lower their risk tier. By lowering the inherent risk of the plant, they would not be required to have as high a level of security if the plant moves from high risk to low risk. Obviously, a plant that makes extremely toxic chemicals needs tighter security than one that makes less dangerous ones. I believe that acquiring the use of inherently safer technology where feasible would be more effective, but I am hopeful that the incentive approach will be successful. We also ensure that chemical plant workers will be our partners in securing their facilities, by directing the Secretary to set up a method that will allow workers to report security gaps that they find to the Department, and ensuring that such workers are not retaliated against.

The time for action is now. We have an opportunity to ensure this vital industry, and the population that lives around these facilities, are safe and secure. We must seize the opportunity to work together to secure our infrastructure, our economy and the lives of our citizens.

RECOGNIZING THE COMMUNITY OF BARNES, KANSAS

HON. JERRY MORAN

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the citizens of Barnes, KS, for continuing efforts to sustain and revitalize their community.

Deb Kruse, local bank manager and active civic volunteer, wants to see her hometown raise another generation of Kansans. ''We are very fortunate and blessed to have a community that pulls together to support our businesses and projects that need volunteer or financial assistance,'' Kruse said. ''We have a lot to offer—not always a large salary—but caring friends and neighbors.''

Despite its small size—144 people—Barnes is bustling with activity.

More than a year ago, the city council started a successful initiative to rehabilitate and demolish old houses. To date, eight homes have been rehabilitated and five old structures have been demolished.

The volunteer fire department is made up of 20 dedicated members. With the assistance of local and Federal funding, the department has successfully upgraded its pumper truck, safety equipment, information system and continuing education requirements.

More than 20 years ago, the Barnes Community Development Corporation was formed to help sponsor important community services and events. In 1995, the corporation purchased and still operates the Hometown Cafe. The corporation is also working to preserve the Barnes Gym which hosts Bingo every Thursday night and is utilized for wedding receptions, programs, plays and other community events. Through the years, the corporation has organized many community activities and celebrations: Barnes Old Home Days, Water Garden Tours, Washington County Junior Miss Scholarship Program and the Annual Barnes Lighted Horse Parade.

Close to four years ago, residents came together to open a faith-based youth center called The Refuge. Thanks to generous personal donations of time and money, The Refuge is currently located in a renovated one room school house. Adult mentors, otherwise known as ''Servants of the Refuge,'' provide area youth opportunities to gather and grow through meaningful community service projects.

Rehabilitation of the Barnes I.O.O.F. Park was initiated by Ms. Marilyn Laflin, a Master Gardener, who donated her time and expertise to the project. Community members have donated lamps, benches and various other items to the park in memory of loved ones. The local Lion's Club has been instrumental in maintaining the beauty of all community parks. In addition, the club provides assistance to the Hometown Cafe, makes improvements to the local ball field and band shell, and erected the town's welcome signs.

Our Daily Bread Family Bake Shoppe and Bistro is a family owned business that started out of a two car garage in December of 2002. Since October of 2003, people have come from all over to dine on delicious homemade meals in a beautiful, historic 100-year-old downtown building. The success of Our Daily Bread is testament to what is possible, with creativity and hard work, in rural America.

The newest community entity is the Barnes Trust for Historic Preservation. The trust is in the formation stage and is charged with preserving and restoring the historical identity of the community. The trust's first priority will be to help restore the Barnes State Bank.

The city maintains an extensive Web site that includes a list of 26 entities on its business and organization directory. That list includes three antique shops, three churches, two bed and breakfasts, two automobile repair shops, two building contractors and a plumber.

Gloria Moore, city treasurer, knows it is no accident that so much is taking place in such a small town. ''The individuals that have started businesses in Barnes have invested their money and talents to keep our community alive,'' Moore said. ''We could live anywhere in the world but choose to live in a small community, because we're sold on rural Kansas.''

For rural communities to survive and prosper into the future, citizens must be willing to create their own opportunities for success. Ongoing efforts to revitalize Barnes are an example of how hard work, vision and community support can create just such an opportunity.

Citizens throughout Kansas are working together to enhance the quality of life in their communities. Barnes is a success story that demonstrates how teamwork and creative thinking can make a positive difference in rural America.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SCOTT GARRETT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, due to unforseen circumstances, I was unavoidably delayed and unable to vote on final passage of H.R. 4973, the Flood Insurance Reform and Modernization Act. I fully support this bill, which makes significant reforms to the National Flood Insurance Program, further updating flood maps and increasing the phase-in of actuarial rates on vacation homes, second homes, and nonresidential properties that have been subsidized by the program since its inception. This bill also includes an amendment that I offered that would require purchasers of primary residential homes to pay actuarially-based flood insurance prices through the same phase-in structure used in the bill for nonresidential properties and nonprimary homes. I look forward to seeing this act signed into law and seeing the many improvements contained in this bill enacted. Had I been able, I would have voted ''yes'' for this bill.

MAKING SAFE BLOOD AVAILABLE IN AFRICA

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I chaired a hearing to examine the important issue of the availability of safe blood

within the medical systems of sub-Saharan Africa.

My extensive travels to Africa have included visits to HIV/AIDS clinics and other health care facilities, and I have long been concerned about global health issues including HIV/AIDS, malaria, and maternal health. It is disturbing, to say the least, to visit district hospitals in remote areas of Africa that have only one or two pints of blood in their refrigerator and to see rooms filled with expectant mothers and emaciated children experiencing an emergency.

One also has to experience a long drive on the narrow sub-Saharan two-lane highways to appreciate the significant danger of serious road accidents and the resulting need for blood to save the injured. One dodges past overloaded trucks broken down in the middle of the road and passes within feet of adults and children walking on the road's edge, intermingled with goats and other livestock. The increased dangers and health crises in Africa call for increased means to address them, including adequate and safe supplies of blood.

A medical benefit related to safe blood that I have long promoted is umbilical cord-blood stem cells. On December 20, 2005, the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act of 2005, which I sponsored, was signed into law. This law provides $265 million for life saving stem cell therapy, cord blood and bone marrow transplant. Today, in America, umbilical cord blood stem cells and adult stem cells are curing people of a myriad of terrible conditions and diseases.

One of my greatest hopes is that these current-day miracles will become common medical practice and available to tens of thousands of I patients, including one day to the peoples of sub-Saharan Africa. This hope is inspired by people who have overcome incredible odds thanks to cord blood stem cells transplants, like Keone Penn who was born with severe sickle cell anemia. Sickle cell anemia afflicts more than 70,000 Americans and a disproportionate number of African-Americans. It is also a serious problem in Africa. According to a WHO report on sickle cell anemia, over 200,000 infants are born each year with sickle cell disease in Africa.

After years of suffering, when no other treatments worked, Keone's doctors decided as a measure of last resort to perform a transplant with cord blood from an unrelated donor. This was the first time such a transplant had been tried for sickle cell disease, and it proved successful. One year after the transplant, Keone's doctors pronounced him cured.

Cord blood stem cells hold enormous promise, and have already been used to treat thousands of patients of more than 67 diseases. This potential should not be limited to the developed world, but should also be explored for the benefit of the peoples in Africa and around the world.

My good friend and colleague Congressman CHAKAH FATTAH knows of my interest in health issues in Africa, and shares my related interest in cord blood stem cell research and medical treatments. Therefore, I was happy to take up his suggestion that the Sub-committee on Africa, Global Human Rights and International Operations conduct a hearing on the availability of safe blood transfusions in Africa.

In its recent report for FY 2007, the House Appropriations Committee expressed its continued concern about the existence of unsafe blood as a source of HIV infection in the developing world. The report notes that contaminated blood is of particular concern for women who require a blood transfusion to address complications from pregnancy and childbirth and for children whose lives are threatened by anemia.

Based on these concerns, the Committee requested that the Office of the Global AIDS Coordinator, together with the Agency for International Development, the Department of Health and Human Services and other relevant parties, develop a comprehensive multi-year strategy for the PEPFAR focus countries. The strategy should aim at achieving a sufficient supply of blood for each country's needs, the recruitment of voluntary, non-remunerated blood donors, universal testing of donated blood for infectious diseases, and the reduction of unnecessary transfusions. A separate strategy is requested for non-focus countries that would provide for the standardized operation and control of blood collection, adequate training, documentation and assessment measures.

The hearing provided the opportunity to examine the extent of the current need in sub-Saharan Africa for an adequate and safe supply of blood. We heard from our distinguished witnesses about the challenges as well as the opportunities that this region faces in providing this essential medical service. We also learned about what we need to do to overcome the difficulties and the best means to accomplish our common goal: a safe and adequate supply of blood to meet the needs of the people of Africa.

NATIONAL SURVIVORS DAY, JUNE 28, 2006

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the roundtable discussion held today that brought together representatives of Veterans' Widows International Network, Gold Star Wives, National Association of Uniformed Services, Military Officers Association of America, Vietnam Veterans of America and other veteran survivor organizations.

I made this statement to them today:

I want to thank Edmee Hills, Ron Armstead and the entire VWIN for organizing this 2nd Annual Conference on widow, survivors and family members.

I believe that June 28 should be made into a National Day of Recognition. for all Veterans Survivors.

As you say in your proposed proclamation—since the days more than 200 years ago, servicemen's spouses have followed their husbands from place to place within the United States as well as overseas. These women, who during their husbands' active duty career, unselfishly made great sacrifices to insure the support and welfare of our armed forces on the local and national levels.

These women, and today, the men who are here on the homefront, are the mental lifeline today's soldiers need to stay grounded in an insane situation: WAR.

Gone are the days, or they should be, when a soldier's usefulness ended when his service ended. The families are great resources and should be treated as such.

I am a cosponsor of two bills regarding the Survivors Benefit Plan.

H.R. 808, the Military Surviving Spouses Equity Act, which repeals provisions to require the offset of amounts paid in dependency and indemnity compensation from Survivor Benefit Plan annuities for the surviving spouses of former military personnel who are entitled to military pay or retired pay.

H.R. 968, to change the effective date for paid-up coverage under the military Survivor Benefit Plan from October 1, 2008. It should be covered now. Survivors should not have to deal with the bureaucracy and their grief.

In addition, I am a cosponsor of H.R. 1573, a bill to provide that the increase of $250 per month in the rate of monthly dependency and indemnity compensation (DIC) payable to a surviving spouse of a member of the Armed Forces who dies on active duty or as a result of a service-connected disability shall be paid for so long as there are minor children, rather than only for two years.

I am glad you are all here to discuss the many issues of concern to survivors and I am willing to listen to your suggestions.

In addition, I would like to acknowledge the participants in this year's roundtable discussion:

Ron Armstead, Anthony Hawkins, Edmee Hills, Sharon Hayes, Kathleen Moakley, Deerdre Parke Hollowman, Joyce Karas, Eva Golleher, Dorothy Eng, Rose Lee, Marianne Nugent, Patricia Sharp, Regina Matson, Etta McAfee, Eunice Luke, Patricia Kreigel, Cynthia Dawkins, Leslie Tjarks, Elsie Ryan and Suzanne Melin.

CELEBRATING THE 133RD ANNIVERSARY OF THE VILLAGE OF BROOKLYN, ILLINOIS

HON. JERRY F. COSTELLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the 133rd anniversary of the incorporation of the Village of Brooklyn, Illinois, the first and oldest African-American town in the United States.

Around the year, 1829, a group of 11 African-American families, some free, some fugitive slaves, crossed the Mississippi River from Missouri and settled in the area that would become Brooklyn, Illinois. The community continued to grow as it attracted both escaped slaves and free African-Americans from the St. Louis area and neighboring states. The thriving settlement was platted and named, Brooklyn, in 1837.

During Brooklyn's early years, before the Civil War, African-Americans had no ability to vote or petition for the incorporation of their community. With the ratification of the Thirteenth Amendment to the Constitution in 1865, the Fourteenth Amendment in 1868 and the Fifteenth Amendment in 1870, African-Americans gained the legal rights of citizenship. Shortly after these events, on July 8, 1873, the citizens of Brooklyn petitioned to incorporate. An election was called and, by unanimous vote, Brooklyn was incorporated as a village in St. Clair County, Illinois.

The history of Brooklyn has roughly paralleled that of neighboring municipalities in the industrial area along the Mississippi River, across from St. Louis. Many of its residents readily found work in the stockyards and factories that flourished into the middle of the last century. As those industries left, so did the jobs that allowed the citizens of Brooklyn to provide for their families.

Despite recent hard times, the same spirit that led those first courageous settlers to establish this community still lives on. The village motto is, ''Founded by Chance, Sustained by Courage,'' and those words inspire the current generation to seek new opportunities for their community. The ''North Star'' Corridor Economic Alliance Project is one example of a new implementation of the community's founding values.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the 133rd anniversary of the Village of Brooklyn, Illinois and to wish them the best as they move forward in the years to come.

KIMBERLY FLYNN ON 9/11 ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to read the statement of Kimberly Flynn, a member of 9/11 Environmental Action, a community group in New York City focused on environmental and health impacts of the terrorist attacks of 9/11. Ms. Flynn gave this statement at a rally in New York City that I attended to bring attention to the health problems that continue to exist from 9/11.

Good afternoon. I'm Kimberly Flynn and I represent 9/11 Environmental Action. We're community activists. For nearly 5 years, we've been fighting for the comprehensive EPA cleanup that never happened. And we're also fighting for the health needs of all those harmed by 9/11 pollution to be met.

In the days after 9/11, like many people, my mother in New Orleans was glued to CNN. Now, my mother has no expertise in occupational health and safety, but she called me with concern in her voice: Kim, why are some people digging through all that rubble wearing respirators, but most people are not? Isn't that going to cause serious problems down the line?

How is it that our government, whose job it is to protect human health from the unprecendented and obvious hazards never asked that question?

After 9/11, when two of tallest buildings buildings in the world were reduced to rubble, and the air was thick with dust and smoke . . . when toxic dust penetrated into buildings throughout the area, they told all of us it was safe.

At a time when your heroism and patriotism were the admiration of the entire world, they told the people of Lower Manhattan it was their patriotic duty to go about their business.

Well, I have a question for President Bush and Governor Pataki: It has been nearly 5 years, when are you going to do your patriotic duty?

To Governor Pataki: Your Ground Zero legacy is at stake. You must act to fix the unconscionable workers comp fiasco . . . NOW.

To President Bush: We will not let you leave office without acknowledging to the American people that so many of those workers, volunteers and cleanup workers who came to the rescue on and after 9/11 are sick . . . as are many others who live, work and go to school in Lower Manhattan. And that they need and deserve our government's help . . . NOW.

We will not let you leave office without making a full commitment to provide for the long-term 9/11 health needs of everyone harmed by these obvious and unprecedented hazards.

These are days of desperation for many of you, and our hearts go out to you and all those suffering from their Ground Zero exposures. But more than that, we are with you! We are yours in the struggle for justice, for the duration.

IN HONOR OF ELAINE CASS

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Elaine Cass, whose law career represents success, accomplishment, and community service. Throughout an illustrious career spanning both the professional and academic realms of law, Elaine's tireless dedication has provided inspiration for friends and colleagues alike. As City Attorney, Elaine represented citizens and their elected representatives on behalf of the cities of Hollister and Seaside.

Elaine was born and raised in Toronto, Canada, graduating from William Lyon Mackenzie High School in 1968. She attended the University of California, Berkeley where she received her Bachelor of the Arts degree in English literature. In 1975 she received her law degree from Santa Clara University and was admitted to the California State Bar the following year. Wasting no time, Elaine immediately embarked upon her law career working for the next six years with Legal Aid Society of Monterey County. Elaine returned to academia in 1978, becoming a law lecturer at both Santa Clara University and Monterey College of Law. While she continued to practice law throughout her university lecturing years, Elaine's educational contributions did nothing to diminish her professional ambition. If anything, lecturing on the ethical nature of law seemed to enhance her already impressive career trajectory.

Elaine served as the City Attorney for Seaside for 11 years. She also served in the same capacity for the City of Hollister, where she initiated the first code enforcement program with an emphasis on substandard housing. It was later expanded to include a relocation program which requires landlords to compensate tenants displaced by such housing. Always mindful of community interests and individual concerns, Elaine successfully blended responsibility and conscientiousness to be an attorney who is both respected by her colleagues and admired by the people she represents.

Elaine is married to Robert Zweben, and has two children, with her first grandchild on the way. Masterfully balancing family, career, and the desire to give back to society, Elaine's many achievements cannot be overstated.

Mr. Speaker, throughout her career, Elaine has made significant contributions, both professionally and academically, to the study of law. On behalf of the United States Congress, I would like to congratulate the accomplishments of Elaine Cass and express my sincere gratitude for her commitment to her community.

''COMFORT WOMEN''

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, United States and Japan have, since the end of hostilities in 1945, enjoyed a strong friendship, an economic partnership, and a diplomatic alliance.

Because our countries have such a durable relationship, it is possible for us, when circumstances demand, to offer criticism to each other in regard to issues of grave concern.

The occasion of Japanese Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi's visit to the United States, in which he will be meeting with President Bush and other prominent Americans, provides a special opportunity for gentle but pointed criticism of one of our ally's shortcomings.

Mr. Speaker, our colleagues, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Smith) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Evans) have introduced H. Res. 759, legislation that cals on Japan to acknowledge and accept responsibility for forcing women and girls into sexual slavery during the World War II era. In Korea, China, the Philippines, and other countries in the Pacific region, the Japanese use of women and little girls as sex slaves known as ''comfort women'' was among the most horrific degradations imaginable.

Sadly, despite decades of democratic rule and engagement with the United States and other countries that have condemned human trafficking of the past and of today, the Japanese government refuses to apologize to the world for its role in this atrocity. In fact, it will not even acknowledge Japan's responsibility for the suffering of so many women and girls forced into prostitution.

''Comfort women'' were recruited in countries throughout Asia and the Pacific as Japanese troops advanced through conquest in the 1930s and 1940s. The suffering and humiliation of these girls and women ended only with the peace that came with the end of the war.

H. Res. 759 sends a strong signal to Japan, a friend and ally of the United States, that American leaders are not satisfied with the silence of the Japanese government on this human rights issue. I urge my colleagues to become cosponsors of this resolution and to bring this issue close to their hearts.

Mr. Speaker, on this issue, I commend to the House an article that appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on Sunday, June 18, written by international health consultant Cesar Chelala and entitled ''Japan Must Atone for Acts of Savagery.''

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, June 18, 2006]

JAPAN MUST ATONE FOR ACTS OF SAVAGERY

(By Cesar Chelala)

Japan's continuing refusal to reach an agreement with the former ''comfort

women''—women from conquered countries who were forced into sexual slavery to serve Japanese troops—has been sharply criticized by Amnesty International, which has called on the Japanese government to accept full responsibility.

Of the estimated 80,000 to 200,000 comfort women, 80 to 90 percent were from Korea. Girls as young as 11 were forced to serve between five and 40 soldiers a day, and almost 100 soldiers daily on weekends. Those who resisted were beaten, burned or wounded with the soldiers' swords. During the Japanese retreat, many were left to starve or were executed to eliminate any trace of the atrocities.

For many years after the Second World War, Japan insisted that the comfort stations had been private brothels. Only in 1993 did Japan admit any military responsibility. Although many of the comfort women have died, and many are now quite old, Japan must make restitution. The principle is not so much war as the human dignity of women, and as long as Japan does nothing, it implies that it does not care.

The first South Korean woman to tell her story was Bae Bong Ki in 1980. Kim Hak Soon, who died in 1997, related in 1991 how Japanese soldiers had abducted her when she was 17 and forced to carry ammunition by day and serve as a prostitute by night. Her testimony sparked several others. Evidence of comfort stations has already been found in Korea, China, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Indonesia, Thailand, Burma, New Guinea and Okinawa.

Chung Seo Woon, interviewed by Dai Sil Kim-Gibson in the book Making More Waves, was the only child of a wealthy landowner in South Korea. Her father was sent to prison and badly tortured. When she was 16, she was allowed to visit him. She was told that if she agreed to work in Japan for 2 years, her father would be released. Despite strong objections from her mother, she agreed.

Chung Seo Woon was placed on a ship with many other girls and women. Her group went from Japan to Indonesia, where they were sterilized and sent to Semarang, a coastal town, where they were forced to serve dozens of soldiers and officers daily. In the process, she was forced to become an opium addict. When Chung Seo Woon attempted to commit suicide by swallowing malaria pills, she was revived, and, she remarks, ''It was then that I made up my mind to survive and tell my story, what Japan did to us.'' When war ended and she returned home, she found her house deserted. Her father had died in prison, and her mother, humiliated by a rape attempt by Japanese soldiers, had committed suicide.

Chung Seo Woon kicked her opium addiction after 8 hard months of struggle and worked hard to regain her dignity. She was never able to attain a normal sex life, but found companionship and care from a physician who had had a nervous breakdown after serving in the Japanese army.

In November 1994, an international commission of jurists stated that ''it is indisputable that these women were forced, deceived, coerced and abducted to provide sexual services to the Japanese military'' and that Japan ''violated customary norms of international law concerning war crimes, crimes against humanity, slavery and the trafficking in women and children. . .Japan should take full responsibility now, and make suitable restitution to the victims and their families.''

Still forthcoming is a formal, clear and unambiguous apology to the victims of sexual abuse by Japanese soldiers, adequate monetary compensation, and punishment of those involved.

In 1995, the Japanese government introduced the Asian Women's Fund as a response to international criticism. But the fund is widely perceived by survivors as a way for the Japanese government not to fulfill its legal responsibilities. As Purna Sen, director of Amnesty International's Asia-Pacific Program, has stated: ''The Japanese government must finally right the wrongs of over 60 years by providing full reparations to the survivors of this horrific system of sexual slavery.''

The money is more than money; it carries with it an important symbolism. During her testimony at the Fourth World Conference on Women held in Beijing in 1995, Chung Seo Woon declared, ''I might be poor, but not that poor. I demand the compensation that is rightly due to me, even if I would burn the money after it is in my hand. It is not a matter of money but of principle. The Japanese have defiled my body but not my spirit. My spirit is strong, rich and proud.''

Contact César Chelala at cchelala@aol.com.

PRESIDENT SASSOU-NGUESSO'S MEETING WITH PRESIDENT BUSH

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, on June 6 of this year, the President of the Republic of Congo, Mr. Denis Sassou-Nguesso, met at the White House with President Bush.

Not a mere photo opportunity, this meeting was substantive and included discussions of the situation in Darfur (Sudan), terrorism in Somalia and other parts of Africa, combating HIV/AIDS, and debt relief.

These discussions were important because, in addition to being leader of his own country, President Sassou-Nguesso serves as chairman of the African Union. Congo is also currently a member of the United Nations Security Council.

The two presidents exchanged views on issues of importance to the entire African continent, in particular the crisis of Darfur (Sudan), the electoral process in Congo's neighbor, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), and the situation in the Ivory Coast.

President Bush welcomed President Sassou-Nguesso's assertion that Africa should take the lead in the search for solutions to Africa's problems. In regard to the crisis of Darfur, I the two heads of state agreed on the sending of U.N. forces to replace those of the African Union. There is a delegation of the U.N. Security Council currently carrying out a mission in the Central African Republic, and they agreed that this mission should remain in place to supervise operations in Darfur, the DRC, and Chad. President Sassou-Nguesso thanked President Bush for the U.S. leadership in the fight against the HIV pandemic in Africa.

They also discussed ecological management of the Congo Basin and the Gulf of Guinea as well as bilateral co-operation between the Republic of Congo and the United States. Congo is one of the countries eligible to participate in trade and investment opportunities under the terms of the African Growth and Opportunity Act of 2000.

After the meeting, President Bush stated: ''We had a very constructive discussion about a variety of issues. We talked about our common commitment to help end the genocide in Darfur. I appreciate the President's leadership in helping negotiate a peace agreement, and I appreciate his leadership in working with the United Nations so we can get the AU forces blue-helmeted as quickly as possible.

''And one of my interests, of course, is to join with African nations in combating HIV/AIDS, and I want to congratulate the President for the low infection rate in Congo.''

For his part, President Sassou-Nguesso said: ''President Bush is absolutely right, we discussed a lot of issues that we're all interested in: peace, security, and not just in Africa, but beyond Africa, in the world. We talked about terrorism, we talked about the Iranian nuclear issue, we talked about the dialogue that's about to open up, I hope, and that will bring good results to that problem.

''And on behalf of all of Africa, I thank President Bush for his commitment in fighting AIDS, the commitment of the United States in the fight against HIV/AIDS. As you know, we had a special meeting on AIDS at the United Nations General Assembly, and as you know also, Africa is the continent that suffers the most from this scourge.

''And we also talked about African development issues. We talked about the situation in the Gulf of Guinea, and the Congo Basin, the NEPAD, Project for African Development in Africa. And I was happy to see President Bush give his entire support to the development of Africa.''

Mr. Speaker, the emergence of the Republic of Congo as a leader in African diplomacy and economic issues is worth noting. Only a few years ago, this small country was suffering from the aftermath of protracted civil conflict. President Sassou-Nguesso has diligently embarked on a program of political reform, social reconciliation, and economic modernization that can serve as a model for other parts of Africa.

I hope that the talks at the White House result in concrete measures for addressing the many issues President Bush and President Sassou-Nguesso discussed.

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

SPEECH OF

HON. STEVE KING

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 27, 2006

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the Fiscal Year 2007 Science, State, Justice and Commerce Appropriations bill would fund the JAG-Byrne program at $367 million, which leaves a gap beyond what many States and local law enforcement agencies can fill without cutting multi-jurisdictional task forces which are critical in fighting the war against drugs.

At a time when meth and other drug crime enforcement has already stretched funding resources thin, this funding reduction will certainly have a negative impact. Most of Iowa's meth is in the purer form of ''Ice.'' It is coming into my State from a foreign nation, Mexico. Our cocaine seizures are almost all of Mexican origin.

Recent marijuana seizures in Iowa are of Mexican origin. States, like Iowa, can use Federal assistance in dealing with this now

national and international drug problem. State resources are being stretched thin to combat meth trafficking from Mexico and to work drug conspiracies that have their roots in Mexico and beyond. I continue to support increased funding for Byrne grants. State and local agencies take the brunt of meth investigations without Federal assistance. More than 90% of drug arrests nationwide are made by State and local law enforcement. Tom Constantine, former head of the Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) testified that the majority of DEA cases begin as referrals from local and multi-jurisdictional drug investigations. He was unaware of any major DEA case during his tenure that did not originate from information gathered at the State and local level.

Byrne-JAG is an effective Federal partnership with State and local law enforcement. The key is local control and information sharing across local, State and Federal jurisdictions. Last year, Byrne task forces seized 5,600 meth labs, 55,000 weapons, and massive quantities of narcotics, including 2.7 million grams of meth. These results demonstrate the power of using Federal dollars to leverage State and local partnerships.

The National Drug Threat Assessment 2006, authored by the Department of Justice, found that Mexican criminal groups control most wholesale distribution of powder and ice methamphetamine. According to DEA and HIDTA reporting, Mexican criminal groups are the predominant wholesale methamphetamine traffickers in the country—even in the Northeast and Florida/Caribbean Regions—supplying various midlevel drug dealers.

Mexican control over wholesale and midlevel methamphetamine distribution is likely to increase as a greater proportion of wholesale methamphetamine production occurs in Mexico-based laboratories. Unfortunately, declines in domestic methamphetamine production, particularly by independent producers, will strengthen the position of Mexican criminal groups as midlevel and retail distributors.

Iowa has made great strides. Iowa is a model for how to address domestic sources of meth lab production with its tough precursor laws. Unfortunately, to meet the demand, more meth is coming in from Mexico. A coordinated multi-jurisdictional response involving local, State and Federal agencies is crucial. Local law enforcement needs to have the funds in this amendment to fight drug crimes.

ON THE ETHICS OF WAR: NONCOMBATANT INVOLVEMENT

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce an article by Alex Vernon, a professor of American Studies in Hendrix College and a former member of the U.S. Armed Forces. The article titled The Road From My Lai, published in the op-ed section of the June 23, 2006 edition of the New York Times, drew parallels between the massacre at My Lai during Vietnam and the alleged atrocities at Haditha and Hamdania.

A veteran of the first Gulf War, Mr. Vernon has firsthand experience of the atrocities the soldiers can be driven to commit in times of war. He is not making excuses for our forces in Iraq and neither do I. My Lai was a terrible tragedy and the Army's attempt of cover-up, abetted by the Nixon administration, was foiled by the efforts of Ronald Ridenhour, Congressman Morris Udall and journalist Seymour Hersh. We do not want to see a repeat of the My Lai cover-up again.

Sitting here on the Capitol, while we are deciding to continue the occupation in Iraq, our National Guard and Reserve troops are being forced to serve their third or even fourth tour of duty. The heightened tension of war and frustration at the efforts of certain groups of Iraqis to resist American occupation may have driven our troops to commit atrocities that they would never have otherwise committed. As Mr. Vernon stated in the article, the dull and boring hour-long instructions on ethics does nothing to change the situation. ''Who needs to be told not to run a bayonet through a baby?''

Unfortunately regardless of the results of official enquiries and court-martial into the incidents of Haditha and Hamdania, the damage has been done. The verdict is already in; and it is not in the U.S.'s favor. While General Peter Pace, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, assures us that 99.9 percent of our servicemen and women are behaving humanely, the majority of the Iraqis confess no surprise at learning about the war crimes of the U.S. soldiers.

Mr. Speaker, our armed forces should remember novelist William Eastlake's remarks on My Lai. You cannot transfer the blame on your superior officer; use your own judgment.

And we, the legislators of the nation should keep in mind that in prolonging this needless war, we are amplifying the physical and psychological strains on our soldiers, thereby making room for more Hadithas and Hamdanias.

THE ROAD FROM MY LAI

(By Alex Vernon)

When I went to war as a junior officer in Iraq 15 years ago, we faced a far different enemy for far less time than today's troops are dealing with—four days back then, into our fourth year now. Yet in those first weeks in the desert before Desert Storm, back when we fully expected Iraq's several armored divisions to drive into Saudi Arabia and crush the two divisions we had on the ground, two soldiers under my command digging a fighting position lost their heads. One pulled a knife on the other. Fortunately, other soldiers pulled them apart.

It's impossible to imagine the frustration and stress on American soldiers in Iraq today—impossible, or maybe it's simply not something we willingly work to imagine. Then the news breaks. My first thought on hearing about the alleged atrocities at Haditha—and of the announcement this week that murder charges are being brought against eight American servicemen for killing an Iraqi civilian at Hamdania in April—was ''Duh.'' If we didn't know this day was coming, we were fools.

I would like to ask those troops accused of war crimes in Iraq what they know about My Lai 4, the site of the most famous American atrocity in Vietnam. In the late 1990's, I did a brief stint in the Army Reserve commanding a company whose job was supporting active-duty basic training units. I recall no mention of My Lai in our classroom instruction.

These days, when I teach a college course on American war literature, My Lai inevitably comes up. Inevitably, a fair number of students raise their hands to be reminded, possibly even introduced, to that dark day in 1968. These young men and women attend a prestigious liberal arts college and probably won't find themselves in places like Haditha or Hamdania. But they should be reasonably expected to know more about American history than their peers whom we do send with guns to Haditha and Hamdania.

I am slightly encouraged by our military's new commitment, announced in the wake of the Haditha reports, to ensure that coalition forces in Iraq receive training in ethics and values. But the cynic in me groans. Not another dull, forgettable one-hour block of instruction on ethics like I endured in my years of officer training. Who needs to be told not to run a bayonet through a baby?

According to Gen. Peter Pace, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs, such training ''should provide comfort to those looking to see if we are a nation that stands on the values we hold dear.'' With all due respect to the general, does he really think that such training will appease those who believe the Americans at Haditha and Hamdania, and our soldiers and agents elsewhere, are guilty of atrocities? Regardless of the results of official inquiries and courts-martial, the damage has been done. In the Muslim (and much of the non-Muslim) court of opinion, the verdict is already in.

Of course, learning about My Lai is hardly assurance against similarly criminal behavior; no more than graphic images of car accidents prevents reckless driving. And focusing on it today can create other problems. One is that we allow it to become representative, and to prejudice our perceptions of all American soldiers' behavior in Vietnam. The other is that we treat it as singular—an aberration for that war or for any American wars.

We already feel similar tensions regarding the reports out of Iraq. While General Pace assures us that ''99.9 percent of the servicemen and servicewomen'' are behaving properly and humanely, too many Iraqis report registering no surprise in learning about the alleged atrocities.

So are we saviors or monsters? The truth, as it always does, lives somewhere between. Our military is as thoroughly professional as scrappy guerrilla forces usually are not. But to pretend our soldiers never mistreat others would be a gross lie. After an article in The New York Times Magazine last year about American soldiers accused of drowning an innocent Iraqi and their battalion commander's cover-up, I got an e-mail message from one veteran of the current war that the treatment of that Iraqi differed from the treatment of others only in degree and result, not in kind.

Apologists for My Lai—and presumably future apologists for Iraq atrocities—are quick to lecture: That's war, buddy. You should see what the other guy does. I object to this argument because it smells like rationalization. It permits us to accept the unacceptable. It resists aspiring to a better way. The very idea of ''wartime atrocity'' is a 20th-century development, the most progressive and hopeful legacy of the world's bloodiest century.

There is hope. I can't imagine a Haditha or Hamdania version of ''The Battle Hymn of Lieutenant Calley,'' a tribute to the officer responsible at My Lai that cracked the Billboard Top 40 in 1971. Its lyrics ran: ''Sir, I followed all my orders and I did the best I could. / It's hard to judge the enemy and hard to tell the good. / Yet there's not a man among us who would not have understood.''

Despite the calls to prosecute up the chain of command (indeed, up to President Bush himself) for the alleged crimes in Iraq, I sense more collective sympathy with the

novelist William Eastlake's remarks to West Point cadets about My Lai, as quoted in the Encyclopedia of American War Literature: ''You cannot say after wiping out a village, 'My superior told me to do it.' You're big boys now. Behave yourselves. Don't blame all your sins on General Westmoreland.''

Last fall, around the time the Haditha events occurred, another veteran of the current war, a National Guard second lieutenant, confessed to me his war crime. His platoon was searching a home where an Iraqi man was sobbing uncontrollably for the loss of his brother. ''Would somebody shut him up?'' the lieutenant shouted, throwing in an expletive for good measure.

THE PATRIOT CORPORATIONS OF AMERICA ACT: INVESTING IN AMERICA

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the 4th of July and the 230th birthday of our great Nation, I am today introducing the Patriot Corporations of America Act which encourages corporations to invest in the American people and the American economy. It is time to rekindle the spirit of patriotism and create a new patriotic corporate ethic in America—one that unites workers and their employers in the mutual goal of building a stronger, more prosperous, more democratic business sector that can vigorously and proudly compete in the twenty-first-century global economy.

Since the adoption of the Declaration of Independence, we have benefited from the great work and contributions of countless American patriots and Congress has always undertaken efforts to honor those men and women. The Patriot Corporations of America Act continues that tradition by rewarding companies that commit to America and American workers.

If you want to make Americans of all stripes mad, tell them about the billions of dollars in subsidies and tax breaks our government gives to companies that outsource jobs and relocate to avoid giving back to the our great country. A recent poll in Foreign Affairs magazine reported that nearly 90 percent of Americans worry about losing their jobs to corporate outsourcing. And, it is estimated that between $30 and $70 billion is hidden away in tax havens like Bermuda by corporate ex-patriots.

To end this race to the bottom, to end the offshoring of jobs and research, Bill Edley, a former State Representative in Illinois, and political scientist Robin Johnson of Monmouth College, introduced a new idea of turning the tables around with the Patriot Corporations of America Act. It would reward companies, like New Maryland Clothing and Tama Manufacturing, that care about our Nation, our communities, and American workers. I am honored to be introducing this commonsense concept in the form of legislation in the U.S. House of Representatives.

In exchange for preferential treatment in government contracting and a 5 percent tax rate reduction, Patriot Corporations would be asked to pledge their allegiance to our country by producing at least 90 percent of their goods and doing at least 50 percent of their research and development in the United States. They would limit top managements' compensation to no greater than 100 times that of their lowest-compensated full-time workers. They would show their commitment to their workers by contributing at least 5 percent of payroll to portable pension funds and by paying for at least 70 percent of the cost of health insurance plans. Finally, Patriot Corporations would simply be required to comply with existing federal regulations regarding the environment, workplace safety, consumer protections and labor relations, including maintaining neutrality in employee organizing drives.

Mr. Speaker, the Patriot Corporations for America Act would be revenue neutral. It would be paid for by closing corporate offshoring loopholes that that have been exploited and, if necessary, reining in some of the new tax breaks for millionaires.

Patriot Corporations would create a new class of companies committed to uphold the dignity and prosperity of American workers as well as to selling their goods on the American market and around the world.

Patriot Corporations are an expression of the American spirit of our fore fathers and mothers when they took that brave step of declaring our independence and creating the United States of America.

I am honored to be introducing this bill today and I encourage my colleagues to join me in saluting American businesses and workers.

INTRODUCTION OF THE STUDENT FINANCIAL READINGS ACT OF 2006

HON. JOE KNOLLENBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a very important piece of legislation that will provide additional relief for families as they plan for the financial cost of their children's education.

Over the past ten years, tuition at public and private four-year institutions of higher learning has increased by 38 percent. Furthermore, over the past twenty-two years the cost of a four-year degree at a public college has increased by more than 202 percent. The expense is staggering, but the financial burden of college should not prevent individuals from seeking and receiving an advanced education.

That is why I am introducing the Student Financial Readiness Act of 2006, which will increase the amount of the annual tax-free contribution a family or individual may contribute to a student's elementary, secondary, or college expenses.

Coverdell Education Savings Accounts allow families to make a yearly tax-free contribution of $2,000 per child to assist with educational costs. The money can be spent on both K–12 education, and college. By allowing families to make tax-free contributions to education savings accounts, we promote ownership of education and help ease the financial burden of education expenses.

However, the current $2,000 annual limit currently in place on Coverdell accounts needs to be adjusted to keep pace with increasing tuition rates. My bill, the Student Financial Readiness Act of 2006, would permit a contribution level of $5,000 annually and index the contribution amount by the cost-of-living adjustment.

We must give families the option of providing the very best education possible for their children. Our nation's future depends on the next generation. They must be given every opportunity to receive the highest education and the ability to be competitive in our changing job market.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for the time to speak on behalf of my bill, the Student Financial Readiness Act of 2006. I respectfully request the support of my colleagues for this important piece of legislation to help ensure the future success of our nation's children and the financial stability of American families.

THE IMMIGRANT STORY OF AMERICA

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind my fellow colleagues about the contributions of immigrants to America. In an article in the New York Daily News, published June 16, 2006, Mr. Errol Louis told us about the opportunities that America has given immigrants to leap from ''humble, grinding work to middle-class prosperity.''

Idrisul Alam, whose father has been a cook at the Waldorf-Astoria for the past 9 years, is one of the many who was given the chance to make something of herself. She graduated first in her class at the High School of Telecommunication Arts and Technology in Brooklyn, speaks four languages, was an editor of her school newspaper, was a student government officer, and raised money for earthquake victims in Pakistan. She is planning on studying engineering at Columbia University this coming fall.

Idrisul is only one of the 35 high school seniors whose achievements were celebrated in a ceremony at the Sheraton New York last week. Michelle Quach who is heading to University of Pennsylvania, Reuben Rafaelov who is going to St. John's University, Jessica Acosta who is starting classes at Harvard are all shining examples of the triumph of the immigrant experience.

Coming from parents who have had no choice but to perform low rung jobs like bellhops, busboys and housekeepers, because of their lack of language skills, these children symbolize the success of the dreams and wishes of their parents. In light of the controversial national debate on immigration and all the immigrant bashing, we need to remind ourselves what immigrants bring to our society. I congratulate the New York Daily News and Mr. Louis for bringing attention to these heartwarming stories about the immigrant experience and reminding us about the positive aspects of immigration.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to enter the article titled From humble roots, they blossom by Mr. Errol Louis into the RECORD.

FROM HUMBLE ROOTS, THEY BLOSSOM

(By Errol Louis)

Far away from the speeches and slogans of the national debate over immigration, a simple, inspiring ceremony at the Sheraton New

York this week spoke louder than all the posturing and threats coming from immigrant-bashing politicians these days.

The point of the ceremony was to give plaques, congratulations—and $8,000 scholarships for college—to 35 graduating high school seniors whose parents are members of Local 6 of the New York Hotel Trades Council. Local 6 represents the invisible New York army that prepares meals, cleans rooms and hails cabs for tourists, diplomats, politicians, movie stars and business titans.

A great many of these bellhops, busboys and housekeepers are immigrants. ''You don't have to know how to speak English to wash dishes, scrub floors, polish silver or clean 14 suites a day, and so hotel jobs have always attracted immigrants,'' is how Local 6 spokesman John Turchiano puts it.

Hotels attract men like Idris Alam, who traded in his apron for a jacket and tie and made his way to the Sheraton to see his daughter, Idrisul, collect her award. Alam, who has been a cook at the Waldorf-Astoria for the last nine years, was quiet, dignified and understated, like the other parents.

Even on this joyous day, they carried themselves the way they do on the job: with humility and class. There was none of the silly parental whooping and screaming you normally hear at graduation ceremonies.

But there was plenty to be happy about. The ceremony showed, in stunning fashion, how New York creates Americans, giving immigrants the chance to leap from humble, grinding work to middle-class prosperity in a single generation.

Reading thumbnail sketches of the extraordinary achievements of the 35 award winners, it was hard to remember that they are teenagers, barely out of childhood.

Alam's daughter Idrisul, for instance, finished first in her class at the High School of Telecommunication Arts and Technology in Brooklyn. She speaks four languages, helped edit the school newspaper, was a student government officer and raised money for earthquake victims in Pakistan. She plans to study engineering at Columbia University.

Michelle Quach, whose father works at the New York Athletic Club, is the valedictorian of DeWitt Clinton High School in the Bronx, captain of the varsity swim team and a volunteer at the New York Chinese School. She's heading to the University of Pennsylvania. Reuben Rafaelov, the valedictorian of Thomas Edison Technical High School in Queens, will be off to St. John's University in the fall.

Jessica Acosta, whose mother works at the St. Regis, studied flamenco guitar in Spain and is going to Harvard. Innis Baah, who hails from Ghana, plans to study business at Hobart and William Smith College. Nanaba Wallace is on her way to Yale to study politics.

The national debate on immigration will take a turn in a few years, when these kids are running Congress, the courts and whatever else they set their minds to. And make no mistake about it—these kids will be running the show.

The festivities ended with a ballroom luncheon for the awardees and their parents—giving the cooks and cleaners a chance to relax and be served for a change.

On the way out, I asked Alam, the Waldorf cook, how the food tasted.

''Fantastic,'' he said. ''Fantastic.''

FAMILIES USA STUDY EXPOSES THE WEAKNESSES OF PRIVATE PRESCRIPTION DRUG PLANS

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in order to bring to the attention of my colleagues a study released by Families USA on the new Plan D prescription drug plan, Big Dollars Little Sense: Rising Medicare Prescription Drug Prices. This report, which was released earlier this month, describes how private prescription drug plans have failed to secure cheaper drug prices for Medicare enrollees and have done nothing to stem the tide of rising drug prices.

By comparing the prices under private Part D plans to the prices available to veterans through the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) health system, the Families USA report shows that the private insurers are failing to provide needed cost savings to their customers. Between November 2005 and April 2006, private Part D insurers raised the prices on seventeen of the top twenty most frequently prescribed drugs to seniors significantly, while the same drugs under the VA plan experienced little or no increase at all. The median difference in price between the Part D and VA plans was 46 percent. In other words, seniors enrolled in Part D private plan are paying an average 46 percent more for those drugs than they would have if they had been able to receive VA-negotiated prices.

As the study details:

For each of the top twenty drugs prescribed to seniors, the lowest price charged by Part D plan was higher than the lowest price secured by the VA. For Zocor (20 mg), a drug used to prevent coronary heart disease, the lowest VA price for a year's treatment was $127.44, while the lowest Part D plan price was $1,275.36, a difference of $1,147.92 or 901 percent. For Zocor (40 mg), the lowest VA price for a year's treatment was $190.72, while the lowest Part D plan price was $1,275.36, a difference of $1,084.60 or 569 percent.

This difference is staggering, and it shows the difference between a publicly accountable plan that is committed to helping its beneficiaries and private plans that are committed to helping their profit margins. Big Dollars Little Sense debunks the myth that the price differences between the VA and private Part D plans has to do with the number of drugs covered. As the study states, the VA plan covers just as many drugs as the plans in Part D but is able to obtain ''large discounts simply by using the government's negotiating power.'' The VA utilizes the significant leverage it has in order to get cheaper drugs for its beneficiaries—an authority Medicare is explicitly prohibited from using under the Medicare law.

Another discovery that the report made was that the private insurers have done almost nothing to protect seniors from rising drug prices. Over a six-month period between November 2005 to April 2006, drug prices for the top twenty drugs prescribed to seniors rose 3.8 percent. That increase was mirrored by the private drug plans, which raised their prices to their customers 3.7 percent. (Again, prices under the VA system either did not increase or increased at a far lesser rate.) The drug prices continue to rise and the private insurers simply pass that increase on to the seniors enrolled in their plan, making little effort to negotiate fairer prices.

The Families USA report not only draws attention to the ineffectiveness of the private insurers but highlights the fact that there is no way to hold them accountable. Part D states that these plans are required to pass the discounts they receive on to Medicare beneficiaries but does not specify the proportion of the discount that must be passed on. The insurers could actually be getting huge discounts from the drug manufacturers and just keeping the difference, but we have no way of knowing. There is no disclosure and no accountability for the private providers who supply an essential benefit to the elderly in this country. This is a serious problem for seniors. Prices are higher than necessary, can increase over the course of the year, and can vary among plans. It is also a serious problem for taxpayers, who pay 75 percent of the cost of Part D premiums. Big Dollars Little Sense reports, too, that the median difference between the highest and lowest prices that Part D plans charged for the same drug was 36 percent. This is not just a question of picking the right plan during the enrollment period—since plans can change prices throughout the year but seniors are locked in, even a smart shopper can end up paying much more for their drugs than enrollees in other plans.

This report concludes that seniors in this country would get a far better deal if they were able to benefit from Medicare price negotiation:

Price data from the Part D plans from November 2005 and April 2006 show that these plans are failing to deliver on the promise that competition would bring prices down. The use of ''market power,'' lauded by Medicare officials and the Administration, has not resulted in drug prices that are comparable to the low prices negotiated by the Department of Veterans Affairs. Not only are Part D plan prices high, but these prices are increasing far more often than they are decreasing, and the plans are not containing drug price inflation. These disturbing price tends do not bode well for either Medicare consumers or taxpayers. The ''market power'' of the plans has not delivered the low prices promised to Medicare consumers.

The law that established the Medicare prescription drug benefit, in prohibiting Medicare from using the negotiating clout of 43 million seniors and others in Medicare to obtain low drug prices, has given seniors and taxpayers a benefit that costs more than it should. When negotiations are divided among a multitude of plans, none seems to do as well as a single negotiator might. When it comes to reducing and containing drug prices, the Medicare drug program is an opportunity that has been badly squandered.

A Medicare-administered plan with Medicare price negotiation would lower prices since the drug companies would be more likely to provide a good deal to an entity representing 43 million of their best customers. That is why I urge my colleagues to read this important report and to support H.R. 752, the Medicare Prescription Drug Savings and Choice Act, which would give seniors and persons with disabilities the ability to enroll in a Medicare-operated plan with lower prices.

PRISONERS AND PUBLIC AT HEALTH RISK

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to an article from the June 8, 2006, Washington Times newspaper entitled ''Prisoners, Public at health risk'' reporting on the findings of the 21-member Commission on Safety and Abuse in America's prisons.

The article discusses the high rates of disease and illnesses among the inmates in the Nation's jails and prison and the subsequent threat this problem poses to communities outside of the prison's scope as inmates are released back into the communities.

Based on data gathered and reported by the Commission on Safety and Abuse in America's Prison, more than 1.5 million people are released from jails and prisons nationwide carrying life-threatening contagious diseases, and another 350,000 inmates have serious mental illnesses.

While this article and the report explores the prisons' inability to treat physical and mental illnesses it also examines prison overcrowding, violence and abuse. It addresses the impact of reduced funding for programming, a reduction which directly leads to inactivity and unproductiveness in our prisons. The report reveals that most correctional systems are set up to fail because they are charged with protecting public health and public safety, and reducing human suffering as they strive to care for the sick on a shoestring budget with very little support from the community health care providers and public health authorities.

Mr. Speaker: I enter this article into the RECORD to send a message that it is imperative that health officials and lawmakers realize that the issue of inadequate health care in our Nations' prisons has to be addressed and rectified sooner rather than later.

[From the Washington Times, June 8, 2006]

PRISONERS, PUBLIC AT HEALTH RISK

(By Jerry Seper)

High rates of disease and illness among inmates in the Nation's jails and prisons, coupled with inadequate funding for correctional health care, has put the Nation's 2.2 million prisoners at risk, along with corrections officers and the public, a report said yesterday.

Every year, according to a report by the 21-member Commission on Safety and Abuse in America's Prisons, more than 1.5 million people are released from jails and prisons nationwide carrying life-threatening contagious diseases, and another 350,000 inmates have serious mental illnesses.

''Protecting public health and public safety, reducing human suffering and limiting the financial cost of untreated illness depends on adequately funded, good quality correctional health care,'' the report said. ''Unfortunately, most correctional systems are set up to fail.

''They have to care for a sick population on shoestring budgets and with little support from community health-care providers and public health authorities,'' it said.

The commission, co-chaired by former Attorney General Nicholas de B. Katzenbach, is based on a lengthy investigation and hearings, which included testimony from corrections professionals, prison monitors and litigators, former prisoners, scholars and others. The inquiry focused on the ''crucial role of oversight and accountability'' in creating safe conditions in U.S. prisons and jails, and on the nature and prevalence of gang violence.

''The questions 'who's watching' and 'who's responsible' are at the beginning and end of dealing with all of the problems we've examined,'' Mr. Katzenbach said.

The report also concluded:

Violence remains a serious problem in the Nation's prisons and jails, with ''disturbing evidence'' of assaults and patterns of violence in some U.S. correctional facilities. It said corrections officers reported a near-constant fear of being assaulted, and prisoners recounted gang violence, rapes and beatings.

Violence and abuse are not inevitable, but the majority of prisons and many jails nationwide hold more people than they can accommodate safely and effectively, creating a degree of disorder and tension almost certain to erupt into violence.

Because lawmakers have reduced funding for programming in the country's prisons and jails, inmates are largely inactive and unproductive.

The increasing use of high-security segregation is counterproductive, often causing violence inside facilities and contributing to recidivism after release. People who pose no threat and those who are mentally ill are ''languishing for months or years'' in high-security units and supermax prisons.

Better safety inside prisons and jails depends on changing the institutional culture, which cannot be accomplished without enhancing the corrections professional at all levels. Because the exercise of power is a defining characteristic of correctional facilities, there is a constant potential for abuse.

The report will be presented today at a hearing of the Senate Judiciary subcommittee on crime, corrections and victims' rights.

EVIDENCE OF SUCCESS IN A SMALL HARLEM COMMUNITY HOSPITAL

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to praise the successful financial restructuring of the North General Hospital, a small community hospital located in Harlem that caters to the neighborhood's vast majority of poor and elderly members. North General Hospital was founded in 1979 and since then, because of the uninsured population it serves who use the hospital for its primary care needs, it had been suffering from severe losses that threatened the hospital's success. However, last year, Dr. Samuel Daniel, North General's Chief Executive and his team launched a plan for a complete transformation that has since proved to be an absolute success.

I would like to enter into the RECORD an article by Rafael Gerena-Morales from the June 22nd, 2006 edition of the Wall Street Journal entitled, How a Harlem Hospital Healed Itself. This article tracks the success of North General Hospital as well as the positive outlook for the future of this promising health care center. According to Gerena-Morales, the strategy pursued by the hospital's Chief Executive and his team has been so successful that the hospital went from a nearly $20 million dollar loss in 2003 to a $2.6 million dollar surplus in 2005.

These achievements are even more appreciated when taking into account the challenges that the hospital has faced since its establishment. North General has always struggled with low government reimbursement rates and it treats a community with a high percentage of uninsured patients who cannot pay their medical bills. Furthermore, the hospital historically provided mainly low-margin routine checkups and physical exams, since it did not possess the resources to pay for high-priced medical specialists.

All this changed when North General began to focus more on treating diseases that afflicted Harlem residents in high rates such as cardiovascular problems, hypertension, obesity, diabetes and infant mortality. By offering surgical procedures to treat these illnesses, North General was able to attract more patients and expand its revenue. Additionally, it began to promote its services at community health fairs, further inviting patients to the small hospital. North General Hospital appealed to the need for emergency care by adding ambulances that brought more Harlem residents to its emergency room.

Another key to success was in the partnership established with Mount Sinai Medical Center located only one mile away from North General Hospital. Mount Sinai is one of New York's most prominent teaching hospitals, and with its alliance, North General has been able to expand the services it offers on campus by gaining access to 16 Mount Sinai specialist doctors who perform vascular surgery, lung biopsies, urology, radiology, and pediatric psychiatry.

All in all, this small community hospital embodies the example of a successful health care institution that truly cares for its own. Surely, the health of Harlem residents will benefit greatly from the achievements of North General Hospital, and this hospital remains a source of hope for other small hospitals hoping to make a difference in their own communities.

[From The Wall Street Journal, June 22, 2006]

HOW A HARLEM HOSPITAL HEALED ITSELF

(By Rafael Gerena-Morales)

Since its founding in 1979, North General Hospital, a small community hospital in Harlem that caters to the poor and elderly, had always lost money—until last year.

That's when the hospital's 2-year-old turnaround plan started to pay off. The strategy was so successful that the hospital's bottom line swung to a $2.6 million surplus in 2005 from a nearly $20 million loss in 2003. The hospital anticipates another $2 million surplus this year.

How North General, a 200-bed hospital located in a predominately black and Latino neighborhood, fixed its finances ''sounds like a business-school case study,'' says Liz Sweeney, who covers the New York state hospital industry for Standard & Poor's, the credit-ratings service.

Struggling with low government reimbursement rates and mainly providing low-margin routine checkups and physical exams, Samuel Daniel, North General's chief executive since 2001, says he and his management team plotted a strategy to tackle a tough question: ''How do we turn the hospital around?''

Among the answers: North General focused more on treating ailments that afflicted Harlem residents in high rates, including cardiovascular problems, hypertension, obesity, diabetes and infant mortality. It offered additional surgical procedures that brought in

additional revenue. It promoted its services at neighborhood fairs and community centers. It struck an alliance with a nearby prominent medical center that gave North General patients access to more specialty care.

Running an inner-city hospital has long been financially draining. Such hospitals lack the money and cutting-edge equipment to compete against larger hospitals. They lose top recruits to prominent teaching hospitals. Low-income communities tend to have a higher percentage of uninsured patients who can't pay their medical bills or are covered by government health plans that typically pay less for medical services than private insurers. And low-income patients frequently bolt to hospitals in affluent areas when they need specialty care.

North General faces these obstacles, yet its plan is working. From 2002 to 2005, the number of patient discharges jumped 40 percent to nearly 9,000, and is expected to climb to 9,225 this year, according to the hospital. Outpatient volume between 2002 and 2005 rose 32 percent to 95,746 visits, and 103,520 visits are expected this year.

During the 3-year period to 2005, North General's revenue rose 45 percent, boosted by higher patient visits, including surgical procedure volumes that jumped nearly 20 percent. This year, North General estimates revenue will rise 2.7 percent to $152 million from $148 million last year. North General is paid in large part by government health plans, such as Medicare and Medicaid, and to a lesser extent by private insurers.

But before offering any new services, North General had to confront a major problem: attracting higher-skilled surgeons. ''We needed the technical know-how,'' Dr. Daniel says.

The hospital couldn't afford to hire these surgeons, so Dr. Daniel tried another route: He forged an alliance with the Mount Sinai Medical Center, one of New York's most prominent teaching hospitals located just a mile away from North General. (In addition to his North General duties, Dr. Daniel is an associate clinical professor of medicine at Mount Sinai's medical school.)

He approached Mount Sinai's president and CEO, Kenneth L. Davis, and the two men agreed that both hospitals could benefit from a collaboration. Within 90 days, the hospitals reached an agreement that took effect in January of 2004.

North General pays Mount Sinai an annual $2.7 million and in return gains access to 16 Mount Sinai doctors who perform vascular surgery, lung biopsies, and other highly specialized services on North General's campus. Mount Sinai also provides specialists in urology, rheumatology, radiology, and pediatric psychiatry. North General receives the revenue from these services. In a separate agreement, North General and Mount Sinai have teamed up to provide free preventive care to Harlem residents with chronic illnesses in exchange for higher Medicaid reimbursement rates at its outpatient clinic. (The arrangement has benefited both Mount Sinai and New York state.

Contracting these specialists costs less than if the hospital hired the doctors on its own, says Michael Greene, North General's chief operating officer. The contract also gives North General staffing flexibility because it can ask Mount Sinai to send specialists for extra hours as more patients come in for these specialty services. This helps North General control labor costs by linking a doctor's work hours to patient volumes.

For Mount Sinai, the deal boosts the hospital's revenue and brings in patients. Last year, North General transferred roughly 375 patients to Mount Sinai for cardiology, neurosurgery and obstetrics services. As a teaching hospital handling complex cases, Mount Sinai ''needs community hospitals as referral sources,'' Dr. Davis says.

In 2004, North General began offering bariatric, or weight-loss, surgery, in which a surgeon staples off a section of a patient's stomach, leaving a tiny pouch that absorbs less food. Last year, North General performed 109 such surgeries and it expects to perform 125 this year. Medicare and Medicaid typically pay North General $10,000 to $12,000 per bariatric surgery, though a complicated procedure can bring in as much as $20,000. Last year, the bariatric surgery program generated $725,000 in revenue and a $25,000 profit, according to Frank Hagan, North General's chief financial officer.

Since many emergency-room patients were being sent to hospitals in other neighborhoods, North General added ambulances in 2002 and 2004 that brought more Harlem residents through its emergency room—thus boosting revenue. Emergency-room visits jumped 16% to nearly 34,450 in 2005 compared with 2002. North General estimates that roughly eight out of 10 patients who are admitted to the hospital stem from emergency-room visits.

North General recognized that infant mortality is a health problem that looms large in the Harlem community. In August 2004, the hospital opened the Women's Health Center in a separate building that handled nearly 4,000 visits last year. The center offers a prenatal program with services that include ultrasound, nutritional counseling and social work. While the center isn't yet profitable, North General says female patients who are treated at the center are more likely to bring family members to North General for other medical care.

Last year, the hospital expanded its AIDS center and opened a new cardiac-catheterization laboratory that checks patients for clogged arteries, a precursor to heart trouble. The profitable AIDS center, which is promoted in Harlem through brochures, open-house events and free HIV testing at local health fairs, handled more than 6,400 visits in 2005 and projects roughly 7,250 visits this year.

Since opening in December, the catheterization laboratory has handled 152 visits, and projects 300 cases for 2006. North General markets the lab's services to primary-care physicians and cardiologists.

Henock Saint-Jacques, a North General cardiologist, says he used to refer patients to other hospitals for exams, but he estimates as many as 30 percent of patients wouldn't make the trip. ''Those problems started to fade away'' once North General opened its cardiac lab, he says. ''This has improved the quality of care.''

IN SUPPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Mr. Mark Malloch Brown, the Deputy Secretary-General of the United Nations. In a recent speech on ''Power and Super-Power: Global Leadership in the Twenty-First Century'' at the Century Foundation and Center for American Progress in New York, on the 6th of June, Mr. Brown criticized the U.S. government for its lack of support given to the United Nations. In his speech he claims that the U.S. in the eyes of the rest of the world has ignored our commitment to the U.N., allowing divisive issues such as the Iraq War to break up a partnership which since the founding of the U.N. has mutually benefited the U.S. and the U.N.

Historically, the U.N. was designed through U.S. leadership and other nations who emerged from World War II with the realization that there must be a vehicle to encourage the promotion of peace and provide collective security to all nations with the goal of promoting global values such as human rights and democracy. Today, the U.N. fields 18 peacekeeping operations around the world, from the Congo to Haiti, Sudan to Sierra Leone, Southern Lebanon to Liberia. Unfortunately, the U.N.'s ability to respond to the world's challenges is being weakened without U.S. leadership.

The speech identifies several key issues that have exacerbated the tension between the U.S. and the U.N. First, The U.N. is currently renovating the dilapidated U.N. Headquarters in New York. Ironically, the government not fully supporting this project is the U.S. Also, the U.N. is undergoing specific reform. This reform comes in many forms from the creation of a new Ethics Office and a whistle-blower policy, to the establishment of a new Peacebuilding Commission and Human Rights Council. Although the U.S. championed such reform, our endorsement has provoked more suspicion than support.

The U.N. will play a larger role in maintaining security around the world. No country can afford to neglect the global institutions needed to manage it. As such, the U.S. needs to be more supportive of the U.N. as a vehicle around which an international consensus can be formed to promote peace, social and economic development. America's leaders must again recognize that the U.N. matters. Ultimately, as America continues to address concerns in countries like Sudan, Iraq and Afghanistan, it should recognize that it needs the U.N. to provide an effective multilateral response that will have international legitimacy and support.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon my colleagues in the House to encourage more open collaboration and engagement between the U.S. and the U.N.

SPEECH BY U.N. DEPUTY SECRETARY-GENERAL MARK MALLOCH BROWN

Thank you for allowing me to speak to you today on Power and Global Leadership. I often get asked to talk about leadership, but rarely about power. I wonder why.

With that thought as my starting point, I am going to give what might be regarded as a rather un-U.N. speech. Some of the themes—that the United Nations is misunderstood and does much more than its critics allow—are probably not surprising. But my underlying message, which is a warning about the serious consequences of a decades-long tendency by U.S. Administrations of both parties to engage only fitfully with the U.N., is not one a sitting United Nations official would normally make to an audience like this.

But I feel it is a message that urgently needs to be aired. And as someone who has spent most of his adult life in this country, only a part of it at the U.N., I hope you will take it in the spirit in which it is meant: as a sincere and constructive critique of U.S. policy towards the U.N. by a friend and admirer. Because the fact is that the prevailing practice of seeking to use the U.N. almost by stealth as a diplomatic tool while failing to stand up for it against its domestic critics is

simply not sustainable. You will lose the U.N. one way or another.

FOUNDERS' VISION

Multilateral compromise has always been difficult to justify in the American political debate: too many speeches, too many constraints, too few results. Yet it was not meant to be so. The all-moral-idealism-no-power institution was the League of Nations. The U.N. was explicitly designed through U.S. leadership and the ultimate coalition of the willing, its World War II allies, as a very different creature, an antidote to the League's failure. At the U.N.'s core was to be an enforceable concept of collective security protected by the victors of that war, combined with much more practical efforts to promote global values such as human rights and democracy. Underpinning this new approach was a judgement that no President since Truman has felt able to repeat: that for the world's one super-Power—arguably more super in 1946 than 2006—managing global security and development issues through the network of a United Nations was worth the effort. Yes it meant the give and take of multilateral bargaining, but any dilution of American positions was more than made up for by the added clout of action that enjoyed global support.

Today, we are coming to the end of the 10-year term of arguably the U.N.'s best-ever Secretary-General, Kofi Annan. But some of his very successes—promoting human rights and a responsibility to protect people from abuse by their own Governments; creating a new status for civil society and business at the U.N.—are either not recognized or have come under steady attacks from anti-U.N. groups. To take just one example, 10 years ago U.N. peacekeeping seemed almost moribund in the aftermath of tragic mistakes in Rwanda, Somalia and Yugoslavia. Today, the U.N. fields 18 peacekeeping operations around the world, from the Congo to Haiti, Sudan to Sierra Leone, Southern Lebanon to Liberia, with an annual cost that is at a bargain bin price compared to other U.S.-led operations. And the U.S. pays roughly one quarter of those U.N. peacekeeping costs—just over $1 billion this year. That figure should be seen in the context of estimates by both the GAO and RAND Corporation that U.N. peacekeeping, while lacking heavy armament enforcement capacity, helps to maintain peace—when there is a peace to keep—more effectively for a lot less than comparable U.S. operations. Multilateral peacekeeping is effective cost-sharing on a much lower cost business model and it works. That is as it should be and is true for many other areas the U.N. system works in, too, from humanitarian relief to health to education. Yet for many policymakers and opinion leaders in Washington, let alone the general public, the roles I have described are hardly believed or, where they are, remain discreetly underplayed. To acknowledge an America reliant on international institutions is not perceived to be good politics at home.

However, inevitably a moment of truth is coming. Because even as the world's challenges are growing, the U.N.'s ability to respond is being weakened without U.S. leadership. Take the issue of human rights. When Eleanor Roosevelt took the podium at the U.N. to argue passionately for the elaboration of a Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the world responded. Today, when the human rights machinery was renewed with the formation of a Human Rights Council to replace the discredited Commission on Human Rights, and the U.S. chose to stay on the sidelines, the loss was everybody's. I hope and believe the new Council will prove itself to be a stronger and more effective body than its predecessor. But there is no question that the U.S. decision to call for a vote in order to oppose it in the General Assembly, and then to not run for a seat after it was approved by 170 votes to 4, makes the challenge more difficult.

More broadly, Americans complain about the U.N.'s bureaucracy, weak decision-making, the lack of accountable modern management structures and the political divisions of the General Assembly here in New York. And my response is, ''guilty on all counts''. But why? In significant part because the U.S. has not stuck with its project—its professed wish to have a strong, effective United Nations—in a systematic way. Secretary Albright and others here today have played extraordinary leadership roles in U.S.-U.N. relations, for which I salute them. But in the eyes of the rest of the world, U.S. commitment tends to ebb much more than it flows. And in recent years, the enormously divisive issue of Iraq and the big stick of financial withholding have come to define an unhappy marriage.

As someone who deals with Washington almost daily, I know this is unfair to the very real effort all three Secretaries of State I have worked with—Secretary Albright, Secretary Powell and Secretary Rice—put into U.N. issues. And today, on a very wide number of areas, from Lebanon and Afghanistan to Syria, Iran and the Palestinian issue, the U.S. is constructively engaged with the U.N. But that is not well known or understood, in part because much of the public discourse that reaches the U.S. heartland has been largely abandoned to its loudest detractors such as Rush Limbaugh and Fox News. That is what I mean by ''stealth'' diplomacy: the U.N.'s role is in effect a secret in Middle America even as it is highlighted in the Middle East and other parts of the world. Exacerbating matters is the widely held perception, even among many U.S. allies, that the U.S. tends to hold on to maximalist positions when it could be finding middle ground.

We can see this even on apparently non-controversial issues such as renovating the dilapidated U.N. Headquarters in New York. While an architectural landmark, the building falls dangerously short of city codes, lacks sprinklers, is filled with asbestos and is in most respects the most hazardous workplace in town. But the only Government not fully supporting the project is the U.S. Too much unchecked U.N.-bashing and stereotyping over too many years—manifest in a fear by politicians to be seen to be supporting better premises for overpaid, corrupt U.N. bureaucrats—makes even refurbishing a building a political hot potato.

MAKING REFORM WORK

One consequence is that, like the building itself, the vital renewal of the Organization, the updating of its mission, its governance and its management tools, is addressed only intermittently. And when the U.S. does champion the right issues like management reform, as it is currently doing, it provokes more suspicion than support. Last December, for example, largely at U.S. insistence, instead of a normal two-year budget, Member States approved only six months' worth of expenditure—a period which ends on June 30. Developing and developed countries, the latter with the U.S. at the fore, are now at loggerheads over whether sufficient reform has taken place to lift that cap, or indeed whether there should be any links between reform and the budget. Without agreement, we could face a fiscal crisis very soon.

There has been a significant amount of reform over the last 18 months, from the creation of a new Ethics Office and whistleblower policy, to the establishment of a new Peacebuilding Commission and Human Rights Council. But not enough. The unfinished management reform agenda, which the U.S. sensibly supports, is in many ways a statement of the obvious. It argues that systems and processes designed 60 years ago for an organization largely devoted to running conferences and writing reports simply don't work for today's operational U.N., which conducts multibillion-dollar peacekeeping missions, humanitarian relief operations and other complex operations all over the world. The report sets out concrete proposals for how this can be fixed while also seeking to address the broader management, oversight and accountability weaknesses highlighted by the ''oil-for-food'' programme.

One day soon we must address the massive gap between the scale of world issues and the limits of the institutions we have built to address them. However, today even relatively modest proposals that in any other organization would be seen as uncontroversial, such as providing more authority and flexibility for the Secretary-General to shift posts and resources to organizational priorities without having to get direct approval from Member States, have been fiercely resisted by the G–77, the main group of developing countries, on the grounds that this weakens accountability. Hence the current deadlock.

What lies behind this? It is not because most developing countries don't want reform. To be sure, a few spoilers do seem to be opposed to reform for its own sake, and there is no question that some countries are seeking to manipulate the process for their own ends with very damaging consequences. But in practice, the vast majority is fully supportive of the principle of a better run, more effective U.N.; indeed they know they would be the primary beneficiaries, through more peace, and more development. So why has it not so far been possible to isolate the radicals and build a strong alliance of reform-minded nations to push through this agenda? I would argue that the answer lies in questions about motives and power. Motives, in that, very unfortunately, there is currently a perception among many otherwise quite moderate countries that anything the U.S. supports must have a secret agenda aimed at either subordinating multilateral processes to Washington's ends or weakening the institutions, and therefore, put crudely, should be opposed without any real discussion of whether they make sense or not.

And power, that in two different ways revolves around perceptions of the role and representativeness of the Security Council. First, in that there has been a real, understandable hostility by the wider membership to the perception that the Security Council, in particular the five permanent members, is seeking a role in areas not formally within its remit, such as management issues or human rights. Second, an equally understandable conviction that those five, veto-wielding permanent members who happen to be the victors in a war fought 60 years ago, cannot be seen as representative of today's world—even when looking through the lens of financial contributions. Indeed, the so-called G–4 of Security Council aspirants—Japan, India, Brazil and Germany—contribute twice as much as the P–4, the four permanent members excluding the U.S.

Prime Minister Tony Blair acknowledged exactly this point on his trip to Washington last month, and it is something which does need to be addressed. More broadly, the very reasonable concerns of the full U.N. membership that the fundamental multilateral principle that each Member State's vote counts equally in the wider work of the U.N. needs to be acknowledged and accommodated within a broader framework of reform. If the multilateral system is to work effectively, all States need to feel they have a real stake.

NEW GLOBAL CHALLENGES

But a stake in what system? The U.S.—like every nation, strong and weak alike—is today beset by problems that defy national, inside-the-border solutions: climate change, terrorism, nuclear proliferation, migration, the management of the global economy, the internationalization of drugs and crime, the spread of diseases such as HIV and avian flu. Today's new national security challenges basically thumb their noses at old notions of national sovereignty. Security has gone global, and no country can afford to neglect the global institutions needed to manage it. Kofi Annan has proposed a restructuring of the U.N. to respond to these new challenges with three legs: development, security and human rights supported, like any good chair, by a fourth leg, reformed management. That is the U.N. we want to place our bet on. But for it to work, we need the U.S. to support this agenda—and support it not just in a whisper but in a coast to coast shout that pushes back the critics domestically and wins over the sceptics internationally. America's leaders must again say the U.N. matters.

When you talk better national education scores, you don't start with ''I support the Department of Education''. Similarly for the U.N. it starts with politicians who will assert the U.S. is going to engage with the world to tackle climate change, poverty, immigration and terrorism. Stand up for that agenda consistently and allow the U.N. to ride on its coat-tails as a vital means of getting it done. It also means a sustained inside-the-tent diplomacy at the U.N. No more ''take it or leave it'', red-line demands thrown in without debate and engagement.

Let me close with a few words on Darfur to make my point. A few weeks ago, my kids were on the Mall in Washington, demanding President Bush do more to end the genocide in Darfur and President Bush wants to do more. I'd bet some of your kids were there as well. Perhaps you were, too. And yet what can the U.S. do alone in the heart of Africa, in a region the size of France? A place where the Government in Khartoum is convinced the U.S. wants to extend the hegemony it is thought to have asserted in Iraq and Afghanistan. In essence, the U.S. is stymied before it even passes ''Go''. It needs the U.N. as a multilateral means to address Sudan's concerns. It needs the U.N. to secure a wide multicultural array of troop and humanitarian partners. It needs the U.N. to provide the international legitimacy that Iraq has again proved is an indispensable component to success on the ground. Yet, the U.N. needs its first parent, the U.S., every bit as much if it is to deploy credibly in one of the world's nastiest neighbourhoods.

Back in Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt's day, building a strong, effective U.N. that could play this kind of role was a bipartisan enterprise, with the likes of Arthur Vandenberg and John Foster Dulles joining Democrats to support the new body. Who are their successors in American politics? Who will campaign in 2008 for a new multilateral national security?

A REVIVAL OF HARLEM'S ELEGANCE

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to enter into the RECORD, an article by Ruth La Ferla, titled Downtown Comes to Harlem. The article published on June 22, 2006, in the Thursday Styles section of the New York Times, talks about the retail potential of Harlem. Most inner city communities, such as Harlem, possess tremendous undiscovered potential, and provide manifold opportunities for success by large scale business. It is a region of the city that has a greater competitive advantage, according to Michael E. Porter, a professor of Harvard Business School and a leading authority on business strategy. Compared to the suburbs and areas in the other boroughs of the city, the Harlem community is under-serviced and under-retailed. Although the average household income is low, the dense population of the Harlem community represents a buying power that is comparable to that of other parts of the city. Because of its historical and cultural heritage, entrepreneurs in Harlem have an added marketing advantage. As Ms. La Ferla remarks, N, the new fashion emporium in Harlem, ''is the latest in a growing number of retailers to invoke Harlem's multilayered heritage to put their wares on the fashion map.''

Offering a mix of local labels and African American designers like Byron Lars and Tracy Reese with more established, upscale brands, these rarified stores are visible symbols of the rapid gentrification of Harlem. Springing up along and just off Seventh and Lenox Avenues, from about 114th St. to 135th St. stores like Pieces of Harlem, Montgomery, Denim Library, B. Oyama, Harlemade are realizing urban sociologists' prediction of the ''branding'' of Harlem using niche marketing. Meanwhile some longtime residents are fretting that the goods might not be relevant to the local population. The store owners are countering that their inventories were specifically conceived to cater to the locals, simultaneously drawing attention of the tourists.

I want to commend these business owners who are finally utilizing the competitive advantage of Harlem to revive the community. By infusing the legacy of Harlem's glory days with Cab Calloway, Dorothy Dandridge, and Nat King Cole with the modern street-inflected sensibility, these entrepreneurs are marketing Harlem's diversity and culture to revive the elegance of Harlem.

[From the New York Times, June 22, 2006]

DOWNTOWN COMES TO HARLEM

(By Ruth La Ferla)

Talking up N, his new fashion emporium in Harlem, Larry Ortiz posed a question: ''If we had to put Harlem in a bottle, what would the scent be?'' He then answered with no prompting. ''It would obviously be a little retro, a little 1930's.'' An infusion, in short, evocative of Harlem's glory years, an era of artistic ferment that spawned Cab Calloway, Dorothy Dandridge and Nat King Cole, fused with a modem street-inflected sensibility.

For Mr. Ortiz, one of N's three partners, capturing the essence of the neighborhood is not just rhetoric. To succeed as a merchant, he maintained, he will need to distill Harlem, not just in a fragrance but in all of the upscale fashions, home accessories and cosmetic lines sold at his gracious two-level store in a town house on 116th Street between Seventh and Lenox Avenues.

His objective in showcasing brands like Nicole Miller, Hugo Boss, Marimekko and Jonathan Adler to the increasingly affluent enclave north of Central Park is partly to cater to a fashionably hip local population that has until now traveled downtown in search of popular fashion labels. He is also the latest in a growing number of retailers to invoke Harlem's multilayered heritage to put their wares on the fashion map.

''One of the things that is compelling to us is the idea of branding Harlem,'' Mr. Ortiz said. It is an idea he hopes to render concrete by offering a mix of local labels and African-American designers like Byron Lars and Tracy Reese with more established, upscale brands. ''It's very important to push a lot of black designers who wouldn't get the same attention elsewhere,'' he said.

''This store is not about hip-hop,'' he added emphatically.

At 4,000 square feet, N, which opened in April in Mount Morris Park, is the largest upscale retailer to descend on the area. Like N, other newcomers are pointedly distancing themselves from the brash hip-hop aesthetic and offering fashion that deliberately summons Harlem's fabled past, along with current fashion trends being interpreted by downtown outposts like Scoop, Intermix and Big Drop and also by a clutch of stylish men's stores.

As well they might. They have arrived in a rapidly gentrifying neighborhood. Mount Morris Park, a 16–block area from 118th Street to 124th Street between Fifth and Seventh Avenues, has the highest concentration of Harlem households with incomes exceeding $100,000, said Nikoa Evans, a partner in the store and a former vice president for finance for the Upper Manhattan Empowerment Zone, a federal economic development initiative. Affluent residents pay about $750,000 for a one-bedroom condominium and $2 million for the traditional brownstones that are in high demand.

But Mount Morris Park, and much of Harlem, remains a relative bargain for boutique owners, who pay rents varying from $75 a square foot to as much as $150 on 125th Street, compared with $700 on prime blocks along Madison Avenue.

Flaunting an aura of exclusivity, the new shops offer a high-style—and pricey—alternative to the wares on 125th Street. That crowded, populist thoroughfare is now home to, among others, a MAC cosmetics store; Atmos, a Japanese-owned store specializing in hard-to-find sneakers, with a flagship in the Harajuku district of Tokyo; Old Navy and H & M.

''Harlem is so much more than just 125th Street,'' said Faith Hope Consolo, the chairwoman of the retail leasing and sales division at Prudential Douglas Elliman. ''There is so much retail potential there,'' said Ms. Consolo, who is scouting sites for several clients. ''The challenge is to choose the right location.''

Springing up along and just off Seventh and Lenox Avenues, from about 114th Street to 135th Street, are stores like Pieces of Harlem, on West 135th Street, a boutique that sells denim skirts and jackets with Victorian-inspired ruffles and pearl buttons designed by the owners, Latisha and Colin Daring. It also carries draped jersey dresses ($354) by Rachel Roy, who is married to the rap entrepreneur Damon Dash, and ribbon-trimmed T-shirts ($185) by Gwen Stefani.

Montgomery, on Seventh Avenue, sells handbags, T-shirts and lingerie emblazoned with the image of Jolinda, a head-wrapped rag doll that recalls the Southern roots of its designer, Montgomery Harris, who moved her store from SoHo to Harlem about three years ago. Ms. Harris is also known for her whimsically hand-embroidered, one-of-a-kind skirts and dresses, many in a vintage mood ($400 to $500).

Another new store is Denim Library, on Seventh Avenue, a repository for premium jeans like People's Liberation, Citizens for Humanity and Ciano Farmer, all of which are displayed folded with rear pockets on

view in a series of library shelves, and sell for $130 to $750. Hats by Bunn, on Seventh Avenue, sells waxed-straw chapeaus and flat-top felt hats by Bunn, the Trinidad-born milliner.

Bernard Oyama, the owner of B. Oyama, an elegant old-world style haberdashery on Seventh Avenue, sells his own designs of suits, shirts and neckwear, which are displayed amid a collection of black-and-white photographs of dapper greats like Miles Davis and Duke Ellington, each a reminder that the Harlem of the 30's through the 60's was a thriving style capital.

''The idea was to bring back the sense of quality to Harlem,'' said Mr. Oyama, a native of Gabon who studied fashion design in Paris. His store draws locals and, he said, even greater numbers of clients from the Bronx, Brooklyn and New Jersey, who drop in from time to time to be fitted for custom-tailored suits ($800 to $2,200), and to pick up bow ties, cravats and kaleidoscopically colorful gingham and paisley pocket squares.

Not every store is so rarefied. Harlemade, which has been at 116th Street for six years, is stocked with books and photographs offering glimpses of the historic area and its architecture. It also sells handbags, dolls and an assortment of T-shirts bearing Harlem logos.

''I was the first to brand Harlem,'' insisted Murphy Heyliger, an owner. ''Since then I've seen other companies realize you can get cool by putting your neighborhood on a shirt.''

Mr. Heyliger is typical of the merchants catering to both residents and visitors drawn to a Harlem that is increasingly perceived as romantic and vibrant enough to draw several thousand tourists on weekends, many of whom place boutique-hopping high on an itinerary that might also include dining at Emperor's Roe or Settepani, and touring the Studio Museum, which exhibits the work of contemporary African-American artists.

Despite those attractions, some skeptical local merchants and residents wonder if importing fancy wares to Harlem is not premature. The new boutiques are interspersed with bodegas, hairdressers and discount stores, and not all of the retail landscape looks promising. Stores like N ''may be too early,'' said Minya Quirk, the owner of Brand Pimps, a fashion consulting company, and a Harlem resident.

Ms. Quirk also frets that the goods may not be relevant to a local population. ''Harlem residents have a deeply ingrained sense of personal style,'' she said. ''They know what they want, and I think a lot of retailers might underestimate that.''

Not Mr. Ortiz, who argues that his inventory was conceived expressly to appeal to style-driven locals. N offers fashion at prices that vary from $165 for a cotton shirt with grosgrain detailing to $1,000 for a leather coat. Sizes range from 0 to 16.

''We have a market here that has certain needs when it comes to sizing,'' he said. ''We're offering larger sizes mixed in with smaller ones in a very unapologetic way. And we're always making sure we'll accommodate a variety of body types.''

The fashions are often more boldly patterned than those at shops in other neighborhoods. ''They reflect the way our uptown customers would like to wear clothes, and an understanding that this market is more heavily into color,'' Mr. Ortiz said.

Harlem shoppers also are serious fragrance consumers, which is evident from the proliferation of shops displaying ever-widening selections of designer scents. That infatuation attracted Laurice Rahmé, the entrepreneur behind Bond No. 9, with scents named after New York neighborhoods. Ms. Rahmé, who was prescient in branding the area with New Haarlem, a scent introduced in 2004, plans to open a store in Harlem this year. Her flagship is on Bond Street in Lower Manhattan. ''But what happened to retailing and tourism downtown is going to happen uptown,'' she predicted.

Bud Konheim, the chief executive of Nicole Miller, a line with hothouse colors and animated prints that are popular at N, is confident that a presence in the neighborhood is healthy for the bottom line. The collection at N is expected to generate $300,000 to $500,000 in its first year, he said.

''Harlem is an undiscovered secret for now, but that won't last,'' Mr. Konheim went on. ''Things are moving too fast.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I was attending the funeral of a former colleague on Wednesday morning, June 28, 2006, and missed two procedural votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as noted: rollcall vote 331 ''yea''; rollcall vote 332 ''yea.''

A RESPONSIBLE APPROACH TO EXPANDING AMERICA'S FRIENDSHIP WITH INDIA

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to affirm the critical importance of our Nation's friendship with India and to add my name as a cosponsor to H.R. 5682, legislation implementing the U.S.-India Civilian Nuclear Agreement concluded earlier this year.

Our friendship with India is among the most important bilateral relationships for our Nation's security and prosperity. The world's largest democracy, India is a vital partner in many different arenas: fighting the war on terrorism, expanding and advancing both the U.S. and Indian economies, modeling responsible democratic government to other regions of the world, addressing climate change and other key environmental challenges, and crafting a productive relationship with an emerging China, to name a few.

It is also a nation with which we share many common characteristics, making it a natural friend and ally. Both nations emerged from British rule to become flourishing democracies, each giving political voice and representation to hundreds of millions of citizens and each serving as a beacon of democratic values and human rights to the rest of the world. Both nations share a tremendous diversity of ethnicity and religion, and despite periodic setbacks, both have found sustainable and just models for drawing strength from this diversity. The United States and India have, in the last decade, forged increasingly intimate linkages economically, as India has emerged as one of the fastest growing free markets in the world. And, of course, our Nation has welcomed a large and vibrant community of Indian-Americans to our shores, a community that has immeasurably enriched the fabric of American life.

Unfortunately, our friendship with India over the last three decades has not been as strong as it should be. It is the only democracy with which our Nation had poor relations through most of the cold war. In 2000, President Clinton ushered in a new era in our bilateral relationship, becoming the first President to visit India since President Carter. But that positive momentum stalled in the early years of the Bush administration, as the aftermath of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks unsettled South Asian relationships and India-Pakistan tensions increased.

The primary obstacle to a stronger relationship remains India's nuclear program. In 1974, India defied the world by conducting a nuclear weapons test, demonstrating that it had developed nuclear weapons capability outside the bounds of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. From that day forward, India has remained outside nuclear nonproliferation regimes and has faced international sanctions and lack of access to civilian nuclear materials and technology.

The price of its defiance—thirty-two years of sanctions and prohibitions—has not forced India to give up its nuclear weapons program or to make any discernible policy changes. The reality is, despite the best efforts of the international community to limit nuclear proliferation, India is and will continue to be a nuclear weapons state. Moreover, it is a stable, responsible nuclear weapons state that poses no threat to our national security. It is both unfair and unwise to continue to treat India as an international pariah. The time has come to recognize reality and adjust our outdated policies toward one of our most important allies.

The U.S.-India Civilian Nuclear Agreement, as a first step toward recalibrating our policies toward India, holds great promise for bringing our two nations closer together. Characteristically, President Bush has negotiated without adequately engaging Congress and the international community. But he has correctly recognized the need for this landmark policy shift.

The agreement itself is a greatly-needed improvement over current policies, yet the details of the agreement pose some questions and challenges for our national security. The agreement has both negative and positive features, and the American people need to be aware of the full array of consequences as we proceed.

The most critical entry on the positive side of the ledger must be the agreement's impact on our relationship with India. This improved relationship will strengthen our national security in a variety of ways, particularly by enhancing our partnership in the global war on terrorism and in our efforts to forge a productive relationship with an emerging China. Our role as a world leader in confronting several global moral crises—like poverty, hunger, and HIV/AIDS—will also be enhanced, as the improved relationship will allow the United States to bring greater attention to efforts to improve the lot of India's 600 million poor people. Indeed, the accelerated economic development anticipated as a result of expanded civilian nuclear energy production will hopefully lift millions of people out of poverty and into prosperity.

The agreement also has the potential to enhance our efforts to prevent nuclear proliferation around the world. Currently, India's large nuclear program is subject to only limited safeguards. Therefore, bringing any additional part

of its nuclear program under the International Atomic Energy Agency's safeguards and inspections regime will be positive. Perhaps more importantly, we can reasonably hope that, upon entering the community of responsible nuclear-weapons states, India will set aside its historic resistance to nonproliferation regimes and join us in fighting nuclear proliferation around the world.

The agreement likewise could have some adverse consequences. Let us examine the facts:

Eight of India's nuclear power reactors and 9,000 kilograms of spent nuclear fuel—enough to produce more than 1,000 nuclear weapons—will not be placed under any type of international safeguards or inspections regime. India will also have the flexibility to designate any reactors built in the future as part of its military program, keeping them out of international inspections regimes.

Civilian nuclear cooperation could free India to devote more resources to its nuclear weapons program; by purchasing fissile material from the U.S. and other suppliers for its civilian reactors, India could choose to use more of its native uranium stocks for its weapons program.

The agreement could send a dangerously mixed message to other non-nuclear weapons states, namely, that they are expected not to develop a nuclear weapons program but, if they do, they could be rewarded with a Nuclear Cooperation Agreement. This mixed signal is especially harmful at a time when we are confronting reckless proliferation by Iran and North Korea.

These are serious concerns that have the potential to harm our national security. They are concerns that must be addressed in some fashion before we move forward.

Examining both sides of the ledger, I come to three conclusions:

First, the American people should not be under any illusions: this agreement is a strategic trade-off involving a significant element of risk. It states that we are willing to sacrifice some progress on the nonproliferation front in order to achieve broader benefits to our national security as a result of an enhanced U.S.-India friendship and cooperation.

Second, Congress must enact this agreement because a rejection of it would set back U.S.-India relations immeasurably. For the precise reasons I have cited in stating that a strong U.S.-India relationship is critical, a weakened relationship would be disastrous.

Finally, Congress must find a way to navigate between these two realities. We must minimize the risks associated with the gamble the agreement represents while maximizing its potential for strengthening U.S.-Indian cooperation. In other words, Congress's active engagement in refining and strengthening the agreement is essential.

I rise today to cosponsor the implementing legislation accompanying the agreement because I have gained assurances that Congress will play such an active role. I am particularly encouraged by two recent developments.

First, the Bush administration and House leaders have agreed to a two-stage process in ratifying the agreement. Congress will first vote on H.R. 5682, the legislation I am cosponsoring, which will provide the President the authority to waive provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to allow civilian nuclear cooperation with India. Later, after agreements have been reached with the Nuclear Suppliers Group and the International Atomic Energy Agency, Congress will vote on a specific U.S.-India bilateral Nuclear Cooperation Agreement. If our concerns are not sufficiently addressed in these three additional agreements, the second stage will allow Congress to put on the brakes.

Secondly, I am encouraged by the significant steps the House International Relations Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee have taken to refine the legislation and fill in important details. Both Committees have signaled that they will not simply rubberstamp the President's proposal, but that they will conduct due diligence and ensure that the legislation implementing the agreement guarantees our national security. This commitment is embodied in H.R. 5682, which represents a tremendous improvement and refinement of the draft legislation originally submitted by the President.

Mr. Speaker, I am cosponsoring this legislation to signal my belief in its importance and to aid in its forward movement. But I also want to underscore the importance of the next steps to be taken by this body. I rise today to urge my colleagues to focus upon several key considerations as we continue our consideration of the bill.

First, the final legislation must challenge India to take its commitment against nuclear testing seriously. India has refused to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and has only pledged to withhold nuclear testing in the absence of a provocation from another nation. As the 2002 showdown between India and Pakistan demonstrated, any nuclear tests by India will have a destabilizing effect on the region and could damage our national security. The current draft allows the President to terminate the agreement if India conducts a nuclear test, and it is essential that this provision remain in the final legislation.

Second, the agreement must provide for some reasonable transparency over the use of India's native fissile material and spent nuclear fuel. As India begins to import nuclear material for use in civilian reactors, its native material stocks will become fungible, free for use in producing nuclear weapons. Its spent nuclear fuel stocks, not subject to international monitoring under the agreement, will also be available for use in nuclear weapons. Clearly, our civilian nuclear cooperation should not be used as a means for India to accelerate its nuclear weapons development. The current legislation contains a provision that will alert us if India is taking advantage of the nuclear cooperation agreement to fuel a nuclear arms race. Of course, we will depend heavily on our intelligence community to assess India's production of nuclear weapons, and we must ensure that they have the personnel and resources they require.

Third, we must strongly urge India to cease the production of fissile material explicitly for use in nuclear weapons. For over a decade, the international community has been working toward the negotiation of a Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty that would ban the production of new fissile material for use in nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. India's endorsement of such a treaty would significantly allay the concerns about the agreement's impact on nuclear nonproliferation efforts. Our nation should also be urging India's nuclear neighbors, Pakistan and China, to sign such a treaty in order to provide India the assurances that it can do so without endangering its national security.

Fourth, the deal must be conditioned on the conclusion of an acceptable agreement between India and the International Atomic Energy Agency. The negotiations between these parties are ongoing. An acceptable outcome would have to include an acceptance by India of a permanent safeguards regime that requires the same transparency, the same access, and the same type of inspections that other countries admit under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. The legislation contains some helpful provisions in this regard; however, we must remain engaged after the passage of this legislation to ensure that the negotiations meet our standards.

Finally, Congress and the Bush administration can strengthen the U.S.-India Nuclear Cooperation Agreement by working together to enhance and expand nuclear nonproliferation efforts in other regions of the world. Our national security depends greatly on keeping the worst weapons, nuclear weapons of mass destruction, out of the worst hands, those of fundamentalist terrorists who target our nation. Ensuring adequate protections against proliferation in the U.S.-India agreement is a key component of this priority, but it does not end there.

As we work to bring India in line with international standards for nuclear responsibility, we should also be accelerating programs that increase nuclear security elsewhere. One of the most critical programs is the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction program that secures loose nuclear material and technology in the former Soviet Union, where enough nuclear material to produce thousands of nuclear weapons remains unsecured. As the 9–11 Commission's Final Report rightly noted, ''the government should weigh the value of this investment against the catastrophic cost America would face should such weapons find their way to the terrorists who are so anxious to acquire them.''

Of equal importance, the administration and Congress must strengthen our dismally ineffective efforts to confront Iran and North Korea as those nations defy the world. One of this Administration's single most dangerous failures has been to allow North Korea to proliferate freely for five years without crafting any viable strategy for confronting the world's worst proliferator. And the Administration's strategy to rein in Iran has been scarcely better, allowing the situation to continue unresolved for far too long. As long as these two rogue nations freely seek nuclear weapons, weapons they could easily sell or transfer to terrorists, our nation cannot be secure.

The U.S.-India Nuclear Cooperation Agreement is a dramatic departure from the past. We must not enter into it with any illusions that it is without risk; however, I believe it holds the potential to make our nation and the world safer and more secure. We have the opportunity to build a strong and lasting friendship with the world's largest democracy, one of the world's fastest growing markets, and a nation from which we have remained estranged for far too long. We should not let such a tremendous opportunity pass by. At the same time, we must proceed responsibly, ensuring that we minimize the risks inherent in the agreement. I believe Congress is taking

seriously its responsibility to do so, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to craft legislation that makes our Nation stronger and forges a new era in U.S.-Indian relations.

CORRECTING THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 889

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 26, 2006

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that, on Monday, the House passed S. Con. Res. 103, though I am disappointed by the events that necessitated its consideration. Last September, when the House considered H.R. 889, the Coast Guard Authorization Act, I expressed my concern about a provision that would have altered the existing evaluation and approval process for the Cape Wind project, a 420 megawatt offshore wind farm proposed for Horseshoe Shoal off the coast of Massachusetts. That project is currently undergoing a thorough review process that is working with numerous federal and state agencies, as well as interested parties, to assess potential impacts to the environment, navigation and other areas of concern. When the House and Senate went to conference, I wrote to the head House conferees, explaining the strong support in Rhode Island for the project and cautioning about the potential negative ramifications of the provision on the growing wind energy industry, which will help diversify our Nation's energy supply by providing a clean and renewable source to millions of Americans.

Much to my dismay, during conference negotiations, a much broader restriction on the project was inserted—language that had not been considered by either the House or Senate—that would essentially circumvent the existing project by giving the Governor of Massachusetts veto power over this particular project. At a time when our Nation's economy is endangered by our dependence on foreign oil, we should be encouraging clean and renewable energy development, not blocking it. To protest this last-minute back-room conference deal, I joined the gentleman from New Hampshire, Mr. BASS, in leading an effort to ask the House leadership to prevent the consideration of any final agreement on the Coast Guard bill that contained language endangering the Cape Wind project in Massachusetts. I am pleased that widespread public opposition to the language forced it to be removed from the bill, and I will continue my efforts to promote the responsible development of clean and renewable energy in Congress.

TRIBUTE TO MEL BROOKS

HON. TIMOTHY H. BISHOP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 28, 2006

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Speaker, if you've ever seen Blazing Saddles, Young Frankenstein, or History of the World: Part I, then you've probably laughed out loud at one or all of these comedies and rank them among your all-time favorite movies. For those laughs, you can thank Mel Brooks, who I'm proud to represent and recognize today—in wishing him a happy 80th birthday.

Mr. Speaker, many people don't know that before he made movies, Mel Brooks served in the U.S. Army during World War II. One of Corporal Brooks' duties as a combat engineer was defusing landmines in areas around North Africa before the infantry moved in.

With his wife, the late Anne Bancroft, who passed away just over 1 year ago, Mel became a tremendous source of pride on Long Island. Known for his infectious sense of humor and for often breaking into a routine at the delight of surprised patrons of restaurants all around the East End, Long Islanders know Mel is just as extroverted, witty, and entertaining when you come across him in person as he appears on screen. Combined with his warmth and kindness, he has indeed earned a place among the East End's favorite sons.

Mr. Speaker, we can all be very proud of Americans like Mel Brooks who use their humor and celebrity to bring joy to the lives of so many people and to help those less fortunate than ourselves. Today, let's wish Mel Brooks a happy 80th and many happy returns as he keeps making us laugh with his movies and through his unique, very funny outlook on life.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, June 29, 2006 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 11

2:15 p.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine judicial nominations.
SD–226

JULY 12

10 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine USDA dairy programs.
SR–328A

JULY 13

2 p.m.
Appropriations
Business meeting to markup proposed legislation making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and proposed legislation making appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007.
SD–106

2:30 p.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine unmanned aerial systems in Alaska.
SD–562

JULY 19

10 a.m.
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold hearings to examine the semiannual Monetary Policy Report to Congress.
SD–538
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Technology, Innovation, and Competitiveness Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine high performance computing.
SD–562

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Public Lands and Forests Subcommittee
To hold an oversight hearing on the implementation of Public Law 108–148 The Healthy Forests Restoration Act.
SD–366

JULY 20

2 p.m.
Appropriations
Business meeting to markup H.R. 5631, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, proposed legislation making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, H.R. 5385, making appropriations for the military quality of life functions of the Department of Defense, military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and H.R. 5576, making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and independent agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007.
SD–106

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate confirmed the nomination of Henry M. Paulson, Jr., to be Secretary of the Treasury.

Senate agreed to the conference report to accompany H.R. 889, Coast Guard Authorization Act.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S6591–S6727

Measures Introduced: Nine bills and one resolution were introduced, as follows: S. 3587–3595, and S. Con. Res. 107. **Page S6634**

Measures Reported:

S. 3589, to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, to restore the financial solvency of the flood insurance fund. (S. Rept. No. 109–271)

S. 811, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the bicentennial of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

S. 3569, to implement the United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement. **Page S6634**

Measures Passed:

Rural Health Care Capital Access Act: Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 4912, to amend section 242 of the National Housing Act to extend the exemption for critical access hospitals under the FHA program for mortgage insurance for hospitals, and the bill was then passed, clearing the measure for the President. **Page S6726**

Coast Guard Authorization—Conference Report: Pursuant to the order of June 22, 2006, Senate agreed to the conference report to accompany H.R. 889, to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal year 2006, to make technical corrections to various laws administered by the Coast Guard, clearing the measure for the President. **Page S6615**

U.S.-Oman Free Trade Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at approximately 11:30 a.m. on Thursday, June 29, 2006, Senate begin consideration of S. 3569, to implement the United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement. **Page S6726**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

Henry M. Paulson, Jr., of New York, to be Secretary of the Treasury. **Pages S6615–24, S6727**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Debra Ann Livingston, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit.

Kent A. Jordan, of Delaware, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.

Raymond M. Kethledge, of Michigan, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

Stephen Joseph Murphy III, of Michigan, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

John Preston Bailey, of West Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of West Virginia.

Mary O. Donohue, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of New York.

John Alfred Jarvey, of Iowa, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Iowa.

Robert James Jonker, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Michigan.

Paul Lewis Maloney, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Michigan.

Janet T. Neff, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Michigan.

Sean T. Connaughton, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Maritime Administration.

Jay M. Cohen, of New York, to be Under Secretary for Science and Technology, Department of Homeland Security.

Timothy Shanahan, of Illinois, to be a Member of the National Institute for Literacy Advisory Board for a term expiring November 25, 2007.

Patricia Mathes, of Texas, to be a Member of the National Institute for Literacy Advisory Board for a term expiring November 25, 2007.

Carmel Borders, of Kentucky, to be a Member of the National Institute for Literacy Advisory Board for a term expiring November 25, 2008.

Donald D. Deshler, of Kansas, to be a Member of the National Institute for Literacy Advisory Board for a term expiring January 30, 2008.

Eliza McFadden, of Florida, to be a Member of the National Institute for Literacy Advisory Board for a term expiring January 30, 2009.

Blanca E. Enriquez, of Texas, to be a Member of the National Institute for Literacy Advisory Board for a term expiring January 30, 2009. **Pages S6726–27**

Messages From the House: **Pages S6632–33**

Measures Referred: **Page S6633**

Measures Placed on Calendar: **Page S6633**

Measures Read First Time: **Page S6633**

Executive Communications: **Pages S6633–34**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S6634**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S6634–35**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S6635–S6725**

Additional Statements: **Pages S6631–32**

Notices of Hearings/Meetings: **Page S6725**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S6725–26**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:30 a.m., and adjourned at 6:26 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, June 29, 2006. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S6726.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch resumed hearings to examine the progress of Capitol Visitor Center construction, receiving testimony from Alan M. Hantman, Architect, Robert C. Hixon, Jr., Capitol Visitor Center Project Manager, John Eisold, Attending Physician, and Stephen Ayers, Chief Operating Officer, all of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol; Bernard L. Ungar, Director, and Terrell Dorn, Assistant Director, both of Physical Infrastructure Issues, Government Accountability Office; Peter Evelyth, General Counsel, Office of Compliance; and Captain Joseph Terra, U.S. Public Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services.

Hearings continue on Wednesday, August 2.

IRAQI SECURITY FORCES

Committee on Armed Services: Committee met in closed session to discuss training and equipping Iraqi security forces with Lieutenant General Martin Dempsey, USA, Commander, Multinational Security Transition Command in Iraq.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee ordered favorably reported H.R. 5252, to promote the deployment of broadband networks and services, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

NOMINATION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nomination of Marc Spitzer, of Arizona, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, after the nominee, who was introduced by Senators McCain and Kyl, testified and answered questions in his own behalf.

WATER BILLS

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water and Power concluded a hearing to examine S. 1812, to amend the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 to provide for the conjunctive use of surface and ground water in Juab County, Utah, S. 1965, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain buildings and lands of the Yakima Project, Washington, to the Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District, S. 2129, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land and improvements of the Gooding Division of the Minidoka Project, Idaho, S. 2470, to authorize early repayment of obligations to the Bureau of Reclamation within the A & B Irrigation District in the State of Idaho, S. 2502, to provide for the modification of an amendatory repayment contract between the Secretary of the Interior and the North Unit Irrigation District, S. 3404, to reauthorize the Mni Wiconi Rural Water Supply Project, H.R. 2383, to redesignate the facility of the Bureau of Reclamation located at 19550 Kelso Road in Byron, California, as the "C.W. 'Bill' Jones Pumping Plant", and H.R. 4204, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to transfer ownership of the American River Pump Station Project, after receiving testimony from William E. Rinne, Acting Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, and Jason Peltier,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Water and Science, both of the Department of the Interior; Richard Dieker, Yakima-Tieton Irrigation District, Yakima, Washington; and Einar L. Maisch, Placer County Water Agency, Auburn, California.

EPA

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded an oversight hearing on the efforts of the Environmental Protection Agency to meet the challenges of ensuring consistent implementation of federal environmental laws and regulations, after receiving testimony from Granta Y. Nakayama, Assistant Administrator, Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance, and Donald Welsh, Regional Administrator, Region 3, both of the Environmental Protection Agency; John B. Stephenson, Director, Natural Resources and Environment, Government Accountability Office; David Paylor, Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, Richmond, on behalf of the Environmental Council of the States; Jean Payne, Illinois Fertilizer and Chemical Association, Bloomington; Richard W. Waterman, University of Kentucky Department of Political Science, Lexington; and Eric Schaeffer, Environmental Integrity Project, Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Finance: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 1321, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on telephone and other communications, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (As approved by the committee, the substitute amendment incorporates the text of S. 832.);

S. 3569, to implement the United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement; and

The nomination of Henry M. Paulson, Jr., of New York, to be Secretary of the Treasury.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Peter R. Coneway, of Texas, to be Ambassador to Switzerland, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Principality of Liechtenstein, who was introduced by Senators Hutchison and Cornyn, Richard E. Hoagland, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Armenia, and Thomas C. Foley, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador to Ireland, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Mickey D. Barnett, of New Mexico, who was introduced by Senator Domenici, Katherine C. Tobin, of New York, and Ellen C. Williams, of Kentucky, who was introduced by Senator McConnell, each to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 3570, to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2007 through 2011, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3546, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to serious adverse event reporting for dietary supplements and nonprescription drugs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 707, to reduce preterm labor and delivery and the risk of pregnancy-related deaths and complications due to pregnancy, and to reduce infant mortality caused by prematurity, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 757, to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Director of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences to make grants for the development and operation of research centers regarding environmental factors that may be related to the etiology of breast cancer, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

The nomination of Jonann E. Chiles, of Arkansas, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Legal Services Corporation.

NATIVE AMERICAN HOUSING PROGRAMS

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the barriers, challenges, and accomplishments of Native American Housing Programs, including Alaska Native Villages, the Native Hawaiian Program, and the Land Assignment Law, after receiving testimony from Orlando J. Cabrera, Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Public and Indian Housing; Pattye Green, Fannie Mae, Tishomingo, Oklahoma; Marty Shuravloff, National American Indian Housing Council, Washington, D.C.; A.D. Ellis, Muscogee Creek Nation, Okmulgee, Oklahoma; and James Steele, Jr., Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Indian Reservation, Pablo, Montana.

HEDGE FUNDS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the relationship between certain hedge funds and independent analysts, focusing on ensuring integrity of the marketplace and protection of investors and the public from fraud, after receiving testimony from Matthew Friedrich, Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General and Chief of Staff, Criminal Division, Department of Justice; Connecticut Attorney General Richard Blumenthal, Hartford; Gary J. Aguirre, Government Accountability Project, Washington, D.C.; Marc E. Kasowitz, Kasowitz, Benson, Torres & Friedman LLP, and Joseph McLaughlin, Sidley Austin LLP, on behalf of Managed Funds Association, both of New York, New York; Kim D. Blickenstaff, Biosite Incorporated, San Diego, California; Owen A. Lamont, Yale School of Management, New Haven, Connecticut; Demetrios Anifantis, JP Morgan, Scottsdale, Arizona; Howard M. Schilit, Center for Financial Research and Analysis, Rockville, Maryland; and Jonathan A. Boersma, CFA Institute, Charlottesville, Virginia.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Kimberly Ann Moore, of Virginia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit, who was introduced by Senator Warner, and Bobby E. Shepherd, of Arkansas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit, who was introduced by Senators Lincoln and Pryor, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 17 public bills, H.R. 5693–5709; and 4 resolutions, Con. Res. 439; and H. Res. 895, 898–899 were introduced. **Pages H4794–95**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H4795–96**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed as follows:

H.R. 5061, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey Paint Bank National Fish Hatchery and Wytheville National Fish Hatchery to the State of Virginia (H. Rept. 109–533);

H.R. 413, to establish the Bleeding Kansas and the Enduring Struggle for Freedom National Heritage Areas, with an amendment (H. Rept. 109–534);

H.R. 5534, 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 (H. Rept. 109–535);

H.R. 5611, 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, with an amendment (H. Rept. 109–536);

H.R. 5632, to amend Chapter 301 of title 49, United States Code, to establish a national tire fuel efficiency consumer information program, with an amendment (H. Rept. 109–537);

H.R. 5646, to study and promote the use of energy efficient computer servers in the United States (H. Rept. 109–538);

H. Res. 896, providing for consideration of H. Res. 895, supporting intelligence and law enforcement programs to track terrorists 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 (H. Rept. 109–539); and H. Res. 897, providing for consideration of H.R. 4761, the Deep Ocean Energy Resources Act of 2006 (H. Rept. 109–540). **Page H4794**

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Rehberg to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H4683**

Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest Chaplain, Rev. Dr. Karl D. East1ack, Senior Pastor, Eastern Hills Wesleyan Church, Williamsville, New York. **Page H4683**

Motion to Adjourn: Rejected the Wu motion to adjourn by a yea-and-nay vote of 27 yeas to 358 nays, Roll No. 331. **Page H4689**

Science, State, Justice, Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2007: The House continued consideration of 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. Further consideration is expected to continue tomorrow, Thursday, June 29th. **Pages H4689–H4779**

Agreed To:

Wolf amendment to increase the amount for Operations and Administration under the ITA by $5 million; **Page H4694**

Reyes amendment adds $10 million to the southwest Border Initiative, offset by a $10 million cut to State CIO, after vacating the previous request for a recorded vote; **Pages H4690–91**

Garrett amendment adds $2 million to the Department of Justice's General Administration salaries and expenses account, offset by cuts to State CIO, after vacating the previous request for a recorded vote; **Page H4691**

Lynch amendment adds $12 million to the COPS bulletproof vest program, offset by a cut to State CIO, after vacating the previous request for a recorded vote; **Page H4691**

Brown amendment increases by $6 million the funding for the International Trade Administration's Office of China Compliance, after vacating the previous request for a recorded vote; **Pages H4694–96**

Johnson, Eddie Bernice, of Texas amendment adds $2.7 million to the funding for the Weather Service of NOAA, offset by cuts to the Department on Commerce's Department of Management, after vacating the previous request for a recorded vote; **Pages H4696–97**

Thompson of California amendment to provide an additional $2 million (by transfer) for the West Coast commercial salmon industry; **Pages H4699–H4701**

Pallone amendment (No. 17 printed in the Congressional Record of June 26th) makes available $1 million for the study of which coastal population centers are most at risk from the impacts of sea level rise due to global warming for the Commerce Department to contract with the National Academy of Sciences, offset by a $1 million reduction in the Commerce Department's administrative expense account; **Pages H4701–07**

Murphy amendment to increase (by $50,000) and immediately decrease (by $50,000) funding for the FCC in order to encourage the FCC to promulgate a rule on caller ID services; **Pages H4707–08**

Davis of California amendment to increase funding to the National Veterans Business Development Corporation by $1 million; **Pages H4708–11**

Tancredo amendment (No. 25 printed in the Congressional Record of June 26th) would invalidate several State Department guidelines that needlessly restrict communication between officials from Taiwan and the U.S. These guidelines prevent meetings between officials from Taiwan and Executive Branch personnel from taking place in the Old Executive Office Building, the White House, and the State Department. They also prevent Executive Branch officials from going to Twin Oaks (the former Washington, DC residence of Taiwan's de facto ambassador), and bar executive branch personnel above the rank of GS–14 from attending Taiwan's annual holiday reception. The guidelines also prevent high ranking DOD officials and military officers above the rank of Colonel or Captain (Navy) from traveling to Taiwan;

Cardoza amendment increases funding for the Office of Justice Programs Justice Assistance for the Drug Endangered Child grant program; **Pages H4725–26**

Chocola amendment (No. 2 printed in the Congressional Record of June 26th) would prohibit the use of funds by NASA in contravention of OMB federal travel regulations, which govern the use of agency-owned passenger aircraft; **Page H4726**

Chocola amendment (No. 3 printed in the Congressional Record of June 26th) prohibits the use of funds by the State Department in contravention of the General Services Administration's (GSA) Federal Travel Regulation, which governs travel by State's civil service employees; **Pages H4729–30**

Culberson amendment states that no funds from this Act may be used on activities in contravention of section 1373 of title 8; **Pages H4731–33**

Capuano amendment adds $3 million to the Justice Assistance for young witness assistance, offset by a $3 million cut to the Department of Commerce's Departmental Management; **Page H4734**

Engel amendment prohibits the use of funds in contravention of a provision in current law requiring that at least 75% of vehicles acquired by federal agencies run on alternative fuels; **Page H4734**

DeGette amendment to revise 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 million; **Page H4748**

Lipinski amendment cuts the General Administration funding by $500,000 and add to the Law Enforcement Tribute Act program; **Pages H4756–57**

DeLauro amendment to provide an additional $10 million for various new Violence Against Women programs; **Pages H4757–58**

McCaul amendment prohibits funds for the United Nations Human Rights Council unless all state sponsors of terrorism are removed; **Pages H4758–59**

Johnson, Eddie Bernice, of Texas amendment to reduce funding for the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Block Grant program by $5 million; **Pages H4759–60**

Waxman amendment prohibits funding for Industry Trade Advisory Committee on Chemicals unless certain membership requirements are met; **Page H4762**

Garrett amendment (No. 5 printed in the Congressional Record of June 26th) prohibits funds from this Act to be used to send or otherwise pay for the attendance of more than 50 employees form a Federal department or agency at any single conference occurring outside the United States; **Pages H4762–63**

Nadler amendment to increase funding (by offset) for the Jessica Gonzales Victims Assistance program by $5,000,000; **Pages H4763–64**

Mica amendment (No. 13 printed in the Congressional Record of June 26th) states that none of the funds made available in this Act maybe used in contravention of the Buy American Act; **Pages H4767–68**

Baird amendment to prohibit use of funds in the bill 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 case; **Pages H4770–71**

Renzi amendment to revise amounts in the bill 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 million; **Pages H4771–72**

Wolf amendment to increase by $2,000,000 funding for prisoner re-entry programs; **Page H4774**

Musgrave amendment (No. 16 printed in the Congressional Record of June 26th) that sought to prohibit funds from being used to carry out section 924(p) of title 18, United States Code (by a recorded vote of 230 ayes, to 191 noes, Roll No. 343); and **Pages H4760–62, H4776–77**

Soudrel amendment that sought to prohibit use of funds in the bill for the purpose of enforcing the final judgement of the Federal District Court for the Southern District of Indiana issued in Hinrichs v. Bosma (by a recorded vote of 246 ayes, to 174 noes, Roll No. 345). **Pages H4768–70, H4777–78**

Rejected:

Flake amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds ($250,000) made available in this Act be used to fund the Rochester, NY, Tooling and Machining Association for a workforce development program; **Pages H4716–17**

Flake amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds ($200,000) made available in this Act be used to fund the Oil Region Alliance of Business, Industry and Tourism; **Pages H4718–19**

Flake amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds ($750,000) made available in this Act be used to fund the Fairplex Trade and Conference Center; **Pages H4719–20**

Flake amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds ($400,000) made available in this Act be used to fund the Wisconsin Procurement Initiative; **Pages H4722–23**

Hinchey amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds to prevent certain states and local programs from implementing medical marijuana laws (by a recorded vote of 163 ayes, to 259 noes, Roll No. 333); **Pages H4735–39**

Flake amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds ($150,000) made available in this Act be used to fund the Arthur Avenue Retail Market for local business requirements and improvements (by a recorded vote of 76 ayes, to 345 noes, Roll No. 334); **Pages H4717–18 H4739–40**

Flake amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds ($300,000) made available in this Act be used to fund the Bronx Council for marketing of local business arts initiatives (by a recorded vote of 74 ayes, to 343 noes, Roll No. 335); **Pages H4720–21, H4740–41**

Flake amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds ($800,000) made available in this Act be used to fund the Johnstown Area Regional Industries (JARl) organization (by a recorded vote of 63 ayes, to 356 noes, Roll No. 336); **Pages H4721–22, H4741**

Flake amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds ($900,000) made available in this Act be used to fund the Fairmont State University for a small business initiative (by a recorded vote of 70 ayes, to 350 noes, Roll No. 337); **Pages H4723–24, H4741–42**

Flake amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds ($1,000,000) made available in this Act be used to fund the Southern and Eastern Kentucky Tourism Development Association (by a recorded vote of 56 ayes, to 363 noes, Roll No. 338); **Pages H4724–25, H4742–43**

Frank amendment that sought to prohibit funding for a manned space missions to Mars (by a recorded vote of 145 ayes, to 274 noes, Roll No. 339); **Pages H4726–29, H4743**

Gingrey amendment (No. 6 printed in the Congressional Record of June 26th) that sought to prohibit funds from this Act to be used for negotiating the participation of additional countries under the visa waiver program in section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; **Pages H4755–56**

Stearns amendment (No. 21 printed in the Congressional Record of June 26th) that sought to prohibit funds from this Act to be used to carry out any provision of section 203 of the Voting Rights Act (by a recorded vote of 167 ayes, to 254 noes, Roll No. 340); **Pages H4743–48, H4774–75**

Weiner amendment that sought to increase funding (by offset) for the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) program by $467,574,000 (by a recorded vote of 185 ayes, to 236 noes, Roll No. 341); **Pages H4748–52, H4775**

Stearns amendment (No. 20 printed in the Congressional Record of June 26th) that sought to prohibit funds from this Act to be used for the design, renovation, construction, or rental of any headquarters for the United Nations in any location in the United States (by a recorded vote of 131 ayes, to 288 noes, Roll No. 342); **Pages H4752–53, H4775–76**

Nadler amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds from being 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 USA PATRIOT ACT (by a recorded vote of 189 ayes, to 230 noes, Roll No. 344); and **Pages H4764–67, H4777**

Henchey amendment that sought to prohibit use of funds in the bill in contravention of section 3109 of title 18, United States Code (knock and announce rule) (by a recorded vote of 109 ayes, to 310 noes, Roll No. 346). **Pages H4772–74, H4778–79**

Withdrawn:

Gilchrest amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn which sought to add $738 million to NOAA, offset by a $738 cut to NASA; **Pages H4697–99**

Etheridge amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn which sought to allocate $38,000,000 for the Public Safety Officers' Death Benefits program; **Pages H4733–34**

Hinchey amendment that was off erred and subsequently withdrawn which sought to prohibit funds to prevent certain states and local programs from implementing medical marijuana laws and transfers of funds; **Page H4735**

Jones amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn which sought to prohibit funds from being used to operate the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's National Contact Center; **Pages H4753–55**

McCaul amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn which sought to prohibit funds for any U.N. peacekeeping missions in which United Nations employees under investigation have not been removed; **Page H4757**

Garrett amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn which sought to require that not later than 90 days after enactment, and annually thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress a report listing contributions of the United States Government for the preceding fiscal year to the United Nations and United Nations affiliated agencies and related bodies; and **Page H4764**

Jackson-Lee of Texas amendment that was offered and subsequently withdrawn which sought to prohibit funds made available in this Act from being used to target segments of Muslim and Arab Communities for national security investigations. **Page H4768**

Point of Order sustained against:

The proviso, Sec. 608, sought to prohibit legislation in an appropriations bill; **Pages H4711–12**

Obey amendment that sought to insert a new section at the end of title IV amending Section 6(a)(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(a)(1)) to raise the Federal minimum wage; and **Pages H4712–13**

Watson amendment that sought to prohibit the use of funds from being made available to negotiate the accession by the Russian Federation into the World Trade Organization. **Page H4730**

Rejected the Miller, George, of California motion that the Committee rise by a recorded vote of 37 ayes, to 352 noes, Roll No. 332. **Pages H4692–93**

H. Res. 890, the rule providing for consideration of the bill was agreed to yesterday, Tuesday, June 27th, by a yea-and-nay vote of 224 yeas to 188 nays, Roll No. 319, after agreeing to order the previous question without objection.

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Amending the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users to make technical corrections: H.R. 5689, to amend the Safe, Accountable, Flexible. Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users to make technical corrections; and **Pages H4779–83**

Congratulating the National Hockey League Champions, the Carolina Hurricanes, on their victory in the 2006 Stanley Cup Finals: H. Res. 881, to congratulate the National Hockey League Champions, the Carolina Hurricanes, on their victory in the 2006 Stanley Cup Finals. **Pages H4783–86**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:50 p.m and reconvened at 12:25 a.m. **Page H4793**

Senate Message: Messages received from the Senate today appear on pages H4743.

Senate Referrals: S. 801 was held at the desk and S. 2650 was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. **Page H4793**

Amendments: Amendment ordered printed pursuant to the rule appears on page H4796.

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote and fifteen recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4689, H4692–93, H4739, H4739–40, H4740–41, H4741, H4741–42, H4742–43, H4743, H4774–75, H4775, H4775–76, H4776–77, H4777, H4777–78, and H4778–79. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 12:27 a.m.

Committee Meetings

AFGHANISTAN SECURITY AND STABILITY

Committee on Armed Services: Held a hearing on the status of security and stability in Afghanistan. Testimony was heard from Karen Tandy, Administrator, DEA, Department of Justice; the following officials of the Department of Defense: LTG Karl Eikenberry, USA, Commanding General, Combined Forces Command-Afghanistan; and Mary Beth Long, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, International Security Affairs; and James Kunder, Assistant Administrator, Asia and the Near East, U.S. Agency for International Development, Department of State.

CHARACTER BUILDING IN EDUCATION

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Held a hearing on The First Tee and Schools: Working To Build Character Education. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MENTAL ILLNESS AND BRAIN DISEASE

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on Mental Illness and Brain Disease: Dispelling Myths and Promoting Recovery Through Awareness and Treatment. Testimony was heard from Thomas Insel, M.D., Director, National Institute of Mental Health, NIH, Department of Health and Human Services; and public witnesses.

MAKING THE INTERNET SAFE FOR KIDS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations continued hearings entitled ''Making the Internet Safe for Kids: The Role of ISPs and Social Networking Sites.'' Testimony was heard from Pamela Jones Harbour, Commissioner, FTC; Diego Ruiz, Deputy Chief, Office of Strategic Planning and Policy Analysis, FCC; and public witnesses.

INVESTOR PROTECTION

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Capital Markets, Insurance, and Government Sponsored Enterprises held a hearing entitled ''Investor Protection: A Review of Plaintiffs' Attorney Abuses in Securities Litigation and Legislative Remedies.'' Testimony was heard from Vaughan R. Walker, Chief Judge, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California; William F. Galvin, Secretary, State of Massachusetts; and public witnesses.

HOUSING MARKET AND NEXT NATURAL CATASTROPHE

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity held a hearing entitled ''Is America's Housing Market Prepared for the Next Natural Catastrophe?'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

TREAT METHAMPHETAMINE VICTIMS

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources held a hearing entitled ''Availability and Effectiveness of Programs To Treat Victims of the Methamphetamine Epidemic.'' Testimony was heard from Bertha Madras, Deputy Director, Demand Reduction, Office of National Drug Control Policy; the following officials of the Department of Health and Human Services: Charles Curie, Administrator, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration; and Nora D. Volkow, M.D., Director, National Institute on Drug Abuse, NIH; and public witnesses.

OMB'S FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT LINE OF BUSINESS INITIATIVE

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on Government Management, Finance and Accountability held a hearing entitled ''OMB's Financial Management Line of Business Initiative: Do Recent Changes to the Implementation Guidance Clarify the Rules?'' Testimony was heard from Linda Combs, Controller, Office of Federal Financial Management, OMB; Mary Mitchell, Deputy Associate Administrator, GSA; and public witnesses.

HOMELAND SECURITY DEPARTMENT BORDER SECURITY INTELLIGENCE

Committee on Homeland Security: Subcommittee on Intelligence, Information Sharing, and Terrorism Risk Assessment held a hearing entitled ''DHS Intelligence and Border Security: Delivering Operational Intelligence.'' Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Homeland Security: Charles E. Allen, Chief Intelligence Officer, Office of Intelligence Analysis; James Sloan, Assistant Commandant, Intelligence, U.S. Coast Guard; Cynthia O'Connell, Acting Director, Office of Intelligence, Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and L. Thomas Bortmes, Director, Office of Intelligence,

Customs and Border Protection; and public witnesses.

EAST TIMOR: INSTABILITY AND FUTURE PROSPECTS

Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific held a hearing on East Timor: Instability and Future Prospects. Testimony was heard from Eric John, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, Department of State.

HURRICANE RECONSTRUCTION AND PREPAREDNESS

Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere held a hearing on Hurricane Reconstruction and Preparedness. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the U.S. Agency for International Development, Department of State: Adolfo A. Franco, Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean; and Timothy M. Callaghan, Senior Regional Advisor, Latin America and the Caribbean, Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance.

BUSINESS ACTIVITY TAX SIMPLIFICATION ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Ordered reported, as amended, H.R. 1856, Business Activity Tax Simplification Act of 2005.

The Committee also began consideration of H.R. 5323, Proud to Be an American Citizen Act.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks held a hearing on the following bills; H.R. 2692, Acadia National Park Improvement Act of 2005; H.R. 3871, To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the Missouri River Basin Lewis and Clark Interpretive Trail and Visitor Center Foundation, Inc. Certain Federal land associated with the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail in Nebraska, to be used as an historical interpretive site along the trail; and H.R. 5145, to authorize the National War Dogs Monument, Inc. to establish a national monument in honor of military working dog teams. Testimony was heard from Representatives Michaud, Fortenberry, Osborne, and Terry; Sue Masica, Associate Director, Park Planning, Facilities, and Lands, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; and public witnesses.

DEEP OCEAN ENERGY RESOURCES ACT OF 2006

Committee on Rules: Granted, by a vote of 9 to 4, a structured rule providing 1 hour of general debate on H.R. 4761, Domestic Energy Production through Offshore Exploration and Equitable Treatment of State Holdings Act of 2006, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Resources now printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment and shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Resources. The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution. The rule provides that the amendments printed in the report may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report. The rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Finally, the rule provides that House Resolutions 162, 163, 181, 182, 393, 395, 400, 401, 468, and 620 are laid upon the table. Testimony was heard from Chairman Pombo, Chairman Boehlert, Chairman Tom Davis of Virginia and Representatives Calvert, Flake, Bartlett of Maryland, Udall of New Mexico, Markey, Inslee, and Jackson-Lee of Texas.

RESOLUTION—CONDEMNING DISCLOSURE AND PUBLICATION OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Committee on Rules: Granted, by a vote of 9 to 4, a closed rule providing 1 hour of debate in the House on 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, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the resolution. Finally, the rule provides one

motion to recommit which may not contain instructions. Testimony was heard from Chairman Oxley and Representative Frank of Massachusetts.

HIGH NATURAL GAS PRICE EFFECTS

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Tax, Finance and Exports held a hearing entitled "The Effects of the High Cost of Natural Gas on Small Businesses and Future Energy Technologies." Testimony was heard from James Kendell, Director, Natural Gas Division, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy; the following officials of the Department of the Interior: Walter Cruickshank, Deputy Director, Minerals Management Service; and Tom Lonnie, Assistant Director, Bureau of Land Management, Minerals, Realty and Resource Protection Directorate; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES; ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS SURVEY RESOLUTIONS

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Ordered reported, as amended, the following bills: S. 362, Marine Debris Research, Prevention, and Reduction Act; H.R. 4650, National Levee Safety Program Act of 2005; and H.R. 5681, Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2006.

The Committee also approved U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Survey Resolutions.

VA OFFICE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Held a hearing on What VA IT Organizational Structure would have best prevented VA's "Meltdown" in Information Management. Testimony was heard from MG Robert Howard, USA (Ret.), Acting Assistant Secretary, Information and Technology and Acting Chief Information Officer, Department of Veterans Affairs; and the following former Assistant Secretaries, Information Technology and Former Chief Information Officers, Department of Veterans Affairs: Robert McFarland and John A. Gauss; and public witnesses.

HEALTH SAVINGS ACCOUNTS

Committee on Ways and Means: Held a hearing on Health Savings Accounts. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

REPORT: AL QAEDA

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Met in executive session and approved the following: "Report: 'al Qaeda: The Many Faces of an Islamic Extremist Threat.' "

Joint Meetings

BUSINESS MEETING

Joint Committee on the Library: Committee met and agreed to certain committee procedural matters.

ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE (OSCE)

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki Commission): Commission concluded a hearing to examine Belgium's Chairmanship of the OSCE, focusing on developments in Central Asia and neighboring Afghanistan, the emergence of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization, the political situation in the Caucasus, and human rights trends in the Russian Federation, after receiving testimony from Karel De Gucht, Foreign Minister of Belgium, Brussels.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 29, 2006

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: business meeting to mark up H.R. 5427, making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, H.R. 5441, making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, H.R. 5522, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, and H.R. 5386, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2007, 10 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: business meeting to consider the nomination of James S. Simpson, of New York, to be Federal Transit Administrator, Department of Transportation, Time to be announced, Room to be announced.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine the U.S.-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Subcommittee on Long-term Growth and Debt Reduction, to hold hearings to examine how to increase worker coverage relating to small business pension plans, 2:30 p.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine Russia, 9 a.m., SD–419.

Full Committee, business meeting to consider Protocol between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the State of Israel, signed at Jerusalem on July 6, 2005 (Treaty Doc. 109–3), an original bill, to exempt from certain requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 U.S. exports to India of nuclear materials, equipment and technology to India, and to implement the U.S. Additional Protocol, S. Res. 460, expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States should

increase its support to the people of Somalia in their efforts to end decades of violence, establish lasting peace, form a democratically elected and stable central government, and become an effective partner in eradicating radicalism and terrorism from their country and the region, S. Con. Res. 105, commending the Government of Canada for its renewed commitment to the Global War on Terror in Afghanistan, and the nominations of Earl Anthony Wayne, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to Argentina, Gaddi H. Vasquez, of California, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as U.S. Representative to the United Nations Agencies for Food and Agriculture, John Clint Williamson, of Louisiana, to be Ambassador at Large for War Crimes Issues, Michael E. Ranneberger, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Kenya, Eric M. Bost, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Republic of South Africa, W. Stuart Symington IV, of Missouri, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Djibouti, Gayleatha Beatrice Brown, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Benin, Robert O. Blake, Jr., of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Republic of Maldives, Robert D. McCallum, Jr., of Georgia, to be Ambassador to Australia, Leslie V. Rowe, of Washington, to be Ambassador to Papua New Guinea, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Solomon Islands and Ambassador to the Republic of Vanuatu, Clifford M. Sobel, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador to the Federative Republic of Brazil, Peter R. Coneway, of Texas, to be Ambassador to Switzerland, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Principality of Liechtenstein, and Thomas C. Foley, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador to Ireland, 11 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, the Federal Workforce, and the District of Columbia, to hold hearings to examine proposed legislation relating to enhancing employee performance, 9:30 a.m., SD–342.

Subcommittee on Federal Financial Management, Government Information, and International Security, to hold hearings to examine the case for reform regarding community development block grants, focusing on issues surrounding program formulas, recipient communities, and management of grants within the Community Development Block program, including aspects of the reform package, the "CDBG Reform Act of 2006", 2:30 p.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider the nominations of Neil M. Gorsuch, of Colorado, and Jerome A. Holmes, of Oklahoma, each to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Tenth Circuit, Gustavo Antonio Gelpi, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico, Daniel Porter Jordan III, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Mississippi, R. Alexander Acosta, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Florida, Martin J. Jackley, to be United States Attorney for the District of South Dakota, and Brett L. Tolman, to be United States Attorney for the District of Utah, S. 2453, to establish procedures for the review of electronic surveillance programs, S. 2455, to provide in statute for the conduct of electronic surveillance of suspected terrorists for the purposes of protecting the American people, the Nation, and its interests from terrorist attack while ensuring that the civil liberties of United States citizens are safeguarded, S. 2468, to provide standing for civil actions for declaratory and injunctive relief to persons who refrain from electronic communications through fear of being subject to warrantless electronic surveillance for foreign intelligence purposes, S. 3001, to ensure that all electronic surveillance of United States persons for foreign intelligence purposes is conducted pursuant to individualized court-issued orders, to streamline the procedures of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, S. 2831, to guarantee the free flow of information to the public through a free and active press while protecting the right of the public to effective law enforcement and the fair administration of justice, H.R. 1036, to amend title 17, United States Code, to make technical corrections relating to Copyright Royalty Judges, S. 155, to increase and enhance law enforcement resources committed to investigation and prosecution of violent gangs, to deter and punish violent gang crime, to protect law-abiding citizens and communities from violent criminals, to revise and enhance criminal penalties for violent crimes, to reform and facilitate prosecution of juvenile gang members who commit violent crimes, to expand and improve gang prevention programs, S. 2703, to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965, S. 1845, to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the appointment of additional Federal circuit judges, to divide the Ninth Judicial Circuit of the United States into 2 circuits, S. 2679, to establish an Unsolved Crimes Section in the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, and an Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Investigative Office in the Civil Rights Unit of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and other committee matters, 9:30 a.m., SD–226.

Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts, to hold hearings to examine H.R. 1038, to amend title 28, United States Code, to allow a judge to whom a case is transferred to retain jurisdiction over certain multidistrict litigation cases for trial, 2:30 p.m., SD–226.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship: business meeting to consider the nomination of Steven C. Preston, of Illinois, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration, Time to be announced, Room to be announced.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to receive a closed briefing regarding intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Agriculture, hearing to review Agriculture's Role in the Renewable Fuels Market, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Armed Services, hearing on reports of weapons of mass destruction findings in Iraq, 9 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities, hearing on assessing United States Special Operations Command's missions and roles, 10:30 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Workforce Protection, to mark up H.R. 2561, Improving Access to Workers' Compensation for Injured Federal Workers Act, 10:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, hearing on Growth, Opportunity, Competition—America Goes to Work, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing entitled ''Pandemic Influenza Preparedness in the Financial Services Sector,'' 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, to consider the following: H.R. 3329, Civilian Prisoner-of-War Medal Act of 2005; the Federal Wildland Firefighter Classification Act; H.R. 4962, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Pitcher Street in Utica, New York, as the ''Captain George A. Wood Post Office Building; H.R. 5626, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 802 South Carrier Parkway in Rand Prairie, Texas, as the ''Alexander McRae Dechman Post Office Building;'' H. Res. 189, Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a day ought to be established to bring awareness to the issue of missing persons; H. Res. 533, Supporting the goals and ideals of Cambodian-American Freedom day; H.R. 721, Supporting the goals and ideals of a Salvadoran-American Day (El Dia del Salvadoreno) in recognition of all Salvadoran-Americans for their hard work, dedication, and contribution to the stability and well-being of the United States; and H. Res. 823, Commending the outstanding efforts by members of faith-based and community organizations in response to Hurricane Katrina and Hurricane Rita; and to hold a hearing entitled ''What Price Free Speech?: Whistleblowers and the Ceballos Decision,'' 11 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Economic Security, Infrastructure Protection and Cybersecurity, hearing on H.R. 5695, Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Act of 2006, 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

Committee on International Relations, Subcommittee on Africa, Global Human Rights and International Operations and the Subcommittee on International Terrorism and Nonproliferation, joint hearing on Somalia: Expanding Crisis in the Horn of Africa, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, hearing on North Korean Brinkmanship: Is U.S. Policy Up to the Challenge? 2 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary: to mark up the following bills: H.R. 2389, Pledge Protection Act of 2005; and H.R. 5323, Proud to Be an American Citizen Act, 2:30 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, hearing on H.R. 5219, Judiciary Transparency and Ethics Enhancement Act of 2006, 11:30 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on Fisheries and Oceans, hearing on H.R. 5539, North American Wetlands Conservation Reauthorization Act of 2006, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health, oversight hearing on Healthy Forests: Targets and Accomplishments, 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Aviation, oversight hearing on Airline Passenger Baggage Screening: Technology and Airport Deployment Update, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs,, oversight hearing on VA's current status of mitigating the nation's second largest data breach, 10:30 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, to consider the following: H.R. 5640, Child and Family Services Improvement Act of 2006; and H.R. 5684, United States-Oman Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act, 10:30 a.m., 1100 Longworth

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, executive, hearing on Integrated Collection Architecture, 10 a.m., and executive, briefing on Global Updates/Hotspots, 3:30 p.m., H–405 Capitol.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, June 29

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 2 hours), Senate will begin consideration of S. 3569, to implement the U.S.-Oman Free Trade Agreement.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, June 29

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Continue consideration of H.R. 5672—Science, State, Justice, Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2007. Possibly, consider H.R. 4761—Deep Ocean Energy Resources Act of 2006 (Subject to a Rule).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Baldwin, Tammy, Wisc., E1303
Bishop, Timothy H., N.Y., E1317
Brown, Corrine, Fla., E1305
Carson, Julia, Ind., E1300
Costello, Jerry F., Ill., E1305
Cuellar, Henry, Tex., E1298, E1301
Davis, Tom, Va., E1297
Farr, Sam, Calif., E1299, E1306
Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E1301
Garrett, Scott, N.J., E1304
Graves, Sam, Mo., E1297, E1298, E1299, E1300, E1300, E1301, E1302, E1302
Grijalva, Raúl M., Ariz., E1300
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E1299, E1303
Hooley, Darlene, Ore., E1303
King, Steve, Iowa, E1307
Knollenberg, Joe, Mich., E1309
Langevin, James R., R.I., E1317
McCarthy, Carolyn, N.Y., E1300
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E1306
Matsui, Doris O., Calif., E1315
Moran, James P., Va., E1298
Moran, Jerry, Kans., E1304
Ortiz, Solomon P., Tex., E1299
Otter, C.L. ''Butch'', Idaho, E1302
Price, David E., N.C., E1315
Rangel, Charles B., N.Y., E1308, E1309, E1311, E1311, E1312, E1314
Rogers, Harold, Ky., E1301
Sanchez, Loretta, Calif., E1300
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E1309, E1310
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E1304
Sodrel, Michael E., Ind., E1302
Thompson, Bennie G., Miss., E1303
Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E1306, E1307
Velázquez, Nydia M., N.Y., E1298
Young, Don, Alaska, E1297

Congressional Record The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through *GPO Access*, a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the *Congressional Record* is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through *GPO Access* at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at 202–512–1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or *GPO Access* can be directed to the *GPO Access* User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1–888–293–6498 (toll-free), 202–512–1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202–512–1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The *Congressional Record* paper and 24x microfiche edition will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $252.00 for six months, $503.00 per year, or purchased as follows: less than 200 pages, $10.50; between 200 and 400 pages, $21.00; greater than 400 pages, $31.50, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $146.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly *Congressional Record Index* may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record,* U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.