



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 153

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 20, 2007

No. 100

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

June 20, 2007.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ALBIO SIREs to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

As a people, we protect our privacy and prize our secrets. Perhaps this is why, O Lord, we have difficulty in accepting You as infinite self-disclosure.

Out of love for us, You continue to reveal Yourself in Your creation, by speaking Your word and breathing forth Your spirit upon us and the work of Congress.

Today, again, Lord, speak Your word and Your servants will try to listen more attentively. In the midst of the many problems and concerns before Congress, Your servants can seem at times distracted or even dissipated. Let faith open their minds and hearts.

Send forth Your spirit to free these leaders in government, touch individual consciences, and help them collaborate with one another to address the priorities of Your people as a focused agenda.

By Your revelation to them and in them may Your servants accomplish mighty deeds in Your holy 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 Texas (Mr. POE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. POE 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 one-minute speeches on each side.

STAND BY OUR VALUES, IDEALS, AND PRINCIPLES

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in a recent international survey, we find that nations around the world think China could be better trusted to lead this world than the United States. It's a devastating conclusion. It would not have been the case even 6 years ago.

It's not that people around the world don't acknowledge our military power, but it is our arrogance and the fact that we don't live up to our principles and ideals that this survey reflects.

If we are going to win this so-called global war on terrorism, it is not going to be through a military victory. It is going to be because we stand by the values and ideals and principles that define us as a nation and as a people.

One of the things that every day undermines those defining principles is keeping the Guantanamo detention facility open, keeping hundreds of people detained without charging them, without enabling them to know what they are charged with and thus being able to defend themselves. It's the antithesis of what this country stands for. That detention facility needs to be shut down. And we need to regain our rightful position as the leader of the free world.

THE NINE FIREFIGHTERS OF CHARLESTON

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

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, firefighters are a special brand of people. When others are fleeing burning buildings, firefighters suit up and charge head first into the searing infernos and blackening smoke, not stopping until that beast is tamed. They go where others fear to tread.

In Charleston, South Carolina, on Monday night, firefighters were called to a blaze at a local furniture store. As they were trained to do, they entered the engulfed building. Moments later, without warning, the roof of the furniture store collapsed, trapping and killing nine firefighters.

Last night, at 7:00 p.m., 24 hours after the tragedy, at 30,000-plus fire stations across the plains of America, firefighters stood in reverent silence for their brothers. This devastation in Charleston is the single greatest sacrifice of American firefighters since 343 of them were killed on September 11.

This Nation's firefighters are ordinary citizens armed with extraordinary bravery and dedication to the public. When danger occurs, most run from the danger, but America's firefighters are not like most. They run to the danger.

And that's just the way it is.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H6739

DEMOCRATS INVESTING IN RIGHT PRIORITIES

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

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, to govern is to choose. For the past 6 years, the choices made by the Republican leadership in this Congress have been wrong for America: tax cuts for the very wealthy, budget cuts for everyone else in health care, in education and the environment. It has led to the largest deficit in the history of this country.

The new Congress is making a different choice, promising to invest in America's priorities, first by bringing back fiscal responsibility and then making government work for average working families. Last week this House passed a Homeland Security bill. It improves aviation and port security, restores cuts to first responders across the Nation.

This week we passed an Energy and Water appropriations bill that finally provides a significant investment in studying the effects of global warming, something that's been ignored for far too long.

This new Congress is moving this country in a new direction and has made a new choice.

COMMENDING THE WORK OF HOUSE CONSERVATIVES

(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, last week the House engaged in an important debate regarding the transparency and accountability of Member project requests. As Democrat leaders sought to earmark taxpayer dollars in the dark of night, and away from public scrutiny, House Republicans took them to task, demanding the reforms we past last year be upheld.

I am grateful for the work of my colleagues on the Republican Study Committee who are committed to returning our party to its roots of fiscal discipline. Budget Committee ranking member PAUL RYAN has worked tirelessly in his fight against the Democrat budget, which amounts to the largest tax increase in American history.

RSC chairman JEB HENSARLING and his staff are working night and day literally to promote conservative philosophy. I am especially thankful for the work of communications director Brad Dayspring, who works some of the longest hours on Capitol Hill to accomplish this goal.

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

FUNDING FOR VETERANS HEALTH CARE, DEMOCRATS PROVIDE LARGEST FUNDING INCREASE EVER

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, many of our soldiers returning from service in Iraq and Afghanistan suffer from a loss of limb or other serious wounds. Our VA and military hospitals have state-of-the-art facilities to treat these wounds and to help our soldiers make a recovery that they need and deserve.

But the same is not true for those soldiers who return from combat suffering from post-traumatic stress syndrome. A Washington Post series chronicled the struggles faced by many of our soldiers seeking psychological assistance and support from our medical facilities and from the VA. The Post writers concluded that Walter Reed lacks sufficient psychiatrists and clinicians to properly treat the growing numbers of soldiers returning with combat stress.

I am proud to say help is on the way. The historic VA funding which passed the House last week provides 600 million more than the President requested to treat PTSD and finally, finally, begin to address a disturbing problem. Let us not repeat the mistake we have made with our Vietnam veterans and begin to help our veterans now.

WORLD REFUGEE DAY

(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, today is World Refugee Day, and I rise to draw the attention of this body to the plight of millions of refugees and internally displaced people around the world.

As a beacon of hope and freedom, the United States has historically been a leader in raising awareness and providing assistance to the world's refugees, and the need is certainly great.

Thousands, for instance, of Iraqis have been forced to flee their homeland and face a daily existence that denies them even the most basic protections. The military dictatorship in Burma has inflicted such horrific violence on the Burmese people that hundreds of thousands of people have been forced to flee just to save their own lives. These are just two examples. The list goes on.

There are over 8 million refugees, nearly 24 million IDPs, internally displaced people, worldwide. Combined, that's nearly equal to the population of California.

On this World Refugee Day, let us remember the plight of these people. Try to find ways that we can help and support them.

ST. JUDE CHILDREN'S RESEARCH HOSPITAL AND STEM CELL RESEARCH

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, Saturday night Memphis, Tennessee, will celebrate the 50th anniversary of ALSAC, which is the fund-raising arm of St. Jude Hospital, an institution of which I am extremely proud.

St. Jude has used science to bring cures to cancer and to fight cancer for children. It is a leading institution in our country. President Bush has a stem cell bill before him that this House and the Senate have passed. It needs his signature to become law.

I plead to the President to allow that bill to become law, as Nancy Reagan has pleaded to the President when she saw her husband suffering from Alzheimer's; as Christopher Reeve pleaded when he had spinal cord injuries and some hope for his future, but didn't see it and died; as people with Parkinson's, multiple sclerosis and cancer hope.

Today I speak to you as a victim of polio. I wish we had stem cell research 50 years ago so we could regrow the muscle in my leg, and I would be whole, and I could play on the baseball team that the Congress has going to play next month. But I can't do it.

We didn't have that research. We didn't have stem cells. We have it today. We need to invest it for the people of the 20th century and to cure illness. Please, Mr. President, sign the bill.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

DEMOCRATS ARE TAXING AND SPENDING

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

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, congressional Democrats are looking to fund \$190 billion in spending projects. However, they don't have \$190 billion. So the Democrats seem to be disguising the truth from the American people by playing hide and seek. They are hiding \$190 billion by claiming it's in a reserve fund. But there isn't any reserve fund.

So where will \$190 billion come from? Well, the Democrats have voted to terminate the Republican tax cuts of 2001 through 2003. The money will come from the American taxpayers.

As much as I strongly disagree with tax increases, the least the Democrats can do is to level with the American people.

Rather than playing hide and seek, the Democrats should have the political courage to admit that they are

taxing and spending. The American people deserve to know the truth. After all, it's their money.

FUNDING FOR HEALTH CARE OF AMERICAN SOLDIERS

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

Mr. MAHONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it's an unfortunate fact of war young American soldiers are not only losing their lives on the battlefield, but many soldiers who survive traumatic combat injuries are returning home with equally serious psychological wounds. Unfortunately, the Veterans Administration has not been given, by this administration, the personnel and the funding necessary to address the problem.

A recent series of Washington Post articles followed the stories of several soldiers returning home from service in Iraq who suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder. The articles paint a harrowing picture of the challenges that face these veterans, suicidal patients left in waiting rooms, psychiatric wards with terrible odors and a disconcerting lack of therapy and treatment.

Mr. Speaker, last week this House took action to help our military personnel who are suffering from post-traumatic stress syndrome. We passed the largest increase for funding for veterans health care in the VA's history. This includes treatment for PTSD.

It is clear that these funds are desperately needed to provide better care for our men and women returning from serving our Nation.

□ 1015

AMERICA IS AT AN ENERGY CROSSROAD

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, we in America are at an energy crossroad. Now, one road will lead to price controls and a potential energy crisis that would remind us of the 1970s. The other would lead to cutting-edge technology that will provide affordable, reliable energy for decades to come.

Yet, the liberal leadership in this House has chosen to revert to the 1970s and repeat that history. Today, the Energy appropriations bill under consideration will underfund nuclear production by \$20 million in one account, hydroelectric power by \$20 million in another account, and other forms of American productivity by hundreds of millions of dollars.

And where does the money go? Well, it goes to fund research for climate change in another bow to the religion of global warming.

And in coordination with other House and some Senate legislation, we

find out that some of these proposals could end up raising the price of a gallon of gas over the next couple of decades to \$6 a gallon.

We need to focus on energy independence today. It is what the American people want.

SOME THINGS ARE MORE IMPORTANT THAN POLITICS

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, some things are more important than politics. Lifesaving research that has the potential to cure diseases and end suffering for millions of Americans ought to be one of them.

But for President Bush, certain things aren't above politics. The President formed his opinion on stem cell research and now he has America ensnared in his political straitjacket.

The American people see stem cell research as a cure to illnesses that plague their family and family members.

So today, as the President vetoes legislation that is backed by 72 percent of the American people, he will attempt to fool the American public and soothe his conscience with a symbolic gesture that is empty of medical value.

The American people will not be fooled. They know that the President has failed to lead and, instead, made a decision that is a crushing blow to millions of Americans suffering from diseases like Parkinson's, Alzheimer's and ALS.

Sixty years ago, when America was plagued with polio, this Nation and its political leaders rose to the challenge and took on the medical challenge of their time. Thank goodness we are not facing that challenge now, and we had leaders then who put medical science ahead of political stance.

CATHEDRAL HIGH SCHOOL WINS CLASS 2A BASEBALL TOURNAMENT

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

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for a happy occasion to congratulate the St. Cloud Cathedral High School Crusaders for winning the Class 2A High School Baseball Tournament Championship in Minnesota.

This was a thrill, Mr. Speaker, when the Crusaders came from behind in the final inning, in a most dramatic 7-6 victory over the great students from Glencoe-Silver Lake. It doesn't get much better than this in Minnesota, Mr. Speaker.

The championship is a long tradition of success for the Cathedral students. And over the course of 13 State appearances, the Crusaders have come a way with six State titles.

This continued success of the program for the Cathedral Crusaders is no

doubt due to the steady leadership of the head coach, Mr. Bob Karn who, in his 37 seasons of coaching the Crusaders, brought his team once more to a great victory.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this body would join me in congratulating Coach Karn and the Cathedral Crusaders on their Class 2A State Baseball Championship.

DEMOCRATS CONTINUE TO WORK TO BRING REAL ACCOUNTABILITY TO WASHINGTON

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

Mr. HODES. Mr. Speaker, when Democrats took control of Congress earlier this year, we vowed to restore accountability here in Washington. Unfortunately, President Bush is stubbornly resistant to any changes in the status quo.

Case in point: Earlier this year we passed the Accountability in Contracting Act which cleans up government contracting abuses and no-bid contracts that companies like Halliburton and KBR have made infamous. The bill overwhelmingly passed here in the House, and yet the Bush administration says it currently opposes the bill.

We've all heard about the \$100 million compensation packages that executives walk away with at the same time their company is laying off their employees. So we in Congress passed a corporate accountability bill that enhances the accountability of corporate management shareholders by allowing a nonbinding vote by shareholders on executive compensation plans. But the administration opposes this legislation in its current form.

Mr. Speaker, despite opposition from the President and his party, Democrats will continue to serve as a catalyst for change to care about ordinary, hardworking Americans and bring real accountability here in Washington.

START ADDRESSING THE PRIORITIES OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(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, during the first months of this new Congress, Democrats have passed resolutions congratulating sports teams and renaming post offices, along with the largest tax increase in American history. But they've done nothing to lower the tax burden on hardworking American families, enact legislation to address skyrocketing gasoline prices, or enact legislation to secure our borders.

I know what my district needs. Families in my district want a lower tax bill. They want us to spend their tax dollars sparingly and wisely. My constituents want to pay less for gas at

the pump. They want to know our borders are secure, and that our ports and airports are safe from terrorists.

It's time for this Congress to start addressing the priorities of the American public. It's time we stopped passing resolutions congratulating sports teams and started enacting legislation into law.

I urge my Democrat colleagues not to continue to languish as a do-nothing Congress, but to let us start enacting some of the legislative priorities of our constituents into law.

A CHANGE IN DIRECTION IS NEEDED IN IRAQ

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, General David Petraeus acknowledged that we will not see any significant improvements in the situation on the ground in Iraq by September.

When President Bush first proposed the troop escalation plan at the beginning of this year, he said we should know if it's actually working by the beginning of the summer. A couple of months later, when the troops were actually on the ground, the President revised that time frame, saying that we should have a good grasp if the plan is working by September.

Now we have confirmation from the President's top general on the ground that positive signs in Iraq will continue to be elusive.

The question now is, will the administration do as it has in the past and change the deadline?

Moving deadlines are simply no longer acceptable. President Bush has been promising for months that we would see significant changes come September, and since that is no longer possible, a significant change in direction is needed in Iraq.

It is time for the President and the congressional Republicans to realize that Petraeus is now admitting that no improvements will be seen by September.

ADDRESSING VETERANS' INVISIBLE WOUNDS

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, our troops are returning from all over the world having suffered from many wounds, but many of the wounds that they're suffering from are not visible to the naked eye. Those wounds are psychological wounds. And tragically, our veterans system is not equipped, as we've seen this last week from a series by the Washington Post, to address many of those concerns.

Our Nation needs to be better prepared to address the psychological and

emotional wounds that our veterans are facing. And tragically, this country has not come to grips with the mental health crisis that even our own citizens face.

This Congress needs to address this problem. It needs to address it within the Veterans Administration, and it needs to address it for this country by passing mental health parity and by making sure that we address PTSD for our veterans, making sure we have oversight of the VA, and making sure that they address the needs of our veterans, both visible and invisible wounds of our Nation's veterans.

BUSH ADMINISTRATION BLOCKING DEMOCRATIC ATTEMPTS TO MOVE AMERICA IN A NEW DI- RECTION

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

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, over the last 6 months the new Democratic Congress has passed over 37 major pieces of legislation, many of them with bipartisan support, which have helped millions of Americans. Unfortunately, President Bush seems content with the status quo, opposing two-thirds of our forward-agenda.

Today, the President will again veto legislation providing for a serious Federal investment in lifesaving stem cell research, supported by 70 percent of the American people. Further stem cell research would give new hope to millions of American families across the country suffering from life threatening and debilitating diseases like lupus, juvenile diabetes and Parkinson's.

Earlier this year, we approved a defense authorization bill that includes a 3.5 percent pay raise for military personnel. The President's response was a veto threat. He believed a 3.5 percent raise was too much.

Mr. Speaker, there is never too much gratitude and respect we can show for our troops. We don't show gratitude with lip service, we show it by action.

Mr. Speaker, I was elected in November to move this country in a new direction, and my fellow Democrats are serious about real change. And I respectfully ask the President to join us.

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 later today.

EMMETT TILL UNSOLVED CIVIL RIGHTS CRIME ACT OF 2007

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass

the bill (H.R. 923) 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 for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 923

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 "Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Act of 2007".

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that all authorities with jurisdiction, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation and other entities within the Department of Justice, should—

(1) expeditiously investigate unsolved civil rights murders, due to the amount of time that has passed since the murders and the age of potential witnesses; and

(2) provide all the resources necessary to ensure timely and thorough investigations in the cases involved.

SEC. 3. DEPUTY CHIEF OF THE CRIMINAL SECTION OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS DIVISION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall designate a Deputy Chief in the Criminal Section of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice.

(b) RESPONSIBILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Deputy Chief shall be responsible for coordinating the investigation and prosecution of violations of criminal civil rights statutes that occurred not later than December 31, 1969, and resulted in a death.

(2) COORDINATION.—In investigating a complaint under paragraph (1), the Deputy Chief may coordinate investigative activities with State and local law enforcement officials.

(c) STUDY AND REPORT.—

(1) STUDY.—The Attorney General shall annually conduct a study of the cases under the jurisdiction of the Deputy Chief or under the jurisdiction of the Supervisory Special Agent and, in conducting the study, shall determine—

(A) the number of open investigations within the Department for violations of criminal civil rights statutes that occurred not later than December 31, 1969;

(B) the number of new cases opened pursuant to this Act since the previous year's study;

(C) the number of unsealed Federal cases charged within the study period, including the case names, the jurisdiction in which the charges were brought, and the date the charges were filed;

(D) the number of cases referred by the Department to a State or local law enforcement agency or prosecutor within the study period, the number of such cases that resulted in State charges being filed, the jurisdiction in which such charges were filed, the date the charges were filed, and if a jurisdiction declines to prosecute or participate in an investigation of a case so referred, the fact it did so;

(E) the number of cases within the study period that were closed without Federal prosecution, the case names of unsealed Federal cases, the dates the cases were closed, and the relevant federal statutes;

(F) the number of attorneys who worked, in whole or in part, on any case described in subsection (b)(1); and

(G) the applications submitted for grants under section 5, the award of such grants, and the purposes for which the grant amount were expended.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and each year

thereafter, the Attorney General shall prepare and submit to Congress a report containing the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1).

SEC. 4. SUPERVISORY SPECIAL AGENT IN THE CIVIL RIGHTS UNIT OF THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Attorney General shall designate a Supervisory Special Agent in the Civil Rights Unit of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice.

(b) *RESPONSIBILITY.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Supervisory Special Agent shall be responsible for investigating violations of criminal civil rights statutes that occurred not later than December 31, 1969, and resulted in a death.

(2) *COORDINATION.*—In investigating a complaint under paragraph (1), the Supervisory Special Agent may coordinate the investigative activities with State and local law enforcement officials.

SEC. 5. GRANTS TO STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The Attorney General may award grants to State or local law enforcement agencies for expenses associated with the investigation and prosecution by them of criminal offenses, involving civil rights, that occurred not later than December 31, 1969, and resulted in a death.

(b) *AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.*—There are authorized to be appropriated \$2,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2017 to carry out this section.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—There are authorized to be appropriated, in addition to any other amounts otherwise authorized to be appropriated for this purpose, to the Attorney General \$10,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2008 through 2017 for the purpose of investigating and prosecuting violations of criminal civil rights statutes that occurred not later than December 31, 1969, and resulted in a death. These funds shall be allocated by the Attorney General to the Deputy Chief of the Criminal Section of the Civil Rights Division and the Supervisory Special Agent of the Civil Rights Unit of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in order to advance the purposes set forth in this Act.

(b) *COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.*—In addition to any amounts authorized to be appropriated under title XI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000h et seq.), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Community Relations Service of the Department of Justice \$1,500,000 for fiscal year 2008 and each subsequent fiscal year, to enable the Service (in carrying out the functions described in title X of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2000g et seq.)) to provide technical assistance by bringing together law enforcement agencies and communities in the investigation of violations of criminal civil rights statutes, in cases described in section 4(b).

SEC. 7. DEFINITION OF "CRIMINAL CIVIL RIGHTS STATUTES".

In this Act, the term "criminal civil rights statutes" means—

(1) section 241 of title 18, United States Code (relating to conspiracy against rights);

(2) section 242 of title 18, United States Code (relating to deprivation of rights under color of law);

(3) section 245 of title 18, United States Code (relating to federally protected activities);

(4) sections 1581 and 1584 of title 18, United States Code (relating to involuntary servitude and peonage);

(5) section 901 of the Fair Housing Act (42 U.S.C. 3631); and

(6) any other Federal law that—

(A) was in effect on or before December 31, 1969; and

(B) the Criminal Section of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice enforced, before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8. SUNSET.

Sections 2 through 6 of this Act shall cease to have effect at the end of fiscal year 2017.

SEC. 9. AUTHORITY OF INSPECTORS GENERAL.

Title XXXVII of the Crime Control Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 5779 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 3703. AUTHORITY OF INSPECTORS GENERAL.

"(a) *IN GENERAL.*—An Inspector General appointed under section 3 or 8G of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.) may authorize staff to assist the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children—

"(1) by conducting reviews of inactive case files to develop recommendations for further investigations; and

"(2) by engaging in similar activities.

"(b) *LIMITATIONS.*—

"(1) *PRIORITY.*—An Inspector General may not permit staff to engage in activities described in subsection (a) if such activities will interfere with the duties of the Inspector General under the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

"(2) *FUNDING.*—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. I thank my chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime.

Mr. Speaker, today is a very important day. What we're doing is recalling a difficult period in American history to understand the combined climate at that time that coexisted with fear and violence during the civil rights era. And so we have the Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Act.

The first thing I want to do is try to recapture, for the moment, all those who were not in the Judiciary Committee the day of the testimony, because it moved both Republicans and Democrats and visitors when we had Myrlie Evers, the widow of Medgar Evers, who was himself a victim of the violence that marked the civil rights era, talking to us about Emmett Till and how this youngster's life was taken.

And it was one of those moments in judiciary history that we were all electrified by the ability of our witnesses to recapture this moment in our history.

□ 1030

It was a remarkable hearing. I commend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and others, including the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, LAMAR SMITH, and also I lift up the name of STEVE KING of Iowa. Everybody was moved by this determination that at this point in American history we are now moving forward at a pace that may not always be recognized, faster than we think. And the reason I say that is that we are now going back into history to make the

corrections that law enforcement could have and should have made at that earlier time. So it is to me a very powerful determination of the Committee on the Judiciary to bring H.R. 923 to the floor for the expedited action that is required this morning.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 923, the Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Act of 2007. I am a cosponsor of H.R. 923, which has broad bipartisan support.

At the full committee markup of this legislation last week, members from both sides of the aisle, as Chairman CONYERS just mentioned, and from all backgrounds and experiences joined together to ensure the swift prosecution of civil rights-era crimes, which were oftentimes ignored.

It is appropriate that the House consider this legislation today, Mr. Speaker. Last week marked the 44th anniversary of the murder of civil rights leader Medgar Evers. Before his death, Medgar Evers was a primary, although unofficial, investigator of the Emmett Till murder. The committee was privileged to hear from his widow, Mrs. Myrlie Evers William. She movingly testified that the conviction of Medgar's killer in 1994, 31 years after his murder, gave a sense of hope to those who experienced this bleak time in our Nation's history.

Last week also marked an enormous victory in the fight to bring justice to unsolved civil rights-era murders. A Mississippi jury convicted former Klansman James Ford Seale for his role in the 1964 kidnapping and murder of 19-year-olds Charlie Eddie Moore and Henry Hezekiah Dee.

Unfortunately, time is running out for other unsolved civil rights-era murders. To date, the FBI has identified nearly 100 outstanding cases that still need to be solved. Many of these crimes are 30 to 40 years old. Evidence has been lost or destroyed, witnesses and defendants have died, and memories have dimmed. We must act swiftly to help bring long overdue justice to the victims, their families, and the communities that these brutal crimes affected.

H.R. 923 directs the Attorney General to designate a deputy chief within the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice to coordinate the investigation and prosecution of unsolved civil rights-era murders. The bill also directs the Attorney General to designate a supervisory special agent within the Civil Rights Unit of the FBI to further investigate these outstanding cases.

Finally, the bill provides much-needed resources to the Department of Justice, the FBI, and State and local law enforcement officials to prosecute these same cases.

Mr. Speaker, I want to especially thank Chairman CONYERS and Representatives NADLER, FRANKS, SCOTT,

and FORBES, members of the Judiciary Committee, for their commitment to this legislation.

I hope my colleagues will support this much-needed bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES), the ranking member of the Crime Subcommittee, and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time on this side.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), and I yield him such time as he may consume.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 923, the Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Act of 2007. This important bill enjoys wide bipartisan and bicameral support. The bill will assist Federal, State, and local governments with the important task of solving unsolved civil rights-era crimes.

Mr. Speaker, at the recent joint hearing held by the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security and the Subcommittee on Constitution, Civil Rights, and Civil Liberties, we heard from six excellent witnesses. The most moving of these were Mrs. Myrlie Evers Williams and Mrs. Rita Schwerner Bender, both of whose husbands the Ku Klux Klan assassinated because of the import civil rights work they were doing. The Klan assassinated Medgar Evers on June 12, 1963, and Michael Schwerner on June 21, 1964. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) has asked us to take up this act now because it coincides with the anniversary of these two important events. In both cases it took government authorities decades before the killers were convicted of these brutal murders.

Unfortunately, these cases were not isolated incidents. There are dozens of cases, probably hundreds, like these, some of which have never been acknowledged, investigated, or prosecuted. Indeed, we don't even know how many people were murdered during the 1950s and 1960s, because retaliation was so common that many families did not dare report that their loved ones had been murdered. The FBI has identified more than 100 cold cases that should be investigated and, when possible, charges should be brought against the accused killers.

I support H.R. 923 because it will hold the Department of Justice and the FBI

accountable for following through on these investigations and prosecutions. The act requires the Attorney General to appoint a specific high-ranking employee in each agency to be accountable for this work. The act also requires the Department of Justice to report to Congress annually on the progress it has made towards solving these cases, and the first such report is due 6 months after the bill becomes law.

Lastly, the bill authorizes funds to the Department of Justice, the FBI, and when appropriate, State and local enforcement agencies, to investigate and prosecute these cases.

The FBI has already made a start in investigating these cases when it kicked off the Cold Cases Campaign in February of 2006 and expanded on this campaign in February 2007 when it solicited assistance from major civil rights organizations. However, there is still much more work that needs to be done, and Federal resources are necessary to do it. H.R. 923 will provide these necessary resources.

I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF).

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

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me the time this morning.

Mr. Speaker, in 1963, while confined in the Birmingham city jail, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. wrote a letter to eight Alabama clergymen regarding his recent demonstrations. In that letter, Dr. King eloquently wrote: "Injustice anywhere is a threat to justice everywhere." Dr. King's words ring true today in this debate on H.R. 923, the Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Act. We can no longer stand by and allow those civil rights cold cases to collect dust on our shelves. As a Nation, we owe it to the victims and their families and the country generally to provide them with long overdue justice.

Before I begin, I see waiting in the wings my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS). His diligence and perseverance on this legislation has been instrumental in getting us here today.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for considering this bill.

It is truly an honor to stand in league with my friend from Georgia as we began this bill, actually, this trek in the last session of Congress, and certainly he is a giant in the civil rights legislation and it is a privilege for me, Mr. LEWIS, to stand with you on this bill.

I also want to thank Alvin Sykes, who is the president of the Emmett Till Justice Campaign, and also former Senator Jim Talent from Missouri. Had it not been for them, I don't think we would be standing here today. Mr.

Sykes was inspirational in opening the Emmett Till case, for whom this legislation is named. He came to Senator Talent two years ago with the idea that ultimately spawned this legislation.

I think in the short time of this calendar year, a couple of months ago we commemorated as a Nation the 150-year anniversary of the Dred Scott decision. As the gentleman from Michigan eloquently stated a moment ago, there have been chapters in our country's history that are not proud chapters, and yet we cannot turn past those chapters in the book of history, but instead must focus and right wrongs.

For those of you who don't know the story of Emmett Till, Emmett was a 14-year-old African American boy from Chicago who spent his summer vacation with relatives in Mississippi. One afternoon, young Emmett spotted a Caucasian woman and allegedly whistled. For this indiscretion he was kidnapped from his house, brutally beaten, and thrown into a river with weights around his neck. And although Emmett's murderers were quickly arrested and placed on trial, the jury acquitted them and they walked out of the courtroom as free men. What makes this story even more tragic is that about a year later, one of the murderers confessed to his guilty conduct, without remorse no less, in an interview in *Look* magazine.

As an original cosponsor of this bill, I rise today to express my strong support for this legislation as I hope it will help bring closure to countless families who continue to suffer from injustices perpetrated so long ago. As has been noted, this legislation will establish an Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Investigative Office within the FBI to investigate these pre-1970 cases in conjunction with, that is, in conjunction with, State and local authorities. H.R. 923 will also create an Unsolved Crime Section to prosecute these cold cases.

In my previous life as a prosecutor, I tried some three dozen or so murder cases. And with any trial, particularly murder trials, time is of the essence. And that is especially true with cold cases that this legislation addresses. Over the past nearly 20 years, we have had 29 unsolved civil rights murder cases that have been reopened, reexamined. Thankfully, 22 convictions have resulted. We have seen justice brought to the families of Henry Dee and Charlie Moore, who were only 19 when they were murdered. What were their infractions that caused this horrific end to their lives? Henry and Charlie were believed to have knowledge about African Americans importing firearms into the country. And for this James Ford Seale and a group of fellow Klansmen kidnapped Henry and Charlie, took them into the woods, brutally beat them, and drove them into Parker's Landing in Mississippi. Henry was tied to an engine block and thrown into the Mississippi River, still alive. Charlie had to sit there and watch his friend drown,

knowing that his fate would be no different. Their bodies were found several months later, Henry still tied to the engine block, Charlie to a pile of iron weights.

After more than 40 years, James Ford Seale was finally held accountable for his actions, convicted just last week for his role in the murders. A fellow Klansman was given immunity in exchange for testifying about Seale's role in the murders.

The Nation has witnessed the conviction of Edgar Ray Killen for his part in the murders of civil rights activists Andrew Goodman, Michael Schwerner, and James Cheney. Ironically, tomorrow, June 21, actually marks the anniversary of those murders.

We have recently seen authorities re-examine the murders of Johnnie Mae Chappell in Florida and Jimmie Lee Jackson in Alabama and hopefully, hopefully, with the enactment of H.R. 923, many more.

Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall once said: "Justice too long delayed is justice denied." I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation so we can continue to help heal the Nation, rectify the inequities of the past, and provide justice to those who have been seemingly forgotten.

□ 1045

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, in recognizing the gentleman from Georgia, JOHN LEWIS, I can't help but observe that the difference between this crime, the Emmett Till crime of 52 years ago, and today is that passionately held beliefs about justice and fairness could cost you your life. There are only a few people left in America today who put their lives on the line knowingly in this struggle for justice, and the one in this body, the 110th Congress, is none other than JOHN LEWIS of Georgia, and I yield him as much time as he may consume.

Mr. LEWIS OF Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, (Mr. CONYERS) for those kind words.

Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased the Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Act is being considered today before the full House of Representatives.

I would like to thank the lead cosponsor of this bill, my good friend, Representative KENNY HULSHOF from Missouri, and my good friends in the United States Senate, Senator CHRIS DODD of Connecticut, and Senator PATRICK LEAHY of Vermont for their distinguished support in this effort.

Again, I must thank Chairman CONYERS for all of his help and for all of his support in bringing this bill before us today. Also, Subcommittee Chairs SCOTT and NADLER for coordinating a powerful hearing on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the sake of history, for the sake of justice, for the sake of closure, the 110th Congress must pass this legislation.

On August 28, 1955, almost 52 years ago, a 14-year-old boy from Chicago, a

young African American boy, was visiting his uncle in Money, Mississippi. He was pulled from his bed in the darkness of night. He was beaten until he could hardly be recognized. He was shot in the head, and his body was dumped in the Tallahatchie River, all because somebody said he had been fresh with a white woman.

Several years later, an intelligent and dignified NACP leader named Medgar Evers was gunned down in front of his home in Mississippi in June of 1963. Some historians said it was the injustice of these unsolved two murders that began the mass movement in the American South that we call the modern-day civil rights movement.

Who can forget the NAACP leader and his wife, Harry and Harriette Moore, who were killed by a bomb on Christmas night as they celebrated their 25th wedding anniversary in 1951 in Florida? Who can forget the two black couples lynched about 60 miles east of Atlanta in 1946, or the death of Lemuel Penn, a lieutenant colonel in the United States Army Reserve from Washington, D.C., who was a veteran trying to get home from Fort Benning, Georgia for a little rest. He was killed in 1964 as members of the KKK drove by him on a highway.

Who can forget Viola Liuzzo, shot down in Alabama in 1965, from the hometown of our chairman, Chairman CONYERS from Detroit, trying to bring nonviolent activists back to their home after the Selma-to-Montgomery march?

There are hundreds, maybe even thousands, of these crimes that were never brought to justice. There are murderers who have walked free for decades while the families of victims cry out for justice. Passing this bill is the least we can do. And we must do something to right these wrongs.

I will never forget the three civil rights workers, three young men I knew, Andy Goodman, James Chaney and Mickey Schwerner. They came to Mississippi with a simple mission, to register as many black voters as possible. They were stopped, arrested, taken to jail. Later that night, June 21, 1964, they were taken from jail by the sheriff and his deputy, turned over to the Klan, where they were beaten, shot and killed. They didn't die in Vietnam. They didn't die in Eastern Europe. They died right here in the United States. They died in Philadelphia, Mississippi.

Viola Liuzzo didn't die on a road or some street in Baghdad, she died right there in Alabama on Highway 80. Lemuel Penn, Medgar Evers, Emmett Till and countless others didn't die in the Middle East; they died right here in our own country fighting for simple justice.

Mr. Speaker, we have an obligation, we have a mission, we have a mandate. The blood of hundreds of innocent men and women is calling out to us. Then, no one came to their aid. But today we can help make it right. Let us move to

close this dark chapter in our history. Let us try to wash away the stains on our democracy. So I call on all of my colleagues to pass this legislation and pass it today.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following letters of support for H.R. 923, the Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crimes Act.

LAWYERS' COMMITTEE FOR
CIVIL RIGHTS UNDER LAW,
Washington, DC, June 18, 2007.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: I am writing on behalf of the Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law to express our strong support for H.R. 923/S. 535, the Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Act. The bill, sponsored by Congressman John Lewis of Georgia, will give the U.S. Department of Justice the funding and tools necessary to investigate and prosecute civil rights era murders.

Ever since our founding by President John F. Kennedy in 1963, the Lawyers' Committee has sought to attain equal justice under law for all Americans, and the Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Act is an important step in continuing that mission.

We are hopeful that the House of Representatives will pass the bill this week, as June 21 represents an incredibly symbolic day in the history of the civil rights movement. On that date in 1964, KKK member Edgar Ray Killen assembled a mob to hunt down three civil rights workers in Mississippi. The victims' names were James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner. Those young men sacrificed their lives in pursuit of equal rights for all Americans, yet their killer roamed free for decades until a court finally convicted him on June 21, 2005.

We urge Congress to mark this important anniversary by passing H.R. 923.

The bill assigns offices within the Justice Department the specific responsibility of investigating and prosecuting civil rights murders before 1970. Then, civil rights murder cases that went to trial often ended in hung juries. However, today, different attitudes and improved race relations could result in color-blind justice, and technological advancements could allow prosecutors to present more persuasive evidence at trial.

To this end, H.R. 923 will provide the Justice Department with \$11.5 million in funds to carry out their duties, a sum publicly supported by a D.O.J. representative at a recent House subcommittee hearing.

At that same hearing, Myrlie Evers-Williams, the widow of slain civil rights worker Medgar Evers, spoke in support of the bill. Her husband was assassinated in 1963, and three decades later, a jury convicted 74 year-old Byron de la Beckwith of the murder, proof that justice knows no time limitations.

Although the Lawyers' Committee and Americans-at-large are thankful that the Evers family and others have received some level of closure, we know that countless American families are still waiting to see justice served. Just last week, a federal jury convicted James Ford Seale of two counts of kidnapping in relation to the 1964 murders of two African-American teenagers. Passage of the Emmett Till Unsolved Crimes Act will help the Justice Department investigate and prosecute cases similar to the Killen, Seale, and De la Beckwith trials.

With your support of this measure, aging murderers who have subverted our legal system for decades could finally face a court of law. The long-grieving families of numerous victims could hope to see closure. Perhaps

most importantly, this bill could assist the United States government in upholding justice, no matter how long overdue.

Again, we urge you to mark this important anniversary by scheduling a floor vote on H.R. 923/S. 535 this week. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions regarding this request.

Sincerely,

JOHN G. BRITTAIN,
Chief Counsel.

LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE
ON CIVIL RIGHTS,
Washington, DC, June 4, 2007.

Hon. JOHN LEWIS,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

Hon. KENNY C. HULSHOF,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

Hon. PATRICK J. LEAHY,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR COLLEAGUES: On behalf of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights (LCCR), the nation's oldest, largest, and most diverse civil and human rights coalition, with nearly 200 member organizations, we urge you to co-sponsor and support the bipartisan Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Act (S. 535/H.R. 923). LCCR believes that it is imperative to put resources behind investigating and prosecuting those individuals involved with committing the unsolved civil rights era crimes.

The historic conviction of Edgar Ray Killen, for the 1964 deaths of three Mississippi Civil Rights workers, Andrew Goodman, James Chaney, and Michael Schwerner, demonstrates how it is imperative that our nation bring murderers to justice, even if several decades have passed since these heinous crimes were committed. However, time is running out because the witnesses to these crimes are elderly.

S. 535/H.R. 923 will create two new offices to investigate and prosecute unsolved civil rights era murders. The Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Investigative Office, a new FBI office headed by a Chief Investigator, will aggressively investigate pre-1970 murder cases in coordination with state and local law enforcement. The second office will be the Unsolved Crimes Section in the Civil Rights Division of the DOJ, which will focus specifically on prosecuting these cases. If a crime other than murder is discovered during the course of an inquiry, it will be referred to the appropriate law enforcement officials.

The bill authorizes \$11.5 million in annual appropriations: \$5 million for the Unsolved Crimes Section, \$5 million for the Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Investigative Office and \$1.5 million for Community Relations Service of the Department of Justice to work with local communities in identifying these cases.

We hope that you co-sponsor and support the Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Act (S. 535/H.R. 923), which will bring to justice individuals who committed heinous crimes against civil rights activists and individual African Americans.

Sincerely,

WADE HENDERSON,
President & CEO.
NANCY ZIRKIN,
Vice President/Director
of Public Policy.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE
ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,
Washington, DC, June 5, 2007.

Re H.R. 923, the Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Act.

Hon. JOHN LEWIS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. KENNY HULSHOF,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN LEWIS AND HULSHOF: On behalf of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), our nation's oldest, largest and most widely-recognized/grassroots civil rights organization, I would like to thank you for your sponsorship of and leadership behind H.R. 923 the Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Act. It is imperative to bring murderers of early civil rights activists to justice, to show the victims' families, as well as the Nation, that their sacrifices continue to outrage our Nation. The United States' government needs to commit the resources necessary to see that these heinous crimes intended to intimidate are resolved.

Witnesses and evidence to these crimes are aging and time is of the essence. As proven by the historic 2005 conviction of Edgar Ray Killen for the 1964 deaths of three Civil Rights workers, Andrew Goodman, James Chaney, and Michael Schwerner, and the 1994 conviction of Byron De La Beckwith of the murder of Medgar Evers, more than 40 years earlier, there is no time limit on justice.

As you know, this bill creates two new offices within the Department of Justice whose sole purpose is to investigate these crimes. The Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Investigative Office, a new FBI office headed by a Chief Investigator, will aggressively investigate pre-1970 cases in coordination with state and local law enforcement officials that resulted in death and remain unsolved. This office will do everything possible to make certain those who have committed these murders are brought to justice. The Unsolved Crimes Section, a new office within the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice, will focus specifically on prosecuting these cases. If a crime other than murder is discovered during the course of an inquiry it will be referred to the appropriate law enforcement officials. Lastly, the bill authorizes \$11.5 million in annual appropriations: \$5 million for the Unsolved Crimes Section, \$5 million for the Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Investigative Office and \$1.5 million for Community Relations Service of the Department of Justice to work with local communities in identifying these cases.

In order for our Nation to fully begin to move beyond these heinous crimes, the federal government needs to resolve these cases. Thank you again for your leadership on this bill; the NAACP deeply appreciates all you are doing on this issue. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions or comments on the NAACP position, or if there is any way that I can be helpful to you as we move ahead with this legislation.

Sincerely,

HILARY O. SHELTON,
Director.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is both humbling and an honor to speak on this bill after the distinguished gentleman, Congressman LEWIS, has just spoken. And I join my colleagues in strong support of H.R. 923, the Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Act OF 2007, and also compliment Chairman CONYERS for his leadership and work on bringing this bill forward.

It is important that Congress adopt this legislation as quickly as possible; 30 to 40 years have passed since many of these murders were committed.

Under normal circumstances, trying a murder case is difficult and costly. Add to that the loss or destruction of evidence, witnesses who have died or are unavailable, and numerous procedural hurdles, it only increases the difficulty and cost of prosecuting these crimes. But law enforcement officers and prosecutors are continuing to pursue these cases, and we applaud their efforts.

In 2006, the FBI directed all 56 of its field offices to comb through their own cold case files and assess how many could be prosecuted. The FBI identified roughly 100 such cases. Many cases are confined to a handful of field offices that must complete rigorous in-depth investigations before it's too late.

H.R. 923 directs the Attorney General to designate a deputy chief within the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice to coordinate the investigation and prosecution of unsolved civil rights-era murders. The bill also directs the Attorney General to designate a supervisory special agent within the Civil Rights Unit of the FBI to investigate these outstanding cases.

Mr. Speaker, most of these cases, if viable, will lack the requisite Federal nexus for prosecution by the Department of Justice. Yet, the Department and the FBI are able to provide valuable assistance to State prosecutors in their investigations. The Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Act provides additional resources to fully assess these cases and bring the offenders to justice.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 7 minutes. The gentleman from Virginia controls 13 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to yield to the articulate gentlelady from Texas, SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, a distinguished member of the committee, as much time as she may consume.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, allow me to take a moment of personal privilege to acknowledge the chairman of the full Judiciary Committee. It has only been a little over 6 months, or almost 6 months, that Mr. CONYERS has taken the realm of this august body. And I think if history is to be accurate, to recount the volcanic change that has come about on the life-changing legislative initiatives that have been able to be moved out of this committee, we recognize that hate should not be applauded, but it should be made illegal.

We have confronted the issues dealing with the creativity of America, addressing the questions of patent reform. We are looking closely at the idea of how do we find a balance on the issue of immigration. We are listening, we are learning, we are sympathetic. We are, in fact, what the Judiciary Committee, one of the oldest committees, was really intended to do: to listen to the grievances of people and be able to find relief.

Let me thank the ranking member of the subcommittee, the ranking member of the full committee, for they have partnered on a number of initiatives, and we have found, sometimes, common ground. Today I rise on that very shining example of a common ground.

Allow me to thank Congressman HULSHOF of Missouri for his passion and his commitment, and Mr. Sykes, who was a witness and who humbly said he was simply a public servant, someone who thought this idea was long in coming.

And so why we are here today is to talk about what many of you perceive as a television program called *Cold Cases*. I wish it was as simple as that. On that program, you do see the impact on families, but it is, in fact, a television program. Today, we speak of lives, lives long left on the dusty road of unsolved crimes, lives that are broken, torn, full of tears, looking for just a semblance of justice and hope in America. Maybe they were thinking of the words of Winston Churchill when he spoke to President Roosevelt in the dark ways of World War II, "Give us the tools, and we will finish the job." That is what this bill does today; it gives the tools to America's prosecutors to pick up the broken pieces of the civil rights movement.

In 1989, we put together a memorial for those who had lost their lives in the civil rights era. They lost their lives not because they were criminals, not because they were caught in an unfortunate accident, but they lost their lives because they were on the battlefield for justice. They were murdered because they were active in the civil rights movement. They were killed by organized hate groups as acts of terror aimed at intimidating blacks and civil rights activists of many different colors and religious backgrounds. Their death, like the death of Emmett Till, helped to galvanize the movement by demonstrating the brutality faced by African Americans in the South. It is an era of terror which all of us have come to stand against, proudly so, which makes you very proud to stand here as an American, frankly, the greatest country in the world. For we have traveled a blood-stained road, but yet as we've traveled it, there have been those who have tried to go back and be able to bring us forward, united, arm in arm together, sweeping across America talking about the injustices of the past, but looking forward to the future for our children.

And so this bill is in tribute to the likes of Rita Bender, a witness who was

brought before this committee. It was in recognition of the lives that we have heard of, Schwerner, Goodman and Chaney, buried deep in a mud pile. It was a testimony to JOHN LEWIS, who sits among us as an icon of conscience, who will tell you that in those muddy fields of Mississippi and Alabama, there are still skeletons that have yet been found. For many were killed, unnamed, and the relatives were too frightened to ever come forward. Maybe now, because this bill has a section in it on community relations, and I am hoping that as we provide oversight on this bill, we will increase those dollars from \$1.5 million to \$2 million or \$2.5 million, because one of the witnesses said they could not have prosecuted the case had it not been for the persistence and the heart and determination of the family members, having lived under the shadow of this sin for so long.

This bill does create a deputy chief in the Criminal Division of the Civil Rights Division. Many of us would have preferred a division, some separate fixture standing with the responsibility to have the hammer, if you will, of rightness. But we support this legislation, and we hope that as our chairman has been diligent and vigilant, as he looks forward, that we will ensure that that deputy chief does the right thing and provides a vigorous advocacy and prosecution of those unsolved crimes.

□ 1100

Let me, Mr. Speaker, just recount very briefly the moving testimony that was given of the witnesses. Let me home in, if I could, on Myrlie Evers Williams. Why? Because it is part of my psyche to have seen Medgar Evers folding down on his front yard as he was murdered going into his home to see his wife and his children.

Can you imagine the horror of waiting for daddy to come home, waiting for your husband to come home, the dinner on the table, the radio playing, the children making the kinds of pleasant noises that children make? Her husband was a warrior, but a gentle man, a man of peace, a man who was willing to sacrifice his own future so that he might bring justice to some.

Let me, Mr. Speaker, as I close, simply ask my colleagues to remember this past and go to the future as I ask for support for this legislation.

I thank you, JOHN LEWIS, and I thank you, JOHN CONYERS.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong of H.R. 923, the "Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crimes Act of 2007." This legislation, which I am proud to co-sponsor and strongly support, is intended to complete some of the Nation's most important unfinished business. And that is to solve some of the most depraved acts of violence against persons belonging to a racial group that was vulnerable, politically powerless, and innocent, and against those persons who risked life and limb to help them secure the rights promised in the Declaration of Independence and made real in the Constitution.

The Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crimes Act of 2007 is long overdue. I thank

our colleague, JOHN LEWIS of Georgia, who is widely recognized as the moral conscience of the House for sponsoring this legislation and I thank Chairmen CONYERS, SCOTT, and NADLER for their work in shepherding it through the legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, in 1989, the Civil Rights Memorial was dedicated in Montgomery, Alabama, the birthplace of the modern Civil Rights Movement. The Memorial honors the lives and memories of 40 martyrs who were slain during the movement from 1954 to 1968, including Emmett Till. But we know that many more people lost their lives to racial violence during that era. In fact, at the time the Memorial was dedicated, the killers of 13 of the 40 martyrs whose names are inscribed on the Memorial had not been prosecuted or convicted. In 10 of the 40 deaths, defendants were either acquitted by all-white juries or served only token prison sentences. We also know there are many cases that still cry out for justice. These unsolved crimes represent a continuing stain on our Nation's honor and mock its commitment to equal justice under law. The legislation before us is intended to help us remove that stain once and for all.

The 40 victims selected for inclusion in the Civil Rights Memorial fit at least one of three criteria: (1) they were murdered because they were active in the civil rights movement; (2) they were killed by organized hate groups as acts of terror aimed at intimidating blacks and civil rights activists; or, (3) their deaths, like the death of Emmett Till, helped to galvanize the movement by demonstrating the brutality faced by African Americans in the South. The 40 persons who fit the selection criteria ranged in age from 11 to 66. Seven were white, and 33 were black. They were students, farmers, ministers, truck drivers, a homemaker and a Nobel laureate.

But Mr. Speaker, there are many, many other victims besides the 40 who are remembered on the Memorial. The Southern Poverty Law Center reports that its research uncovered approximately 75 other people who died violently between 1952 and 1968 under circumstances suggesting that they were victims of racial violence. For most of them the reason their names were not added to the Memorial is because not enough was known about the details surrounding their deaths. Sadly, the reason so little is known about these cases is because they were never fully investigated or, in some cases, law enforcement officials were involved in the killings or subsequent cover-ups. And because the killings of African Americans were often covered up or never seriously investigated, there is little reason to doubt that many slayings were never even recorded by the authorities.

The reason justice had not been served was the callous indifference, and often the criminal collusion, of many white law enforcement officials in the segregated South. There simply was no justice for African Americans during the civil rights era. The whole criminal justice system—from the police, to the prosecutors, to the juries, and to the judges—was perverted by racial bigotry. African Americans were routinely beaten, bombed and shot with impunity. Sometimes, the killers picked their victims on a whim. Sometimes, they targeted them for their activism. In other cases, prominent white citizens were involved and no consequences flowed. Herbert Lee of Liberty, Mississippi, for example, was shot in the head by a state legislator in broad daylight in 1961.

It is, of course, fitting and proper that H.R. 923 bears the name of Emmett Till, whose slaying in 1955 and his mother's decision to have an open casket at his funeral stirred the Nation's conscience and galvanized a generation of Americans to join the fight for equality. Sadly, hundreds of them were killed in that struggle, and many of the killers, like those of Emmett himself, were never successfully prosecuted.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to learn that the Department of Justice strongly supports this legislation. It should. No government agency has done more through the years to protect and defend the civil rights of African Americans and other victims of injustice. I hope the DOJ's embrace of this legislation represents a rededication to its historic role of ensuring equal justice under law for all, even the poor, powerless, and vulnerable.

Mr. Speaker, the heart of this legislation is sections 3 and 4. Section 3 establishes a Deputy Chief of the Criminal Section of the Civil Rights Division. Section 3 requires the Attorney General to designate a Deputy Chief of the Criminal Section of the Civil Rights division who will be responsible for coordinating the investigation and prosecution of violations of criminal civil rights statutes that occurred before December 31, 1969, and ended in death.

Section 3 also requires a study and report to Congress about the number of cases opened, the number of Federal prosecutions commenced, the number of cases of State and local prosecutions where the DOJ assisted, the number of cases that have been closed, and the number of open pending cases. The report shall be made not later than 6 months after the enactment of the Act.

Section 4 of the bill establishes a parallel component in the Civil Rights Unit of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to be headed by a Supervisory Special Agent designated by the Attorney General. This Supervisory Special Agent in the Civil Rights Unit is responsible for investigating violations of criminal civil rights statutes that occurred not later than December 31, 1969, and resulted in death. The Supervisory Special Agent should, where appropriate, coordinate investigations with State and local law enforcement officials.

Mr. Speaker, although I strongly support H.R. 923, I believe the bill would be even stronger if it incorporated three small but important amendments. First, I would recommend an amendment containing Congressional findings of fact that help explain to the nation and the world why the Congress was compelled to enact this vitally important legislation. We are enacting this legislation not because of who the perpetrators of these unsolved criminal violations of civil rights statutes are, but who we are, and who their victims were.

Mr. Speaker, over the past half century, the United States has made tremendous progress in overcoming the badges and vestiges of slavery. But this progress has been purchased at great cost. From Reconstruction through the modern Civil Rights Movement, heinous and depraved acts of violence were committed against persons belonging to a racial group that was innocent, vulnerable, and politically powerless, and also against those persons who risked life and limb to help them secure the rights promised in the Declaration of Independence and made real in the Constitution. Many of these crimes remain unsolved and no one has ever been held accountable.

Examples of unsolved cases include the 1968 "Orangeburg Massacre" at South Carolina State University where state police shot and killed three student protesters; the 1967 shooting death of Carrie Brumfield, whose body was found on a rural Louisiana road; the 1957 murder of Willie Joe Sanford, whose body was fished out of a creek in Hawkinsville, GA; the 1946 killing of a black couple, including a pregnant woman, who was pulled out of a car in Monroe, GA, and dragged down a wagon trail before being shot in front of 200 people.

These unsolved crimes represent a continuing stain on our Nation's honor and mock its commitment to equal justice under the law. Solving these cases is part of the unfinished work of America. President Kennedy said it so well 44 years ago, when he addressed the Nation on June 11, 1963: "this Nation, for all its hopes and all its boasts, will not be fully free until all its citizens are free."

A second amendment I would recommend is the establishment of a specially created section within the Civil Rights Division with dedicated resources, personnel, and budgetary authority to investigate and prosecute notorious and neglected pre-1970 criminal violations of the civil rights statutes.

I believe that in designating the Deputy Chief required by this legislation, the Attorney General must also be required to delegate to the Deputy Chief authority over the necessary personnel and budgetary resources. The high hope of H.R. 923 is that it may help bring justice to those whom justice has been delayed for more than two generations. The Deputy Chief, therefore, has an awesome responsibility. If we are to expect positive results, it is incumbent upon us to provide the Deputy Chief the resources and authority needed to be successful. As Winston Churchill said to President Roosevelt during the dark days of 1940: "Give us the tools and we will finish the job!"

I am pleased, however, that the bill authorizes annual appropriations of \$10 million for each of fiscal years 2008 through 2017 for the purpose of investigating and prosecuting pre-1970 criminal violations of the civil rights statutes that resulted in a death. Similarly, I am pleased that the bill authorizes annual appropriations of \$1,500,000 to the Community Relations Service of the Department of Justice to provide technical assistance by bringing together law enforcement agencies and communities in the investigation of criminal violations of civil rights statutes.

My third amendment I would recommend is to increase the amount of this annual appropriation by \$500,000 to \$2 million and to make this funding source available to assist the families of victims in coping with the loss of a loved one through counseling and other support services, financial and otherwise. Such assistance must be available to the victim's families because in many cases the testimony of a family member may be indispensable to government investigators and prosecutors. I am particularly mindful that the witnesses testifying before the Judiciary Committee hearing affirmed their belief that the government's ability successfully to investigate and solve criminal civil rights violations would be greatly enhanced were assistance and support available to the victims' families.

Mr. Speaker, 44 years ago, Medgar Evers was murdered in Jackson, Mississippi; justice

would not be done in his case for more than twenty years. But that day was foretold because the evening before the death of Medgar Evers, on June 11, 1963, President John F. Kennedy addressed the Nation from the Oval Office on the state of race relations and civil rights in America. In his historic speech to the nation President Kennedy said:

We are confronted primarily with a moral issue. It is as old as the scriptures and is as clear as the American Constitution.

One hundred years of delay have passed since President Lincoln freed the slaves, yet their heirs, their grandsons, are not fully free. They are not yet freed from the bonds of injustice. They are not yet freed from social and economic oppression. And this Nation, for all its hopes and all its boasts, will not be fully free until all its citizens are free.

H.R. 923 is intended to help bring justice to those whom justice has been delayed for more than two generations. In doing so, this legislation will help this Nation fulfill its hopes and justify its boast that in America all persons live in freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this historic legislation and urge all Members to join me in voting for its passage.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN).

(Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill. The fact that it is on suspension ought not to suggest that it is not an important bill. This bill is another in a number of bills that helps us heal some tremendous wounds in this country that go to the very essence of this country.

The Civil War, which caused more bloodshed than any other war that this Nation has been engaged in, is viewed as the tremendous act of expiation with the effort of this Nation to resolve, in its own mind, what it meant by every man and woman being equal.

That began the process that was followed through in a remarkable period of time during the last century called the civil rights revolution. But that revolution has not ended. There are still things that need to be done.

One of the terrible stains left on this Nation is the lack of justice done for those who suffered at the hands of people who believed this country would never recognize the rights of all; those who thought they could act with impunity to threaten, to terrorize, to murder other human beings merely because of the color of their skin.

I call this bill the "last chance bill," the "now or never bill." If we don't do this now, we will never have the chance to do it again, because those individuals who were involved in these crimes may not be around, and the family members of those who were victims of these crimes may not be around. We give ourselves a 10-year period of time in which we make a real effort to try and bring those to justice who should have been brought to justice a long time ago.

In the process, we say to all Americans, We understand the injustice that was done. We will make sure it is never repeated again. We will work to make this country a better place now and in the future.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank our subcommittee chairman, and I thank our full committee chairman and subcommittee ranking member as well.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill. As it has been said, there exists in America an open sore that is yet to be remedied. I note that sometimes people see an amount of money that is being spent and say that is too much money. But in this case, there is an injustice that cries out for healing and for addressing.

When one American, regardless of race, creed, color, gender, religion, national origin, when one is struck down, then all of us are struck down. We need to address this. Now, I am not one of those who believes that we need to run forward and apologize for the sins of others that we didn't commit. But in this case, this bill addresses an injustice.

We have the power. We have the wherewithal and the ability to address this wrongdoing and this injustice. If we were not to take action, then this body would owe an apology, and I do not want to see that become necessary.

There are times that we hear moving testimony, and our heart is moved. But we know for the greater good of the country we must do something else. This is one of those cases in which we heard testimony that was very moving, and the heart is aligned with the head. This requires action. I appreciate the leadership moving this forward so that this injustice, this open sore, can finally be addressed.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, this bill, partnered by the gentleman from Georgia, a Democrat, and the gentleman from Missouri, a Republican, shows what we can do when we just pause and take a breath from the partisanship, the finger pointing, the negative attacks by the press and even some Members of our own body against this great body and join together to move this country forward.

I want to thank all of the individuals who worked on this bill, especially the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

At this time I would like to yield to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member, Mr. FORBES. I think this is an important step forward. I have been amazed by the congeniality and the cooperation that has been extended to me by all of the members of the House Judiciary Committee.

Things come around. This is a historic moment. It has been expressed with great articulateness by Members

on your side of the aisle, Mr. FORBES, as well as mine. But the witnesses on that day in Judiciary, and Myrlie Evers Williams stands out more than anyone else, were so amazing that I want everyone to go back and read the testimony that just electrified us all.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, the chairman should have the last word on this, and so he has.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNYDER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 923, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 923.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2764, THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 498 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 498

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2764) making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the

Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration in the House of H.R. 2764 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida, my good friend, Mr. DIAZ-BALART. All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. I also ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 498.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1115

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 498 is an open rule that provides for consideration of H.R. 2764, the fiscal year 2008 appropriations for the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and related programs.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen 15 State and Foreign Operations measures go through the House of Representatives in almost 16 years of serving in this body. Some bills were well-intentioned, but fell short of meeting America's critical needs and objectives, while others missed the target altogether.

Regarding today's State and Foreign Operations bill, I must commend Chairwoman LOWEY, Ranking Member WOLF, their respective staffs and the rest of the committee for coming together in a bipartisan fashion to craft this meaningful piece of legislation. Despite critical budget constraints and critical concerns, the bill is fiscally responsible and begins to address our Nation's foreign policy initiatives as they relate to fulfilling our commitments abroad.

In my capacity as chairman of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe and as a senior member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, I believe I can speak to our country's need to restore world stability after years of following misguided and shortsighted foreign policy.

This bill provides \$34.2 billion overall for foreign assistance and State Department operations, with much-needed emphasis placed on international AIDS programs, children's health care, basic education programs and targeted peacekeeping operations. By increasing funds for critical global health, basic education, refugee and disaster assistance programs, we are heightening world stability and rebuilding our image abroad as a nation builder, not divider.

In an effort to shift away from a Middle East foreign policy that focused a little too narrowly on Iraq, we are now reaching out to neighboring Mediterranean countries that need our attention and assistance. The escalating situation in Iraq has forced thousands, indeed millions, of refugees to flee into neighboring countries, Jordan being one of the most heavily affected.

During a trip to the region almost 2 weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, I witnessed firsthand the heart-wrenching effects of people displaced. What I learned in Jordan and saw in Kosovo is that there are people in this world being forced to live in conditions so inhumane that even our wildest nightmares could not comprehend. As such, I am pleased to support the bill's allocation of \$830 million to provide refugees worldwide with food, water and shelter. As I spoke last evening during the testimony in the Rules Committee, I said to Mrs. LOWEY and to Mr. WOLF that I am hopeful in conference that they will be able to add funds specifically for Jordan for reasons that I perceive are necessary.

While we must remain vigilant and diligent on combating the evils of terrorism, we must also simultaneously seize opportunities to establish, maintain and strengthen diplomatic ties in every region of the world. I am pleased also to see that the bill provides \$365 million to enhance our public diplomacy efforts, and allocates \$501 million for cultural, educational and professional exchange programs globally.

The underlying legislation includes critical foreign aid to our allies in the world, including Israel. It also restores funding in many of the areas which the present administration sought to cut.

As I mentioned, I serve as chairman of the U.S. Helsinki Commission, and the President Emeritus of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe's Parliamentary Assembly. Mr. Speaker, I am fond of saying that if you can say all of that, you ought to be president of the assembly. I am deeply appreciative that this bill funds America's commitment to the OSCE and the Helsinki Commission, and I indeed thank the chairwoman and ranking member, especially the chairwoman, for her efforts toward this end.

Mr. Speaker, America has a responsibility in the world. We are, as is constantly reported, the last remaining Superpower. Contrary to what many might argue later in this debate, our power cannot and must not be flexed only in our military might. On the con-

trary, our power must be flexed in what we do to help repair many of the things that are broken in the world.

The underlying legislation is a critical component in this effort. I am pleased to support this open rule and the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida, my good friend, Mr. HASTINGS, for the time. I would also like to thank Chairwoman LOWEY and Ranking Member WOLF for their efforts on this undeniably important piece of legislation.

This bill funds a number of U.S. Government programs and activities, including the State Department, the United States Agency for International Development, foreign, economic and military assistance, contributions to international organizations and international broadcasting programs.

Even though aspects of this bill have clearly bipartisan support, there are significant areas of concern with some of the priorities that the majority has set forth in this legislation.

Just over a year ago, the people of Colombia reelected President Uribe to a second term with over 62 percent of the vote. President Uribe is the first President in over 100 years to be reelected by the Colombian people. His reelection and his extraordinarily high current approval ratings are a testament to his efforts to curb terrorism, corruption and narcotrafficking in Colombia.

For years, designated terrorist organizations in Colombia have hampered efforts by the people of that great country to live in a peaceful democracy. Proactive action must continue to be taken to ensure that armed terrorists are not allowed to create social unrest through violence. With the current landscape in the world today, foreign assistance, Mr. Speaker, is as strategically important to our national interest as it is morally just.

I am concerned that the underlying legislation cuts funding for Plan Colombia \$59 million below the President's request and \$86.5 million below fiscal year 2007. Plan Colombia has achieved significant results. When it began, that country was facing a civil war that was tearing it apart. Now that the plan has had time to take effect, and with President Uribe's leadership, kidnappings have fallen by 75 percent and the gross domestic product of Colombia has increased to 7 percent annually.

We must not take progress in the Andean region for granted, however. If the United States turns its back on the region, it will falter and create a scenario that will require greater U.S. investment and sacrifice at a time when obviously we have significant responsibilities worldwide, not to mention that we would be spurning a democrat-

ically elected ally that has bravely fought corruption and narcotrafficking.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank President Bush for his continued support for a democratic transition in Cuba. Pursuant to the recommendations of his Commission for Assistance to a Free Cuba, the President requested \$45 million in economic support funds for Cuba pro-democracy activities. These funds would support efforts for a transition to democracy in the Western Hemisphere's only totalitarian dictatorship through support for dissidents, human rights activists, independent librarians and others who risk their lives each day for freedom in that enslaved island. Unfortunately, the bill brought forth by the majority is cutting the funds needed to support pro-democracy efforts in Cuba and funding less than 20 percent of the President's request.

I would note that under the bill, the other countries in the Western Hemisphere will receive over 95 percent of the funds requested by the President, and I think that is good. Yet funds to support a democratic transition in the Western Hemisphere's only totalitarian dictatorship constitute approximately 19 percent of the President's request.

Mr. Speaker, these acts include from staging a hunger strike; to demanded access to e-mail and the Internet and going to prison for it; to having the audacity of possessing books by Gandhi and Orwell and Martin Luther King in their homes and offering those books as an independent library to their neighbors, an act of great courage that is met by the dictatorship's goon squads with violence, confiscation of the books and often prison time; to the independent journalists who risk their lives and their families' safety by writing the truth about life under the totalitarian nightmare, and who need paper and typewriters and faxes and telephones to send their stories out; to the children of political prisoners who have received the only toys they have ever seen because of the solidarity of this United States program of assistance; to those from all walks of life who dare to join a human rights organization in a totalitarian police state; to the physicians who open their homes to their neighbors for the practice of medicine and dispense medicines, risking prison for breaking the rules of the totalitarian state, the only employer in the country, or the physicians who refuse to perform the forced abortions ordered by the state when there is any indication whatsoever of a problematic pregnancy, so the regime can keep its infant mortality statistics low.

Mr. Speaker, that is how one of my heroes, Dr. Oscar Elias Biscet began his heroic journey as a pro-democracy activist. He subsequently has become a great pro-democracy leader. I carry a card with his photograph with me at all times. He is currently in a dark and damp dungeon, sentenced to 25 years in the gulag for having the audacity of peacefully advocating for democracy and free elections in Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot send aid to him in prison. The regime will not allow it. But we can help his family and his colleagues in the struggle for freedom.

These are the acts of civic resistance that have grown exponentially in recent years, despite a tremendous increase in the dictatorship's brutal repression, and those are the people, the heroes that I have mentioned, that we help with this program, that we will seek to increase funding for through the President's requested level by an amendment that I will introduce with my friend and colleague Representative ALBIO SIREs of New Jersey, and that I will ask all freedom-loving Members of this House to support.

Last February, Mr. Speaker, the six Cuban American Members of this Congress, BOB MENENDEZ, MEL MARTINEZ, ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, ALBIO SIREs, MARIO DIAZ-BALART and myself, received a letter from nine pro-democracy leaders in Cuba. They know the risks that they were and are taking by sending us that letter. They knew that it would be utilized publicly in forums such as today's.

In that letter, that group of dissidents and pro-democracy leaders, representing an extraordinarily wide spectrum of ideology and opinion, some with whom I have had disagreements in the past, came together and told us of the importance of this aid that we will be debating in this bill. They stated in their letter, "We can affirm that the aid that for years has flowed to the pro-democracy movement takes into account the vast range of needs, from medicine to keep a political prisoner or dissident from dying, to food, water filters, medical equipment, clothing, shoes, coats, toys for the children of political prisoners, who suffer doubly the loss of a loved one and social repression on the streets and in school, essential vitamins, office supplies, and the tools of democracy, computers, printers, phones, fax machines, among others, that account for a long list of articles and materials that have been made possible in Cuba."

Today, with the amendment that I have filed along with Representative SIREs, we reply to the letter sent in February by those pro-democracy leaders, and, as I stated, Mr. Speaker, we will ask all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the aid requested by those pro-democracy leaders in that letter, the assistance for the pro-democracy movement.

□ 1130

Mr. Speaker, on other subjects in this important legislation, the bill cuts by approximately 40 percent the President's request for the Millennium Challenge account. The Millennium Challenge, which President Bush called a new compact for global development, provides assistance through a competitive selection process to developing nations that are pursuing political and economic reforms in three areas: ruling

justly, investing in people, and fostering economic freedom. Contributions from that account are linked to greater responsibility from developing nations. The new responsibilities these nations accept in exchange for the funds ensure that the funds we provide do not go to waste and have the greatest possible impact on those who need the help the most.

That account encourages transparency, and it is a good aspect of our foreign policy, and it is very important that it be increased as this legislation moves forward.

Lastly, I would mention that this bill faces a veto threat by the President because of language which may undermine what is known as the Mexico City policy. The Mexico City policy currently in effect requires that foreign NGOs agree as a condition of receipt of Federal funds for family-planning activities that the organization will neither perform nor promote abortion as a method of family planning. The Mexico City policy applies only to family-planning programs and is designed to protect the integrity of U.S.-funded international family-planning programs by creating a bright line of separation between abortion and family planning.

There is concern by the President and many Members in this Congress that U.S. taxpayer family-planning funds could possibly go to NGOs that promote or provide abortions under the language in the underlying legislation.

I understand the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) will introduce an amendment to address this issue, and I urge Members to consider that very important amendment.

The majority correctly currently brings this important legislation to the floor under an open rule. The House has traditionally considered appropriations bills under open rules in order to allow each Member an opportunity to offer germane amendments without having to preprint their amendments or receive approval from the Rules Committee. I hope that the majority will live up to their campaign promise of running a transparent House and will continue our tradition of open rules with the rest of the appropriations bills this year.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the second-ranking member on the majority side on the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this open rule and the underlying bill, H.R. 2764, the State-Foreign Operations Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2008. There is so much to praise in this bill: its emphasis on funding our core bilat-

eral development programs; its emphasis on funding basic education, child survival and global health initiatives. And most importantly, its emphasis on providing for our national security and our global economic interests.

I would like to praise Subcommittee Chairwoman LOWEY and Ranking Member WOLF and the Foreign Operations Subcommittee in particular for the work they have done on aid to Colombia. This bill makes some badly needed and long overdue changes to our aid program for Colombia. The results of the past several years, particularly where illegal drugs are concerned, made clear that it is time to try a different and more comprehensive approach.

The 2008 bill rebalances our priorities in Colombia. It recognizes that the response to violence, narcotrafficking and instability in our South American neighbor must be multifaceted, helping to guarantee lasting security through good governance.

Colombia is an important friend of the United States and it is the largest recipient of U.S. assistance outside the troubled Middle East region. Colombia deserves our support; and even though I have been a critic of many of our past policies, I have never and I will never advocate walking away from Colombia or its people.

The new approach in this bill will make our counternarcotics policy more effective by helping small farmers transition permanently away from illegal drug production, increasing funds to investigate and prosecute major drug traffickers, and continuing drug interdiction programs. Aerial fumigation and sporadic military offenses are no substitute for helping Colombia to govern its own territory. The results make that clear: 7 years and \$5.4 billion later, the old policy has resulted in more coca growing in Colombia, and the price of cocaine on the streets of America is actually lower than before we started.

It is time for a change, for a new more balanced direction, and this bill provides more funding for judges and prosecutors, roads, clean water, jobs and aid for vulnerable people. It looks to fund the need of today's Colombia, not yesterday's. Many Colombians are working today to clean house in Colombia, going after politically powerful criminals who send drugs to our shores and wreak violence and mayhem in Colombia. The aid in this bill will help them. Success hinges on Colombia's judicial system which faces serious challenges. This bill provides them with new resources to meet those challenges.

Mr. Speaker, unless Colombia deals with the overriding issue of impunity, many of us are going to continue to fight for even more changes in our policy, restricting security assistance to the Colombian military which is responsible for a lot of the human rights

violations, and we are going to continue to insist that no free trade agreement move forward until the human rights situation improves in Colombia.

If the United States of America stands for anything, it should stand out loud and foursquare for human rights. And for too many years, we have turned our backs on the harsh reality in Colombia where thousands of trade unionists have disappeared or been murdered, thousands of people have been victimized by security forces and their allies in the paramilitary forces.

We should not be sending money in a way that does not acknowledge that those security forces need to do better. Mr. Speaker, success also depends on Colombia's ability to govern and create employment, especially in the lawless zones where drug traffickers and paramilitary groups still operate. This bill allows USAID to expand badly needed efforts to those communities in coca-growing areas that up until now have been beyond our reach due to lack of funds.

Finally, success depends on Colombia's ability to care for and reintegrate victims of violence. This includes helping Colombia's internally displaced population which is second in the world only to Sudan. That is not a list you want to be on, Mr. Speaker. It means protecting people coming forward to testify who are seeking redress. It also means helping people recover stolen land through violence and helping Afro-Colombian and indigenous people who have been disproportionately hit by violence.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does a good job of achieving balance between economic development and security aid for Colombia. It demonstrates a level of support for Colombia's democratic future that we have not been able to articulate before now. I support this new balanced direction for Colombia, and I applaud the work of the Appropriations Committee for not only these provisions but for its judicious approach of supporting what works best in our global development programs.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Florida for yielding me this time.

I also join in the praise for the bipartisan work of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, the excellent work of Chairwoman LOWEY and Ranking Member WOLF.

Mr. Speaker, the job of the next President of the United States, whoever that may be, whatever party that person may represent, is very straightforward. They are going to have to reintroduce America to the world. They are going to have to reintroduce the America of cooperation, of working together, of multilateralism rather than

unilateralism, of diplomacy rather than force, and strength through persuasion and cooperation.

This Foreign Operations appropriations bill is the introduction to a new relationship that America will have with the world and a new relationship that our appropriations bill will have with the taxpayers of this country. It really does two things. One, it restores accountability. That is best seen in the fact that it does not give a blank check on more money to Iraq that will go down the sink hole. Number two, it recognizes that we have to be a participant in cooperating with other countries in order to solve global problems.

Mr. Speaker, our Appropriations Committee is to be commended for this strong bipartisan work. Our image in the world has been tarnished by the foreign policies of this administration, from the war in Iraq to the rejection of multilateral agreements such to the Kyoto Protocol, the International Criminal Court, to human rights abuses at Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo. Through this appropriations measure, we have the opportunity to send the world a different message about America's priorities. We do that in this bill by allocating \$6.5 billion to combat global health crises, including HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria. We have provided needed help to those suffering from genocide in Darfur by investing \$949 million in development assistance.

We offer needed food, water and shelter for refugees around the world, and we make good on our obligations to international organizations investing \$334 million in multilateral programs to address the global challenges, and we pay \$1.3 billion in U.N. peace-keeping operations. The bill also helps protect the American taxpayer and brings needed accountability from the administration.

I would also like to commend the committee for restoring funding for a small but extremely important initiative, the Middle East Regional Cooperation, or MERC program. Established in 1979 by my colleague from California, MERC provides grants for collaborative scientific research projects between Israel and its Arab neighbors. MERC grants have made it possible for many Vermont students to travel to the Middle East to conduct environmental research at an innovative program called the Arava Institute.

This incredible program, working together on difficult environmental problems, has allowed Vermonters and others to live and work alongside Israeli and Arab colleagues, working together on environmental problems that affect the entire region. MERC grants have made this experience possible, and I applaud the committee for working to make sure this invaluable program receives the funding it deserves.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to supporting important work in the Middle East, this bill implements needed

changes to our policy in another conflicted region, Colombia, as was eloquently described by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN). This bill recognizes that it is time for change in our Colombia policy.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, again I thank my dear friend for yielding me the time initially.

I would like to, with regard to the issue of the amendment that I made reference to previously, note that I will be bringing to the floor along with my friend and colleague, Representative SIREs, to restore to the President's request by offsetting funds from the administration account billions of dollars of the State Department, approximately \$30 million, to bring to the President's request level the assistance for Cuban democracy programs.

Not today on the floor in the context of the rule but last night in the Rules Committee, a colleague who previously spoke made reference to a GAO report to impugn and to impeach the program of assistance to the Cuban pro-democracy movement and oppose efforts to restore the level to the President's request.

I have in my office and I highly recommend to all colleagues precisely that GAO report. We would inform colleagues where to download it. It is a very important report, and there are a couple of things I would like to point out from the report that is used to impeach or attempt to impeach the program and impugn the program, criticize the program, of assistance to the dissidents in Cuba.

□ 1145

The GAO report found that from 1996 to 2006, the Cuba program provided the following assistance:

385,000 pounds of medicine, food, and clothing to the pro-democracy movement.

More than 23,000 shortwave radios.

Millions of books, newsletters and other informational materials.

U.S. assistance, the GAO found, supported journalism correspondence courses for more than 200 Cuban journalists.

The publication of approximately 23,000 reports by independent journalists in Cuba.

And with regard to the recommendations of the GAO report, as you know, Mr. Speaker, the GAO often when it reviews in-depth, as it does, a government program or agency, it often recommends cuts in that program, and the GAO makes no recommendation of a cut. It makes recommendations for the more efficient running of the Cuban democracy programs.

And in response to the GAO report, and I have this letter in my office and it's available to any Member who would like to read it and I highly recommend it, the agency that administers these programs, the U.S. Agency for International Development, USAID, in a letter dated January 16 of this

year, responding to the GAO report, informs specifically, with specificity, how all of the recommendations of the GAO report have been implemented.

And so I highly recommend the reading of the GAO report and also the response by the administrating agency with regard to the implementation of the recommendations of the GAO report, Mr. Speaker.

It's important that we help those who risk their lives and the safety of their families day in and day out to achieve freedom, a democratic transition in our closest neighbor, 90 miles away, that at this time is a state sponsor of terrorism and an anti-American totalitarian regime. And what those heroes of the pro-democracy movement are risking their lives and their families' freedom for is a democratic transition to a reality with the rule of law, obviously a democratically elected government that will no longer be allied with state sponsors of terrorism, anti-American state sponsors of terrorism but that will, rather, be worried and working for the needs to better the lives of the long oppressed people within Cuba.

Mr. Speaker, again I thank my good friend Mr. HASTINGS for yielding the time. I thank any of my colleagues who may have been listening to this debate for their attention. Once again I would plead that they join from both sides of the aisle to bring up to the President's request the assistance for the Cuba pro-democracy movement.

With that, Mr. Speaker, and acknowledging the complexities and yet the importance of the underlying legislation brought to the floor today by this rule, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, America's leadership role is not limited to the Presidency. Nor does it solely fall upon the shoulders of this body. Branches of our government must share responsibility.

During this critical time in world history, when America's image as a global leader is tarnished and questioned, we must lead from this Chamber. We must take it upon ourselves to make it possible for America's image in the world to be restored. We must make it our business to try and make all that is wrong right.

When America leads in a constructive, inclusive and thoughtful manner, others in the world follow. This approach toward global leadership is not, as some have charged, a soft approach to conducting the war on terrorism. On the contrary, it is a clear recognition that America cannot do this alone.

If we have learned anything in the last 6 years, it is that no one in this world is safe from the directions of terrorism. It will take a global effort to curb the efforts of those who are seeking to destroy us and others in the world.

But if we have learned anything else during the last 6 years, it is that the policies of the present administration

have failed and America's standing in the world is in dire need of restoration.

Parts of the Middle East, from Iraq to Gaza, are living in a civil war. People are dying in Darfur as we and others around the world do nothing. And children throughout the world are starving to death and dying of malnourishment and lack of potable fresh water.

The underlying legislation, the first Foreign Operations appropriations bill of this new Democratic majority, sends a clear message to our friends and enemies alike that America's priorities in the world are making must-needed changes.

I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1429. An act to reauthorize the Head Start Act, to improve program quality, to expand access, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 277. An act to modify the boundaries of Grand Teton National Park to include certain land within the GT Park Subdivision, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 1429) "An Act to reauthorize the Head Start Act, to improve program quality, to expand access, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DODD, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. OBAMA, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. ENZI, Mr. GREGG, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BURR, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ALLARD, and Mr. COBURN, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of S. Res. 105 (adopted April 13, 1989), as amended by S. Res. 149 (adopted October 5, 1993), as amended by Public Law 105-275, further amended by S. Res. 75 (adopted March 25, 1999), amended by S. Res. 383 (adopted October 27, 2000), and amended by S. Res. 355 (adopted November 13, 2002), and further amended by S. Res. 480 (adopted November 20, 2004), the Chair, on behalf of the Republican Leader, announces the appointment of the following Senators to serve as

members of the Senate National Security Working Group for the One Hundred Tenth Congress:

The Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR).

The Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER).

The Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS).

The Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI).

The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER).

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 923, by the yeas and nays;

H. Con. Res. 21, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 2359, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 2284, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

EMMETT TILL UNSOLVED CIVIL RIGHTS CRIME ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 923, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 923, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 422, nays 2, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 512]

YEAS—422

Abercrombie	Blunt	Cardoza
Ackerman	Boehner	Carnahan
Aderholt	Bonner	Carney
Akin	Bono	Carson
Alexander	Boozman	Carter
Allen	Boren	Castle
Altmire	Boswell	Castor
Andrews	Boucher	Chabot
Arcuri	Boustany	Chandler
Baca	Boyd (FL)	Clarke
Bachmann	Boyd (KS)	Clay
Bachus	Brady (PA)	Cleaver
Baird	Brady (TX)	Clyburn
Baker	Braley (IA)	Coble
Baldwin	Brown (SC)	Cohen
Barrett (SC)	Brown, Corrine	Cole (OK)
Barrow	Brown-Waite,	Conaway
Bartlett (MD)	Ginny	Conyers
Barton (TX)	Buchanan	Cooper
Bean	Burgess	Costa
Berkley	Burton (IN)	Costello
Berman	Butterfield	Courtney
Berry	Buyer	Cramer
Biggart	Calvert	Crenshaw
Bilbray	Camp (MI)	Crowley
Bilirakis	Campbell (CA)	Cuellar
Bishop (GA)	Cannon	Culberson
Bishop (NY)	Cantor	Cummings
Bishop (UT)	Capito	Davis (AL)
Blackburn	Capps	Davis (CA)
Blumenauer	Capuano	Davis (IL)

Davis (KY) Jefferson
 Davis, David Jindal
 Davis, Lincoln Johnson (GA)
 Davis, Tom Johnson (IL)
 Deal (GA) Johnson, E. B.
 DeFazio Johnson, Sam
 DeGette Jones (NC)
 Delahunt Jones (OH)
 DeLauro Jordan
 Dent Kagen
 Diaz-Balart, L. Kanjorski
 Diaz-Balart, M. Kaptur
 Dicks Keller
 Dingell Kennedy
 Doggett Kildee
 Donnelly Kilpatrick
 Doolittle Kind
 Doyle King (IA)
 Drake King (NY)
 Dreier Kingston
 Duncan Kirk
 Edwards Klein (FL)
 Ehlers Kline (MN)
 Ellison Knollenberg
 Ellsworth Kucinich
 Emanuel Kuhl (NY)
 Emerson LaHood
 Engel Lamborn
 English (PA) Lampson
 Eshoo Langevin
 Etheridge Lantos
 Everett Larsen (WA)
 Fallin Larson (CT)
 Farr Latham
 Fattah LaTourette
 Feeney Lee
 Ferguson Levin
 Filner Lewis (CA)
 Flake Lewis (GA)
 Forbes Lewis (KY)
 Fortenberry Linder
 Fossella Lipinski
 Foxx LoBiondo
 Frank (MA) Loeb sack
 Franks (AZ) Lofgren, Zoe
 Frelinghuysen Lowey
 Gallegly Lucas
 Garrett (NJ) Ruppertsberger
 Gerlach E.
 Giffords Lynch
 Gilchrist Mack
 Gillibrand Mahoney (FL)
 Gillmor Maloney (NY)
 Gingrey Manzullo
 Gohmert Marchant
 Gonzalez Markey
 Goode Marshall
 Goodlatte Matheson
 Gordon Matsui
 Granger McCarthy (CA)
 Graves McCarthy (NY)
 Green, Al McCaul (TX)
 Green, Gene McCollum (MN)
 Grijalva McCotter
 Gutierrez McDermott
 Hall (NY) McGovern
 Hall (TX) McHenry
 Hare McHugh
 Harman McIntyre
 Hastert McKeon
 Hastings (FL) McMorris
 Hastings (WA) Rodgers
 Hayes McNeerney
 Heller McNulty
 Hensarling Meehan
 Hergert Meek (FL)
 Herseth Sandlin Meeks (NY)
 Higgins Melancon
 Hill Mica
 Hinchey Michaud
 Hinojosa Miller (FL)
 Hirono Miller (MI)
 Hobson Miller (NC)
 Hodes Miller, Gary
 Hoekstra Miller, George
 Holden Mitchell
 Holt Mollohan
 Honda Moore (KS)
 Hooley Moore (WI)
 Hoyer Moran (KS)
 Hulshof Moran (VA)
 Hunter Murphy (CT)
 Inglis (SC) Murphy, Patrick
 Inslee Murphy, Tim
 Israel Murtha
 Issa Musgrave
 Jackson (IL) Myrick
 Jackson-Lee Nadler
 (TX) Napolitano

Neal (MA) Thornberry
 Neugebauer Tiahrt
 Nunes Tiberi
 Oberstar Tierney
 Obey Towns
 Olver Turner
 Pallone Udall (CO)
 Pascrell Udall (NM)
 Pastor Upton
 Payne Van Hollen
 Pearce Velázquez
 Pence Visclosky
 Perlmutter Walberg
 Peterson (MN)
 Peterson (PA)
 Petri
 Pickering
 Pitts
 Platts
 Poe
 Pomeroy
 Porter
 Price (GA)
 Price (NC)
 Pryce (OH)
 Putnam
 Radanovich
 Rahall
 Ramstad
 Rangel
 Regula
 Rehberg
 Reichert
 Renzi
 Reyes
 Reynolds
 Rodriguez
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothman
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Salazar
 Sali
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Saxton
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schmidt
 Schwartz
 Scott (GA)
 Scott (VA)
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Sestak
 Shadegg
 Shays
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuler
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sires
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Solis
 Souder
 Space
 Spratt
 Stark
 Stearns
 Stupak
 Sutton
 Tancredo
 Tanner
 Tauscher
 Taylor
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)

Walsh (NY) Wexler
 Walz (MN) Whitfield
 Wamp Wilson (NM)
 Wasserman Wilson (OH)
 Schultz Wilson (SC)
 Waters Wolf
 Watson Woolsey
 Watt Wu
 Waxman Wynn
 Weiner Yarmuth
 Welch (VT) Young (AK)
 Weldon (FL) Young (FL)
 Weller

NAYS—2

Paul Westmoreland

NOT VOTING—8

Becerra McCrery Walden (OR)
 Cubin Ortiz Wicker
 Davis, Jo Ann Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining on the vote.

□ 1217

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 512, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF THE LATE ROBIN BEARD

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make the body aware of the loss of our colleague and friend, Robin Beard, former Congressman from the old Sixth District, who passed away last Saturday. His district basically overlapped with the current Seventh District of Tennessee. He served in this body from 1973 until 1983.

Robin Beard really had a storied and amazing life in which he dedicated himself to public service, and he did love it.

He received a B.A. in history from Vanderbilt in 1962. He was a veteran, serving 4 years in the Marine Corps, where he was a Marine Corps officer in charge of the Gemini IV offshore recovery mission, and attained the rank of lieutenant colonel.

While in Congress, he served on the Armed Services Committee. He was a strong supporter of and friend to Fort Campbell, which was located in both his district and mine.

He was appointed by the House Speaker as a congressional advisor to the Strategic Arms Negotiations in Geneva and the U.N. General Assembly Special Session on Disarmament.

He also served as an assistant Republican whip, was cochairman of the Republican Research Committee on Defense, and an executive committee member of the Republican Study Committee.

His expertise extended to domestic issues, and he served as an executive

committee member of the Congressional Task Force on Economic Policy.

After leaving Congress, he continued to serve the public, twice named as NATO Deputy Secretary General.

He is being laid to rest today in the Protestant French Huguenot Church in Charleston, South Carolina.

He is survived by his wife, Cathy, two children and five grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank Mrs. BLACKBURN for bringing this to our attention.

Robin Beard was a friend of all of ours from Tennessee, and many of you, both professionally and personally. I actually got to know him when he served two stints as Assistant Secretary General in NATO parliamentary, or the NATO organization in Brussels.

He had a keen sense of humor, and he was a man who enjoyed the collegiality of the House. He was a House man, and he served his country well, both in uniform and out, when he was with NATO.

And so I join on behalf of all of our Members from Tennessee and, really, all of the House and Mrs. BLACKBURN in this tribute to our fallen colleague, Mr. Beard.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the body join our Tennessee delegation in a moment of silence in remembrance of our former colleague, Robin Beard.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

CALLING ON UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL TO CHARGE IRANIAN PRESIDENT WITH CERTAIN VIOLATIONS BECAUSE OF HIS CALLS FOR DESTRUCTION OF ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 21, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATSON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 21, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 411, nays 2, answered "present" 11, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 513]

YEAS—411

Ackerman	Akin	Allen
Aderholt	Alexander	Altmire

Andrews Doyle
 Arcuri Drake
 Baca Dreier
 Bachmann Duncan
 Bachus Edwards
 Baird Ehlers
 Baker Ellison
 Barrett (SC) Ellsworth
 Barrow Emanuel
 Bartlett (MD) Emerson
 Barton (TX) Engel
 Bean English (PA)
 Berkley Eshoo
 Berman Etheridge
 Berry Everett
 Biggert Fallin
 Bilbray Farr
 Bilirakis Fattah
 Bishop (GA) Feeney
 Bishop (NY) Ferguson
 Bishop (UT) Filner
 Blackburn Flake
 Blunt Forbes
 Boehner Fortenberry
 Bonner Fossella
 Bono Foxx
 Boozman Frank (MA)
 Boren Franks (AZ)
 Boswell Frelinghuysen
 Boucher Gallegly
 Boustany Garrett (NJ)
 Boyd (FL) Gerlach
 Boyda (KS) Giffords
 Brady (PA) Gillibrand
 Brady (TX) Gillmor
 Braley (IA) Gingrey
 Brown (SC) Gohmert
 Brown, Corrine Gonzalez
 Brown-Waite, Goode
 Ginny Goodlatte
 Buchanan Gordon
 Burgess Granger
 Burton (IN) Graves
 Butterfield Green, Al
 Buyer Green, Gene
 Calvert Grijalva
 Camp (MI) Gutierrez
 Campbell (CA) Hall (NY)
 Cannon Hall (TX)
 Cantor Hare
 Capito Harman
 Capps Hastert
 Capuano Hastings (FL)
 Cardoza Hastings (WA)
 Carnahan Hayes
 Carney Heller
 Carson Hensarling
 Carter Herger
 Castle Herseth Sandlin
 Castor Higgins
 Chabot Hill
 Chandler Hinojosa
 Clarke Hirono
 Clay Hobson
 Cleaver Hodes
 Clyburn Hoekstra
 Coble Holden
 Cohen Holt
 Cole (OK) Honda
 Conaway Hooley
 Cooper Hoyer
 Costa Hulshof
 Costello Hunter
 Courtney Inglis (SC)
 Cramer Inslee
 Crenshaw Israel
 Crowley Issa
 Cuellar Jackson (IL)
 Culberson Jackson-Lee
 Cummings (TX)
 Davis (AL) Jefferson
 Davis (CA) Jindal
 Davis (IL) Johnson (GA)
 Davis (KY) Johnson (IL)
 Davis, David Johnson, E. B.
 Davis, Lincoln Johnson, Sam
 Davis, Tom Jones (OH)
 Deal (GA) Jordan
 DeGette Kagen
 Delahunt Kanjorski
 DeLauro Kaptur
 Dent Keller
 Diaz-Balart, L. Kennedy
 Diaz-Balart, M. Kildee
 Dicks Kilpatrick
 Dingell Kind
 Doggett King (IA)
 Donnelly King (NY)
 Doolittle Kingston

Kirk
 Klein (FL)
 Kline (MN)
 Knollenberg
 Kuhl (NY)
 LaHood
 Lamborn
 Lampson
 Langevin
 Lantos
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (GA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeb
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowey
 Lucas
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Mahoney (FL)
 Maloney (NY)
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCaul (TX)
 McCollum (MN)
 McCotter
 McCreery
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McHugh
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNeerney
 McNulty
 Meehan
 Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY)
 Melancon
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller (NC)
 Miller, Gary
 Mitchell
 Mollohan
 Moore (KS)
 Moore (WI)
 Moran (KS)
 Moran (VA)
 Murphy (CT)
 Murphy, Patrick
 Murphy, Tim
 Murtha
 Musgrave
 Myrick
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal (MA)
 Neugebauer
 Nunes
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Oliver
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor
 Payne
 Pearce
 Pence
 Perlmutter
 Peterson (MN)
 Peterson (PA)
 Petri
 Pickering
 Pitts
 Platts
 Poe
 Pomeroy
 Porter
 Price (GA)

Price (NC)
 Pryce (OH)
 Putnam
 Radanovich
 Rahall
 Ramstad
 Rangel
 Regula
 Rehberg
 Reichert
 Renzi
 Reyes
 Reynolds
 Rodriguez
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rogers (MI)
 Rohrabacher
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothman
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Ryan (WI)
 Salazar
 Sali
 Sanchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Saxton
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schmidt
 Kucinich
 Paul
 Gilchrest
 Hinchev
 Jones (NC)
 McDermott
 Davis, Jo Ann
 Marshall
 Ortiz

Schwartz
 Scott (GA)
 Scott (VA)
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Stetak
 Shadegg
 Shays
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuler
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Sires
 Skelton
 Slaughte
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Solis
 Souder
 Space
 Spratt
 Stearns
 Stupak
 Sutton
 Tancredo
 Tanner
 Tauscher
 Taylor
 Terry
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Thornberry
 NAYS—2
 Paul
 Miller, George
 Stark
 Wu
 Sullivan
 Walden (OR)

Tiahrt
 Tiberi
 Tierney
 Towns
 Turner
 Udall (CO)
 Udall (NM)
 Upton
 Van Hollen
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Walberg
 Walsh (NY)
 Walz (MN)
 Wamp
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters
 Watson
 Watt
 Waxman
 Weiner
 Welch (VT)
 Weldon (FL)
 Weller
 Westmoreland
 Wexler
 Whitfield
 Barton (TX)
 Wilson (NM)
 Wilson (OH)
 Wilson (SC)
 Wolf
 Woolsey
 Wynn
 Yarmuth
 Young (AK)
 Young (FL)

VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2359.
 This will be a 5-minute vote.
 The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 18, not voting 9, as follows:
 [Roll No. 514]
 YEAS—405
 Abercrombie
 Ackerman
 Aderholt
 Akin
 Alexander
 Allen
 Altmire
 Andrews
 Arcuri
 Baca
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Baird
 Baker
 Baldwin
 Barrow
 Bartlett (MD)
 Barton (TX)
 Bean
 Berkley
 Berman
 Berry
 Biggert
 Bilbray
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Bishop (UT)
 Blackburn
 Blumenauer
 Blunt
 Boehner
 Bonner
 Bono
 Boozman
 Boren
 Boswell
 Boucher
 Boustany
 Boyd (FL)
 Boyda (KS)
 Brady (PA)
 Brady (TX)
 Braley (IA)
 Brown (SC)
 Brown, Corrine
 Brown-Waite, Ginny
 Buchanan
 Burgess
 Burton (IN)
 Butterfield
 Buyer
 Calvert
 Camp (MI)
 Campbell (CA)
 Cannon
 Cantor
 Capito
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardoza
 Carnahan
 Carney
 Carson
 Carter
 Castle
 Castor
 Chabot
 Chandler
 Clarke
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Coble
 Cohen
 Cole (OK)
 Conaway
 Cooper
 Costa
 Costello
 Courtney
 Cramer
 Crenshaw
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Cummings
 Davis (AL)
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, David
 Davis, Lincoln
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Davis (CA)

Miller (NC) Reynolds
 Miller, Gary Rodriguez
 Miller, George Rogers (AL)
 Mitchell Rogers (KY)
 Mollohan Rogers (MI)
 Moore (KS) Ros-Lehtinen
 Moore (WI) Roskam
 Moran (KS) Ross
 Moran (VA) Rothman
 Murphy (CT) Roybal-Allard
 Murphy, Patrick Ruppertsberger
 Murphy, Tim Rush
 Murtha Ryan (OH)
 Musgrave Ryan (WI)
 Myrick Salazar
 Nadler Sali
 Napolitano Sánchez, Linda
 Neal (MA) T.
 Neugebauer Sanchez, Loretta
 Nunes Sarbanes
 Oberstar Saxton
 Obey Schakowsky
 Olver Schiff
 Pallone Schmidt
 Pascrell Schwartz
 Pastor Scott (GA)
 Payne Scott (VA)
 Pearce Sensenbrenner
 Perlmutter Serrano
 Peterson (MN) Sessions
 Peterson (PA) Sestak
 Petri Shays
 Pitts Shea-Porter
 Platts Sherman
 Pomeroy Shimkus
 Porter Shuler
 Price (GA) Shuster
 Price (NC) Simpson
 Pryce (OH) Sires
 Putnam Skelton
 Radanovich Slaughter
 Rahall Smith (NE)
 Ramstad Smith (NJ)
 Rangel Smith (TX)
 Regula Smith (WA)
 Rehberg Snyder
 Reichert Solis
 Renzi Souder
 Reyes Space

NAYS—18

Barrett (SC) Franks (AZ)
 Campbell (CA) Hensarling
 Cannon Manzullo
 Duncan Paul
 Flake Pence
 Foxx Pickering

NOT VOTING—9

Becerra Gutierrez
 Cubin Holden
 Davis, Jo Ann Ortiz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes are remaining in this vote.

□ 1236

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPANDING AND IMPROVING ASSISTANCE PROVIDED BY SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2284, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2284.

This will be a 5-minute vote.
 The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 351, nays 73, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 515]

YEAS—351

Abercrombie Doolittle
 Ackerman Doyle
 Aderholt Drake
 Allen Dreier
 Altmire Edwards
 Andrews Ellison
 Arcuri Ellsworth
 Baca Emanuel
 Bachus Emerson
 Baird Udall (NM)
 Baldwin English (PA)
 Barrow Eshoo
 Bartlett (MD) Etheridge
 Barton (TX) Fallin
 Bean Farr
 Berkley Fattah
 Berman Ferguson
 Berry Filner
 Bilirakis Fortenberry
 Bishop (GA) Frank (MA)
 Bishop (NY) Frelinghuysen
 Bishop (UT) Gallegly
 Blackburn Gerlach
 Blumenauer Giffords
 Blunt Gilchrest
 Boehner Gillibrand
 Bonner Gillmor
 Bono Gingrey
 Boozman Gonzalez
 Boren Gordon
 Boswell Granger
 Boucher Graves
 Boyd (FL) Green, Al
 Boyd (KS) Green, Gene
 Brady (PA) Grijalva
 Brady (TX) Gutierrez
 Braley (IA) Hall (NY)
 Brown (SC) Hall (TX)
 Hare
 Harman
 Hastert
 Hastings (FL)
 Heller
 Hergert
 Herseth Sandlin
 Higgins
 Hill
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hirono
 Hobson
 Hodes
 Hoekstra
 Holden
 Holt
 Honda
 Chabot
 Chandler
 Clarke
 Hulshof
 Hunter
 Inslee
 Israel
 Issa
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson-Lee (TX)
 Jefferson
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones (NC)
 Jones (OH)
 Jordan
 Kagen
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Keller
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilpatrick
 Kind
 King (NY)
 Kirk
 Klein (FL)
 Kline (MN)
 Knollenberg
 Kucinich
 Kuhl (NY)
 LaHood
 Lampson
 Langevin

Roskam Skelton
 Ross Slaughter
 Rothman Smith (NJ)
 Roybal-Allard Smith (TX)
 Ruppertsberger Smith (WA)
 Rush Snyder
 Ryan (OH) Solis
 Salazar Souder
 Sánchez, Linda Space
 T. Spratt
 Sanchez, Loretta Stark
 Sarbanes Stupak
 Saxton Sutton
 Schakowsky Tanner
 Schiff Tauscher
 Schmidt Taylor
 Schwartz Thompson (CA)
 Scott (GA) Thompson (MS)
 Scott (VA) Tiaht
 Serrano Tiberi
 Sestak Tierney
 Shays Towns
 Shea-Porter Turner
 Sherman Udall (CO)
 Shimkus Udall (NM)
 Shuler Upton
 Simpson Van Hollen
 Sires Velázquez

NAYS—73

Akin Franks (AZ)
 Alexander Garrett (NJ)
 Bachmann Gohmert
 Baker Goode
 Barrett (SC) Goodlatte
 Biggart Hastings (WA)
 Bilbray Hayes
 Boustany Hensarling
 Brown-Waite, Inglis (SC)
 Ginny Jindal
 Burgess Johnson, Sam
 Campbell (CA) King (IA)
 Cannon Kingston
 Coble Lamborn
 Conaway Lewis (KY)
 Culberson Lungren, Daniel
 Deal (GA) E.
 Duncan Mack
 Ehlers Manzullo
 Everett Marchant
 Feeney McCotter
 Flake McHenry
 Forbes Mica
 Fossella Miller (FL)
 Foxx Miller, Gary
 Wilson (SC)

NOT VOTING—8

Becerra Davis, Jo Ann
 Cole (OK) Ortiz
 Cubin Ros-Lehtinen
 Sullivan
 Walden (OR)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Two minutes are remaining in this vote.

□ 1244

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:
 Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent for rollcall vote No. 515, on suspending the rules and passing H.R. 2284. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 9355(a), amended by Public Law 108-375, and the order of the House of January 4, 2007, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the

Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy:

Mr. DEFAZIO, Oregon
Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
Mr. LAMBORN, Colorado

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 481 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. 2641.

□ 1248

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. 2641) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, with Mr. LYNCH (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, June 19, 2007, amendment No. 19 offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE) had been disposed of and the bill had been read through page 25, line 6.

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I would like to use my time and recognize the gentleman from South Carolina for a colloquy.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you and the ranking member for your work on this bill.

Two weeks ago the House passed the H-Prize Act of 2007. The H-Prize was overwhelmingly supported here in the House with a vote of 408-8, and last year 416-6. The H-Prize is a nonbureaucratic way for government to achieve its goal of harnessing America's entrepreneurial spirit to tackle our energy challenges. The best part is, if no one wins the government doesn't have to pay.

We need \$6 million, Mr. Chairman, to fund the H-Prize at its inception. Of that amount, \$1 million would be used to fund a prize for advancements in components or systems related to hydrogen storage, \$4 million would be used to fund a prize for development of prototypes of hydrogen-powered vehicles or other hydrogen-based products, and \$1 million would be used for administration of the prize competitions.

The Secretary of Energy was granted authorization for creating prizes in the Energy Policy Act of 2005. The H-Prize gives structure to this prize authority in accordance with recommendations from industry, academia, government and venture capitalists.

I would ask the chairman if he would work with Mr. LIPINSKI, the gentleman from Illinois, and me to provide funding for the H-Prize as we move forward in conference with the Senate.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman and Mr. LIPINSKI's request for funding for this very worthwhile program, and certainly look forward to working with him as well as the gentleman from Illinois as we go to conference.

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For salaries and expenses of the Department of Energy necessary for departmental administration in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the hire of passenger motor vehicles and official reception and representation expenses not to exceed \$5,000, \$304,782,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$2,390,000 shall be available for necessary administrative expenses to carry out the loan guarantee program under title XVII of Public Law 109-58, plus such additional amounts as necessary to cover increases in the estimated amount of cost of work for others notwithstanding the provisions of the Anti-Deficiency Act (31 U.S.C. 1511 et seq.): *Provided*, That such increases in cost of work are offset by revenue increases of the same or greater amount, to remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That moneys received by the Department for miscellaneous revenues estimated to total \$161,818,000 in fiscal year 2008 may be retained and used for operating expenses within this account, and may remain available until expended, as authorized by section 201 of Public Law 95-238, notwithstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 3302: *Provided further*, That fees collected pursuant to section 1702(h) of Public Law 109-58 shall be credited as offsetting collections to this account: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of miscellaneous revenues received during 2008, and any related appropriated receipt account balances remaining from prior years' miscellaneous revenues, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2008 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than \$142,964,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. SPACE

Mr. SPACE. 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. 4 offered by Mr. SPACE:

Page 25, line 14, after the second dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$30,000,000)".

Page 37, line 19, after the dollar amount insert "(increase by \$30,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SPACE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The chairman recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am offering this bipartisan amendment with Congressman

ADERHOLT to restore funding for the ARC, Appalachian Regional Commission, to \$65 million in this bill. This amendment brings the Commission's funding up so that it's equal to the President's request in the previous year's funding level.

The Appalachian Regional Commission is very important to my district and many other districts from New York to Mississippi. The Appalachian Regional Commission is a model for Federal economic development initiatives, and has been a responsible steward of the Federal funds it has received over the years. For example, in fiscal year 2006, across all investment areas, each dollar of ARC funding was matched by \$3.14 in non-ARC public project funding, and each ARC dollar invested leveraged \$11.55 in private investment in ARC projects over time. This restoration of funds will be offset by a \$30 million reduction to the Department of Energy's administrative account.

I understand that the Appropriations Committee must make difficult decisions this year. However, over the last 10 years, funding for the ARC has remained level, at around \$65 million, and the region continues to receive less Federal assistance per capita than the rest of the country. Additionally, the House of Representatives had voted to authorize the ARC at levels much higher than \$65 million.

The 410-county region still faces a complex set of economic and social challenges, and will need continued support from Congress. Without basic infrastructure, economic development and improvements in the overall quality of life, the Appalachian region will continue to lag well behind the rest of the Nation.

I ask my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment to restore funding for the commission to levels equal with the President's request and the current funding level for this program.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ADERHOLT).

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of Congressman SPACE's amendment, which is of course funding for the ARC, Appalachian Regional Commission, in this year's Energy and Water appropriations bill.

Many Americans may not be aware that this was a program that was established back in 1965. ARC was created to address the persistent poverty and the growing economic despair of the Appalachian region, which is an area that extends from southern New York to northeast Mississippi. At that time in 1965, one out of every three Appalachians lived in poverty. Per capita income was 23 percent lower than the U.S. average, and high unemployment and harsh living conditions had, in the 1950s, forced more than 2 million people in that area to leave their homes and seek work in other regions.

Even today, ongoing changes in declining sectors of the economy, such as

manufacturing and textiles, exacerbated by globalization, changes in technology, and the recent downturn in the economy have hit this region very, very hard. It has threatened to reverse a lot of the economic gains that were made in these communities over the past several years. For an area that has suffered economically for so long, we can't allow this to happen.

By funding the ARC at least at last year's level, \$65 million, we will ensure that the people and the businesses of Appalachia have the knowledge, have the skills and the access to telecommunications and the technology to compete in a technology-based economy.

As has been mentioned here by Congressman SPACE, this restoration of funds will be offset by \$30 million for the Department of Energy's administrative account. ARC has been a responsible steward for the Federal funds that it has received over the past several years. For example, in fiscal year 2006, across all investment areas each dollar of ARC funding was matched by \$3.14 in non-ARC public project funding, and each ARC dollar invested leveraged \$11.55 in private investment in ARC projects over time.

The 410-county region still faces a complex set of issues. However, this program has made a difference, and we are seeing results.

Over the last 10 years, funding for the ARC has remained level at \$65 million. And the region continues to receive less Federal assistance per capita than the rest of the country. Additionally, in the past, the House of Representatives has voted to authorize the ARC levels at the higher level of \$65 million.

I would like to thank Congressman SPACE for his assistance in this program, and also Chairman VISCLOSKY for his attention to this matter.

Mr. SPACE. I thank the gentleman from Alabama and would yield 1 additional minute to the Congresswoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. I want to thank Mr. SPACE for offering his amendment to something that I believe in very much, and that is more funding for the Appalachian Regional Commission.

The ARC encompasses all 55 counties of the State of West Virginia and is an important resource to the lower economic communities across Appalachia. Some of the good news is, since the ARC was created, poverty in the region has dropped from 31 percent to 13 percent, and more adults have high school diplomas. The percentage rate has risen to 70 percent. Over 400 rural primary health care facilities have been built. And in my district, three of the counties of my district have recently been removed from the list of economically distressed counties. We have already seen that ARC is a solid investment for our government by leveraging both private and public dollars.

The Appalachian region still lags behind the Nation in water and wastewater facilities, health care and pov-

erty. And the ARC is a major part of continuing to address these challenges in my district and across the region. Now is not the time to cut ARC funding. This amendment will simply bring ARC funds back up to last year's level and the President's requested level of \$65 million.

I look forward to bipartisan support of this amendment.

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman, Mr. SPACE, to express my appreciation for the concern he has for his constituency, as well as the gentlelady from West Virginia, and my colleague on the committee, Mr. ADERHOLT, who also raised an amendment in the full committee.

Again, I appreciate their work and their concern for the people in economic development of not only their individual constituencies, but their region, and certainly would pledge to continue to work with them to address their concerns.

Having said that, I would ask my colleague from Ohio to withdraw his amendment.

□ 1300

Mr. SPACE. Mr. Chairman, with that commitment to work for the concerns of those in Appalachia, I would, at this point, withdraw the amendment and continue to work with my colleagues on this important issue.

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

Ms. FOXX. 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. 18 offered by Ms. FOXX:
Page 25, line 14, after the second dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$27,950,000)".

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would reduce funding for the Department of Energy Departmental Administration to the fiscal year 2007 level. This amendment would save \$28 million, reducing the account from \$304.782 million to \$276.832 million, the fiscal year 2007 enacted level.

The Energy and Water appropriations bill is already \$1.1 billion over the President's request. This amendment would reduce the funding in the Departmental Administration account,

putting it at last year's enacted level. The bill provides a 10 percent increase for DOE's Departmental Administration account.

There has been at least \$105.5 billion in new Federal spending over the next 5 years authorized by the House Democratic leadership this year. In enacting the largest tax increase in American history, the Democrats' budget allows for \$28 billion in spending over that of the President's budget request.

This amendment is designed to save the taxpayers almost \$30 million, just a small dent in the unnecessary increases in Federal spending this year, which is being fueled by huge tax increases. We've constantly heard on the floor, around this bill especially, the problem of increased rules and regulations. What happens when you have additional administrators? What you are going to get are more rules and more regulations.

We are constantly adding administrative costs to all of the Federal Government. I think we can make a very small dent, but an important dent, in our deficit spending by cutting these funds. This should not hurt at all the administration of the Department and the administration of programs.

If we were going to put in additional funding anywhere, we ought to put that money in for direct services and not for administration. We hear more and more about too much administration in the education field, but I think we have it all over the Federal Government, State governments, local governments.

We are talking about deficits, not surpluses. If we had a huge surplus in this country, we might be wanting to talk about spending additional money. But we don't need to be doing that. This will benefit the taxpayers all over this country. And what we need to do is to cut spending, not increase spending. That is what we heard all last year from the majority party. I am surprised that we aren't continuing to hear it this year. When they are in charge, they want to spend lots of money.

So, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully ask my colleagues to support this, which would save \$28 million and make a small dent in our deficit.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce DOE's Office of Administration by over \$27 million. The bill provides \$304 million, a decreased amount under the President's request.

The Departmental Administration account funds the guts of the Department; the chief financial officer, human resources, the general counsel, the chief information officer, all are integral to the functioning of the \$25 billion operation of the Department of Energy.

What I am particularly concerned about relative to the gentlewoman's amendment is that the bill has initiatives that would not be funded as a result of the reductions.

There are funds provided in this bill for additional legal counsel to expedite energy efficiency standards for appliances. There has been a significant accumulation of backlog for this work. We can expedite this work and save energy in this country.

The bill also funds a review by the National Academy of Public Administration for the contracting in human resources process. Mentioned yesterday during debate, the Department of Energy has been on a high-risk list with the GAO for 17 years. The purpose of the subcommittee of having the National Academy of Public Administration come in is to get DOE off so that they stop wasting and mismanaging money. And I would hate to see that function not occur because of the gentlewoman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge rejection of it.

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

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

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

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment. And while they say miracles never cease, this is living proof. Despite my frustrations with the leadership of the Department of Energy, and they are great, I am rising to oppose the gentlewoman's motion to cut the DOE's Departmental Administration and make a case for why they need the level requested by the President.

For too long, DOE has been stuck in a quagmire of mismanagement, operating devoid of leadership and vision. But cutting funds that are critical to the successful management of our Nation's energy programs, especially at such a critical time in terms of our energy security, I think is a foolish time to do that. A cut of close to \$30 million to this account will cost far more in terms of our Nation's energy needs than the good message it might send.

So don't be misled by the gentlewoman's argument that cutting \$28 million in discretionary funds in this account will reduce the deficit. It might. But I think it will do the opposite. It will undermine DOE's efforts to oversee climate change research, improve the use of renewable energy, and provide national scientific leadership.

But DOE, I hope, is listening today and gets the message. They need to get their act together, and I agree with the fact that they don't have their act together. But I don't think this is the way to get their attention at this moment. But if I thought it was, I would agree with the gentlewoman, because I believe the intent here is more than just to cut the deficit. It is to wake them up to get some reasonable management in that quagmire that is over

there and just answers to the other body's needs all the time for additional spending. So it is unfortunate, but I do oppose the gentlewoman's amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would yield back my time and urge a "no" vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

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

Ms. FOXX. 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 North Carolina will be postponed.

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, \$47,732,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MATHESON

Mr. MATHESON. 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. MATHESON:

Page 26, line 17, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Chairman, the Department of Energy is currently managing 206 ongoing projects and, unfortunately, the agency has a long record of inadequate management and oversight of contracts. DOE's failure to hold contractors accountable led the GAO to designate DOE contract administration and project management as a high-risk area for waste, fraud, abuse and mismanagement way back in 1990. Although DOE has made some oversight improvements in the intervening years, GAO noted in reports completed this year, 17 years after the 1990 report, that major problems exist in contracting management at the agency.

One quick example: On a project started in 2004 to demonstrate an alternative waste treatment technology at DOE's Hanford site, DOE officials decided to accelerate the project's schedule. As a result, the project was initiated without using key project management tools, such as an independent review of the cost and schedule baseline. After the project experienced significant schedule and technical problems and the estimated cost more than tripled to about \$230 million, DOE began requiring that the project be

managed consistent with its project management requirements.

Furthermore, on four additional projects, estimated to cost over \$100 million each, cost and schedule information was not being reported into DOE's project tracking system, resulting in less senior management oversight.

My amendment would simply require DOE's Inspector General to conduct a root-cause analysis to fully understand the causes of its contract and management problems, as has been recommended by the GAO.

I encourage everyone to support this amendment as a necessary first step in order to better address the contract management challenges faced by the DOE.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I accept the gentleman's amendment. I understand his concern, as I and Mr. HOBSON have grave concerns about the department's record on contracting and project management as well.

This bill requires the department to develop an action plan due to Congress that will get DOE off the GAO high-risk list for their contract management performance as soon as possible, as I indicated in the previous debate, where they have been since 1990; follow its own guidelines in Management Order 413.3 for project management; and contract with the National Academy of Public Administration for a review of the departmental contracting processes, which have been a choke point of getting work done.

Again, I would be pleased to accept the gentleman's amendment and the record that is established for the department to follow through on GAO's recommendation to examine the root causes of poor contract management.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I wish to associate myself with the chairman's comments. I have no objection to the amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY
ADMINISTRATION
WEAPONS ACTIVITIES

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other incidental expenses necessary for atomic energy defense weapons activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, \$5,879,137,000 to remain available until expended.

DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other incidental expenses necessary for atomic energy defense, defense nuclear nonproliferation activities, in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, \$1,683,646,000, to remain available until expended.

NAVAL REACTORS

For Department of Energy expenses necessary for naval reactors activities to carry out the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition (by purchase, condemnation, construction, or otherwise) of real property, plant, and capital equipment, facilities, and facility expansion, \$808,219,000, to remain available until expended.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Administrator in the National Nuclear Security Administration, including official reception and representation expenses not to exceed \$12,000, \$415,879,000, to remain available until expended.

DEFENSE ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses necessary for atomic energy defense environmental cleanup activities in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and the purchase of not to exceed three passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, \$5,766,561,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$463,000,000 shall be transferred to the "Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund".

OTHER DEFENSE ACTIVITIES
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For Department of Energy expenses, including the purchase, construction, and acquisition of plant and capital equipment and other expenses, necessary for atomic energy defense, other defense activities, and classified activities, in carrying out the purposes of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including the acquisition or condemnation of any real property or any facility or for plant or facility acquisition, construction, or expansion, and the purchase of not to exceed twelve passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, \$604,313,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the funds provided under this heading in Public Law 109-103, \$4,900,000 are transferred to "Weapons Activities" for planning activities associated with special nuclear material consolidation.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UDALL OF NEW MEXICO

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to considering the amendment at this point in the reading?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. UDALL of New Mexico:

Page 27, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$192,123,000)".

Page 28, line 2, after the second dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$192,123,000)".

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

□ 1315

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. First let me thank the chairman and ranking member for their work on this bill, which provides a bold vision for moving this country forward along a path of clean energy independence and limits spending on new nuclear weapons.

My district has a particular interest in this bill, as I represent the scientists, employees, and community of Los Alamos National Laboratory, also known as LANL. The scientists at LANL are the best in the world and they work with a commitment to both national security and the pursuit of scientific knowledge. In recent years, there have been administrative and managerial difficulties, which we all agree are unacceptable. Nevertheless, the mission of the lab and the workers are the two things that I will always fiercely defend.

Stockpile stewardship, the core mission at LANL, certifies to the President every year that the nuclear stockpile is safe, reliable and accurate. My amendment will help ensure the stability of that mission and thus the rigor of our Nation's security, while also building a bridge to the future.

It will restore funding to the President's request for three specific areas, including upgrades to the Road Runner computer; the readiness and technical base and facilities at LANL; and the scientific campaign. In so doing, I propose to reduce spending in the office of the NNSA Administrator.

The Road Runner computer upgrades will increase LANL's supercomputing capability and keep the lab's ability to conduct computer simulated weapons testing at state-of-the-art. Additionally, the capacity can also be used for advanced non-weapons materials research, and thus broaden the scientific capability of the lab. The amendment restores proposed reductions in Readiness in Technical Base and Facilities at LANL, which would grind to a halt any safety improvements in the lab's infrastructure.

Finally, the science campaign is at the heart of stockpile stewardship. It sustains our Nation's capabilities and understanding of nuclear weapons, which is essential to protecting our Nation. It also allows us to keep our treaty commitments and not perform nuclear testing.

I believe that the cuts in this bill to our Nation's premier national security laboratory hurt the core mission and inhibit the laboratory's ability to trans-

sition toward the necessary work on energy independence.

LANL must prepare for the future, which includes diversification of its mission. As Chairman VISCLOSKEY has recognized in this legislation, securing our Nation's energy independence is one of the most critical areas of our national security. LANL has an important role to play in this regard.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment, and would hope that at the end of this debate he consider the withdrawal of his amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I have a great deal of respect for Mr. UDALL and also appreciate the fact that he has made a significant contribution to the full Appropriations Committee and also understand the circumstances that he is presented with.

Contrary to what I think the belief of some Members are, we have made cuts in this bill, but they were thoughtful cuts, given a number of considerations. I would point out that the means by which the gentleman is trying to secure additional weapons money would cut the Administrator's office and potentially terminate most of the Nation's nonproliferation programs.

The nuclear nonproliferation programs are one of the few activities at the Department of Energy that are staffed, managed and run by Federal employees. In the end, Federal employees tend to be generally younger professionals with fewer years of public service and would bear the brunt of any Federal reduction in force.

Secondly, I wish that our national labs, which are treasures and do great work, would also be as adamant and as concerned about their security as they are about their budget line. I would ask to submit additional materials in the RECORD, but would point out we had serious security breaches at Los Alamos in December of 1999, June of 2000, November of 2003, May of 2004, July of 2004, in 2005, in 2006. There was an incident in January of 2007 that made Time Magazine. This has got to stop.

But the breach that causes me and should cause every Member here the most heartburn is what happened to a gentleman by the name of Shawn Carpenter. Mr. Carpenter worked at Los Alamos, Mr. Carpenter was concerned about security at Los Alamos, and Mr. Carpenter went to the Federal Bureau of Investigation to express his concern. He did not go to a local newspaper. He went to the FBI, and he was terminated. There was a trial relative to that wrongful termination. And I would point out that the gentleman who fired Mr. Carpenter, and he subsequently won a judgment of \$4.6 million for wrongful termination, got a bonus.

He got a bonus after he fired Mr. Carpenter, and Mr. Carpenter went to the FBI to protect the secrets of this Nation as far as our nuclear security.

The third concern I have is some of these moneys would find their way back into the proposal made by the administration that we have eliminated in this bill for a new nuclear weapon. As we have extensively pointed out in the committee report language, since the termination of the Cold War, since regional conflicts such as Kosovo, since 9/11, we have not developed a new nuclear strategy. This is not a time to build a new nuclear weapon.

We have significant cost overruns and time overruns on three buildings we were told were needed for stockpile stewardship. None of them are done. All of them are over budget. Now let's take a turn in the road. I am adamantly opposed.

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

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

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

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition also to the gentleman's amendment. This is not personal between me and the gentleman, and I hope it wouldn't be when I get over too, because I am really opposed to this amendment, and I am really in support of the chairman on this, because this is something we have worked on for a long period of time.

I know the administration and some Members, those from New Mexico, are not pleased with the cuts to the weapons program. I have heard from the other body, and they may claim these funding reductions somehow threaten our national security.

I also recognize it is politically convenient to move money from a so-called bureaucracy in Washington to what is portrayed as a field-level purpose. Sorry, folks, but I don't buy either of these arguments, and I strongly believe this bill puts our nuclear weapons programs in the proper perspective.

I have been a member of the Energy and Water Subcommittee for the past 5 years, and I have personally visited every single nuclear weapons lab, plant and site in DOE's complex, and I honestly can't tell you how much our national security is protected, whether we fund the nuclear weapons account at \$6.5 billion, \$6 billion, or even \$5.5 billion. And I certainly can't tell you what benefit we will gain by adding \$192 million back to the weapons program and devastating NSA's management office, as the gentleman proposes.

I also sit on the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, as does my chairman, and we both are all too aware of the funding shortfalls in the conventional defense area to believe that nuclear weapons are somehow a higher security priority.

So after years of looking at this from virtually every angle, I can tell you definitively that what we need is a na-

tional strategy for nuclear weapons and a clearly defined set of military requirements that is derived from that strategy. Then, and only then, will NNSA be able to lay out what a modern weapons complex, capability of producing a specified number of reliable replacement warheads will look like.

In the meantime, we have many nuclear nonproliferation priorities that need to be addressed. This will have real security benefits today, not at some weapons design lab tomorrow.

This bill balances our national security needs by making the prudent recommendations on weapons we have discussed and by putting an additional \$398 billion above the President's request towards defense nuclear nonproliferation activities. These funds will play down the risk of nuclear smuggling by improving programs such as the elimination of weapons-grade plutonium production; international nuclear materials production and cooperation; second line of defense and cooperation; MegaPorts; MegaAirports; and global coordination among domestic security agencies, such as DHS and foreign governments.

Furthermore, these additional funds will support the implementation of an International Nuclear Fuel Bank, a priority for security experts ranging from National Security Advisor Steve Hadley to former Senator Sam Nunn to the leadership of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Getting our national security priorities right is what this bill is about, and it is a rational approach I wholeheartedly support. But let's call it what it is. This amendment isn't really about national security. It is all about jobs at these DOE weapons facilities.

In particular, the Los Alamos National Laboratory is in the gentleman's State of New Mexico. This lab has held a preeminent place at the Federal trough for years, and now fears the loss of jobs because of this bill's recommended funding levels. Los Alamos has the largest number of employees of any DOE field site, with employees who receive the highest level of compensation, and a lab that has the highest overhead rate of any DOE operation. All told, Los Alamos receives close to \$2 billion a year from our bill, plus additional reimbursement of work from other agencies. And I cannot tell you what we get in return for that investment.

I do know that Los Alamos has chronic management problems, and I can read a long litany of security failures, safety accidents and costs and schedule overruns brought to you by the 9,000 highly paid folks at Los Alamos. Don't let anyone tell you that these problems are a thing of the past. DOE just informed us this week of yet another security screwup at Los Alamos, and this is after a number of others.

Given this track record, do we really believe adding another \$192 million will

improve security? I would argue our national security might actually be improved by cutting 1,800 jobs from a facility that can't seem to manage sensitive information. We would have a lot less people to watch.

The bottom line is that gutting the office of the NNSA Administrator by reducing its funding by almost half will undermine any chance of the NNSA actually managing the weapons and nuclear nonproliferation programs. Does the gentleman expect us to believe that jobs in New Mexico are more important than the overall national management of these sensitive national security programs?

So I am, you can tell, opposed to the gentleman's amendment. I believe the priorities are misguided. The weapons program has no clear strategy of a way forward. And this bill report addresses the shortcomings with its prudent funding recommendations and bold direction.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this ill-conceived amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), chairman of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee of Energy and Commerce.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, which would fund new nuclear weapons development by taking \$193 million from the National Nuclear Security Administration nonproliferation account.

NNSA plays a very important role in helping us to secure nuclear weapons, "loose nukes," as we call them in committee, around the world. The program helps secure nuclear material in Russia and elsewhere.

This funding includes \$412 million for the installation of radiation portal monitors at over 200 border crossings in Russia, the Baltic States and the Caucasus region, \$293 million more than the President's budget.

Rather than commit billions of dollars to manufacturing another generation of nuclear weapons, our existing nuclear arsenal can be sustained using the life extension program managed by NNSA. If we cut \$193 million from it, there will be no way we can maintain this life extension program.

The JASON Report, a panel of independent nuclear weapons experts, reported last year that the existing plutonium pit will remain reliable for 100 years, far longer than the 45 or 60 years.

We don't need new weapons. Let's put the money where it will do the most good, to secure "loose nukes" around the world. Support the chairman in this position, and do not support the Udall amendment.

□ 1330

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, in closing, first of all, the

NNSA is the problem, not the scientists. NNSA was put there to bring a better security situation, and security has deteriorated since they are there, and that is why I take the money away from the NNSA Administration.

Secondly, I know we can't legislate on an appropriations bill, but I think it would be very appropriate to take a look at the role that NNSA should play in this whole situation, if not return to the Department of Energy managing the nuclear complex. They did a better job.

The vast majority of scientists at Los Alamos work on a broad variety of subjects, not only weapons activities. They stand ready to conduct the research that is most essential to our Nation. However, we need to make sure that these top scientists can do their jobs and have the support they need to work on other missions.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support this amendment that will restore a portion of the funding which is critical to maintaining our commitment to safety and security of our nuclear stewardship responsibilities.

I deeply regret that the Majority has decided to cut these programs and irrevocably harm our nuclear weapon programs and fail to maintain our nuclear stockpile. Our responsibility is to protect the American people and ensure that our weapons programs operate in a responsible and secure manner.

These important programs are our national deterrent against rogue nations who would threaten us with weapons of mass destruction. In addition, these cuts will erode our non-proliferation efforts worldwide, as our allies would have to consider expanding their own nuclear arsenals to make up for our reductions.

The cuts proposed today will cut nearly 40 percent of the funding for our Nuclear weapons programs operated at Los Alamos National Laboratory. I would ask the sponsors of these cuts if they believe that the threats from rogue states and aggressive dictators have reduced by 40 percent? If not, why are we cutting our ability to defend ourselves by 40 percent? These cuts will damage our ability to retain good scientists, preserve the knowledge base of our laboratory, and our preparedness to respond to our future nuclear needs.

In addition, these cuts decimate the nation's Stockpile Stewardship Program. Since we have stopped testing nuclear weapons, our country relies on Los Alamos to ensure that our strategic weapon capabilities are safe, reliable and secure. Failure do so abdicates our responsibility to the protect the American people.

These programs are critical to the mission of Los Alamos and critical to America. We shouldn't just simply fold up our tent and allow these programs to be deeply cut or nearly eliminated and I urge all my colleagues to stand up and support this amendment and furthermore support restoring the full funding to these important programs.

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

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

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

Mr. HOBSON. 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 New Mexico will be postponed.

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

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

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS) for a colloquy.

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, in the report accompanying H.R. 2641, the subcommittee commends the nuclear physics research community for its efforts to rescope the next generation rare isotope research facility in light of the current fiscal constraints. However, the report contends that "the rare isotope beams will involve modifications to existing accelerators rather than the construction of a new rare isotope accelerator, RIA."

As you know, National Superconducting Cyclotron Laboratory, located at Michigan State University, is the leading rare isotope facility in the United States and needs an upgrade to stay on the leading edge of rare isotope science. Michigan State's upgrade proposal includes the reuse of several major components of the existing NSCL. However, it does not intent to use its existing cyclotron accelerators, as they would not be suitable for the beam strengths contemplated by the new facility. As a result, if one were to interpret this language literally, Michigan State would not be eligible for any potential DOE funded facility since it is not proposing "modifications to existing accelerators."

Mr. Chairman, I am assuming this is a problem created by ambiguous wording and does not represent a substantive shift in the position of the subcommittee. Would you concur with my assumption, sir?

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

Mr. HOBSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, as a Notre Dame grad, I would like to interject myself into this colloquy. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his interest in this area.

The gentleman is correct. The subcommittee's objection was to praise the nuclear physics communities adaptiveness in adjusting its facilities plan to our current budgetary realities. It was not meant in any way to define or alter the scope of the proposed facility or limit Michigan State's ability to compete. The subcommittee remains steadfastly committed to ensuring that DOE user facilities are subject to full and open competition and will monitor the process very closely to make sure that all potential competitors are

treated fairly by DOE. Again, I appreciate the gentleman for yielding and bringing this matter up.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee for his work on this issue. You have given me a whole renewed look at Notre Dame University.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFENSE NUCLEAR WASTE DISPOSAL

For nuclear waste disposal activities to carry out the purposes of Public Law 97-425, as amended, including the acquisition of real property or facility construction or expansion, \$292,046,000, to remain available until expended.

POWER MARKETING ADMINISTRATIONS

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION FUND

Expenditures from the Bonneville Power Administration Fund, established pursuant to Public Law 93-454, are approved for official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed \$1,500. During fiscal year 2008, no new direct loan obligations may be made.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHEASTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of electric power and energy, including transmission wheeling and ancillary services pursuant to section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southeastern power area, \$6,463,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, up to \$48,413,000 collected by the Southeastern Power Administration pursuant to the Flood Control Act of 1944 to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of operation and maintenance of power transmission facilities and of marketing electric power and energy, for construction and acquisition of transmission lines, substations and appurtenant facilities, and for administrative expenses, including official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed \$1,500 in carrying out section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U.S.C. 825s), as applied to the southwestern power area, \$30,442,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, up to \$35,000,000 collected by the Southwestern Power Administration pursuant to the Flood Control Act to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures.

CONSTRUCTION, REHABILITATION, OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

For carrying out the functions authorized by title III, section 302(a)(1)(E) of the Act of August 4, 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7152), and other related activities including conservation and renewable resources programs as authorized, including the operation, maintenance, and purchase through transfer, exchange, or sale of one helicopter for replacement only, and official reception and representation expenses in an amount not to exceed \$1,500;

\$201,030,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$191,094,000 shall be derived from the Department of the Interior Reclamation Fund: *Provided*, That of the amount herein appropriated, \$7,167,000 is for deposit into the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Account pursuant to title IV of the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provision of 31 U.S.C. 3302, up to \$258,702,000 collected by the Western Area Power Administration pursuant to the Flood Control Act of 1944 and the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 to recover purchase power and wheeling expenses shall be credited to this account as offsetting collections, to remain available until expended for the sole purpose of making purchase power and wheeling expenditures.

FALCON AND AMISTAD OPERATING AND MAINTENANCE FUND

For operation, maintenance, and emergency costs for the hydroelectric facilities at the Falcon and Amistad Dams, \$2,500,000, to remain available until expended, and to be derived from the Falcon and Amistad Operating and Maintenance Fund of the Western Area Power Administration, as provided in section 423 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995.

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to carry out the provisions of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, the hire of passenger motor vehicles, and official reception and representation expenses not to exceed \$3,000, \$255,425,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed \$255,425,000 of revenues from fees and annual charges, and other services and collections in fiscal year 2008 shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this account, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced as revenues are received during fiscal year 2008 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2008 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than \$0.

GENERAL PROVISIONS—DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

SEC. 301. CONTRACT COMPETITION.—(a) None of the funds in this or any other appropriations Act for fiscal year 2008 or any previous fiscal year may be used to make payments for a noncompetitive management and operating contract, or a contract for environmental remediation or waste management in excess of \$100,000,000 in annual funding at a current or former management and operating contract site or facility, or award a significant extension or expansion to an existing management and operating contract, or other contract covered by this section, unless such contract is awarded using competitive procedures or the Secretary of Energy grants, on a case-by-case basis, a waiver to allow for such a deviation. The Secretary may not delegate the authority to grant such a waiver.

(b) Within 30 days of formally notifying an incumbent contractor that the Secretary intends to grant such a waiver, the Secretary shall submit to the Subcommittees on Energy and Water Development of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report notifying the Subcommittees of the waiver and setting forth, in specificity, the substantive reasons why the Secretary believes the requirement for competition should be waived for this particular award.

SEC. 302. UNFUNDED REQUESTS FOR PROPOSALS.—None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to prepare or initiate requests for proposals for a program if the program has not been funded by Congress.

SEC. 303. UNEXPENDED BALANCES.—The unexpended balances of prior appropriations provided for activities in this Act may be available to the same appropriation accounts for such activities established pursuant to this title. Available balances may be merged with funds in the applicable established accounts and thereafter may be accounted for as one fund for the same time period as originally enacted.

SEC. 304. BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION SERVICE TERRITORY.—None of the funds in this or any other Act for the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration may be used to enter into any agreement to perform energy efficiency services outside the legally defined Bonneville service territory, with the exception of services provided internationally, including services provided on a reimbursable basis, unless the Administrator certifies in advance that such services are not available from private sector businesses.

SEC. 305. USER FACILITIES.—When the Department of Energy makes a user facility available to universities or other potential users, or seeks input from universities or other potential users regarding significant characteristics or equipment in a user facility or a proposed user facility, the Department shall ensure broad public notice of such availability or such need for input to universities and other potential users. When the Department of Energy considers the participation of a university or other potential user as a formal partner in the establishment or operation of a user facility, the Department shall employ full and open competition in selecting such a partner. For purposes of this section, the term “user facility” includes, but is not limited to: (1) a user facility as described in section 2203(a)(2) of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13503(a)(2)); (2) a National Nuclear Security Administration Defense Programs Technology Deployment Center/User Facility; and (3) any other Departmental facility designated by the Department as a user facility.

SEC. 306. INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.—Funds appropriated by this or any other Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, for intelligence activities are deemed to be specifically authorized by the Congress for purposes of section 504 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 414) during fiscal year 2008 until the enactment of the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 2008.

SEC. 307. LABORATORY DIRECTED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—Of the funds made available by the Department of Energy for activities at government-owned, contractor-operator operated laboratories funded in this Act, the Secretary may authorize a specific amount, not to exceed 8 percent of such funds, to be used by such laboratories for laboratory-directed research and development: *Provided*, That the Secretary may also authorize a specific amount not to exceed 3 percent of such funds, to be used by the plant manager of a covered nuclear weapons production plant or the manager of the Nevada Site office for plant or site-directed research and development funding.

SEC. 308. CONTRACTOR PENSION BENEFITS.—None of the funds made available in title III of this Act shall be used for implementation of the Department of Energy Order N 351.1 modifying contractor employee pension and medical benefits policy.

SEC. 309. INTERNATIONAL NUCLEAR FUEL BANK.—Of the funds made available in the first paragraph under the heading “Atomic

Energy Defense Activities—Other Defense Activities” in chapter 2 of title I of division B of Public Law 105-277, \$100,000,000 shall be available until expended, subject to authorization, for the contribution of the United States to create a low-enriched uranium stockpile for an International Nuclear Fuel Bank supply of nuclear fuel for peaceful means under the International Atomic Energy Agency.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the programs authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, notwithstanding section 14704 of title 40, United States Code, and, for necessary expenses for the Federal Co-Chairman and the alternate on the Appalachian Regional Commission, for payment of the Federal share of the administrative expenses of the Commission, including services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, and hire passenger motor vehicles, \$35,000,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR.

NEUGEBAUER

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. 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. NEUGEBAUER:

Page 37, strike lines 9 through 19.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would strike funding for the Appalachian Regional Commission. This commission is a perfect example of Ronald Reagan's belief that the nearest thing to eternal life we will ever see on this Earth is a government program.

Established more than 40 years ago, this commission has evolved into an inequitable and duplicative Federal program, yet it receives \$35 million in next year's budget.

Although most of ARC funding is spent building State roads, the agency also spends tax dollars on water programs, housing projects, business development, and health care.

However, this funding is only available to 13 States. In other words, this is a bracketed bill. The ARC is a redundant layer of bureaucracy. Several other Federal agencies have similar missions as the ARC. For example, an Appalachian community applying for an economic development grant would be eligible to use 20 other programs across five other agencies and receive funding for the exact same purposes. For every ARC program, it is duplicated by another Federal program.

According to the Department of Agriculture's Web site, USDA's Rural Development Agency supports such essential public facilities and services as water and sewer systems, housing,

health clinics and promotes economic development. In other words, under the current Department of Agriculture programs, these communities could apply for these grants instead of having a separate bracketed amount of money.

At the Department of Housing and Urban Development, there is a rural housing and economic development program within the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Departments of Transportation and Commerce, for example, and even the Department of Defense, have programs whose mission is to help rural communities.

Therefore, if we were to eliminate the ARC, applicants could still apply for countless other grants from other agencies that are already providing funding for rural communities.

I represent a rural community, and so I understand the unique challenges facing rural America today. However, as we work to help communities overcome their challenges, we should do it in such a way that we are not wasting taxpayer dollars.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, as I stated earlier, there is a role and a need for the ARC to assist distressed counties in Appalachia with local economic development and to provide infrastructure requirements.

Of the original 223 distressed counties, 74 remain in that category; and clearly the mission of the ARC has not yet been fully realized. The fact is the committee did reduce the administration's request for this account by \$30 million and has targeted all of the funds in this bill for those distressed counties. So I would be in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON).

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to eliminate funding for the Appalachian Regional Commission. I have been against the Appalachian Regional Commission since I was on the Budget Committee in 1995. But I do appreciate the chairman's cutting the funding back because we always have a problem dealing with the Senate on this issue.

But let me tell you, for all of the heartburn we have had over congressional earmarks and administration earmarks, I would point out that funding for the Appalachian Regional Commission basically provides earmarks designated by the Governors of 13 Appalachian States. If we are cutting our earmarks, then we should be reducing these as well. The one thing we should not do is delegate our decision-making to the authority of these Governors, no matter how well intended the purposes are.

And I have to tell you, we have been throwing this money into these counties for all these years, and they are

still at these levels. It doesn't do any good. It just goes down the tube. We should do programs that really help the quality of life in these regions and help them move out, rather than doing these little projects that keep them in the poverty level. So I support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Chairman, I was going to point out exactly the point that the gentleman made about the earmarks. There is \$300,000 for central Pennsylvania's largest kitchen, \$20,000 to renovate an abandoned hospital for a possible visual arts center, \$7,000 to place 16 poster-size vignettes in culturally significant areas in Conellsville, Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, economic development is important to all America. It is important to rural America; but what is also important to America is fiscal responsibility, keeping taxes lower.

If we keep spending money the way we are spending money now, we are going to have to raise taxes. In fact, the Democratic budget passed what is going to be the largest tax increase in American history. The government doesn't have an income problem; the government has a spending problem. When you look at the revenues over the last few years because we lowered taxes and let the American people keep their money and let the American people invest and let small businesses create jobs all across America, what happened? Well, the economy got better. What happened to tax revenues? Tax revenues are increasing at a fairly substantial rate.

What we have to do is cut spending so spending is growing at a slower rate than the revenues. That is the only way we are ever going to be able to balance our budget. I urge support of my amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, despite the eloquence and persuasiveness of my ranking member and good friend, Mr. HOBSON, I remain opposed and would ask the membership to vote against the amendment.

Mr. SPACE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment.

For four decades now, the Appalachian Regional Commission has worked to bring Appalachia to economic parity with the rest of the country.

The statistics are devastating. Twenty percent of Appalachian households still do not have access to community water systems. Sixty-two percent of Appalachian counties have a higher unemployment rate than the national average.

I want to make one thing clear. The Commission's programs are NOT duplicative. They complement Federal activities and extend the reach of those programs into the most challenging parts of Appalachia.

The Commission acts as a key financial partner in attracting private and non-profit investment to the region. In Fiscal Year 2006, every dollar of ARC funding leveraged \$3.14 in other public funding and \$11.55 in private investment.

The modest amount of money we spend on this program is fiscally responsible and enor-

mously beneficial to the taxpayer. The President's own Budget requests that the Commission's funding level continue at \$65 million.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. 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 Texas will be postponed.

□ 1345

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

For necessary expenses of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board in carrying out activities authorized by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, \$22,499,000, to remain available until expended.

DELTA REGIONAL AUTHORITY

For necessary expenses of the Delta Regional Authority and to carry out its activities, as authorized by the Delta Regional Authority Act of 2000, notwithstanding sections 382C(b)(2), 382F(d), and 382M(b) of said Act, \$6,000,000, to remain available until expended.

DENALI COMMISSION

For expenses of the Denali Commission including the purchase, construction and acquisition of plant and capital equipment as necessary and other expenses, \$1,800,000, to remain available until expended, notwithstanding the limitations contained in section 306(g) of the Denali Commission Act of 1998.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MRS.

MUSGRAVE

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. 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. 16 offered by Mrs. MUSGRAVE:

Page 38, strike lines 7 through 13.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, 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, my amendment would eliminate funding for the Denali Commission. This amendment would save taxpayers \$1.8 million.

In fiscal year 2007, the Denali Commission received \$49.5 million. The President's request in this fiscal year for 2008 is \$1.8 million and the bill provides that entire amount.

When we look at the State of Alaska, it has a very low tax burden. Alaska has no State income tax. It has the

lowest taxes as a percentage of per capita income of any State in the country. Also, Alaska is actually a relatively wealthy State in terms of per capita income.

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I would simply indicate that I would be happy to accept the gentlewoman's amendment and if my colleague the ranking member would have an observation, I would invite him to.

Mr. HOBSON. I am also willing to accept the amendment.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Reclaiming my time, I thank both the gentlemen and look forward to our efforts to save the American taxpayers \$1.8 million.

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 (Mrs. MUSGRAVE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

For necessary expenses of the Commission in carrying out the purposes of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 and the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, including official representation expenses (not to exceed \$21,000), \$925,559,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the amount appropriated herein, \$37,250,000 shall be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund: *Provided further*, That revenues from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections estimated at \$757,720,000 in fiscal year 2008 shall be retained and used for necessary salaries and expenses in this account, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of revenues received during fiscal year 2008 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2008 appropriation estimated at not more than \$167,839,000.

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, \$8,144,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That revenues from licensing fees, inspection services, and other services and collections estimated at \$7,330,000 in fiscal year 2008 shall be retained and be available for necessary salaries and expenses in this account, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced by the amount of revenues received during fiscal year 2008 so as to result in a final fiscal year 2008 appropriation estimated at not more than \$814,000.

NUCLEAR WASTE TECHNICAL REVIEW BOARD

For necessary expenses of the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, as authorized by Public Law 100-203, section 5051, \$3,621,000, to be derived from the Nuclear Waste Fund, and to remain available until expended.

OFFICE OF THE FEDERAL COORDINATOR FOR ALASKA NATURAL GAS TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

For necessary expenses for the Office of the Federal Coordinator for Alaska Natural Gas

Transportation Projects pursuant to the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline Act of 2004, \$2,322,000.

TITLE V GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used in any way, directly or indirectly, to influence congressional action on any legislation or appropriation matters pending before Congress as described in 18 U.S.C. 1913.

SEC. 502. 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 appropriation Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. SCHMIDT

Mrs. SCHMIDT. 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. SCHMIDT:

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

SEC. 503. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership initiative for the transfer or storage of spent nuclear fuel or high-level radioactive waste to any site that is not a site where facilities for reprocessing of that fuel or waste have been constructed or are under construction, or used to retain spent nuclear fuel or high-level radioactive waste for permanent storage at such a site where facilities for reprocessing of fuel or waste have been constructed or are under construction.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. SCHMIDT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio.

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

This amendment that I am offering, and plan to withdraw, is based on legislation I have introduced with Congressmen WILSON and SPACE, H.R. 2282, the Nuclear Waste Storage Prohibition Act.

Currently, there are 11 sites around our Nation that are under consideration for hosting one or more facilities related to the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership, called GNEP. It's an initiative that is being studied as we speak. The Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant located in my district in Piketon, Ohio, is one of the 11 sites. The other sites include locations in Tennessee, South Carolina, Kentucky, New Mexico, Illinois, Washington and Idaho. Everyone representing one of these sites or an area nearby has a strong interest in how this important initiative proceeds.

The point of my amendment is to ensure that none of these GNEP sites that have been under consideration only become a de facto storage site for spent nuclear fuel. My amendment prohibits DOE from using funds to transfer spent nuclear fuel or high-level ra-

dioactive waste to any site unless it is a site where the reprocessing facility for this material is either under construction or has been completed.

In addition, my amendment also ensures the final end product after the fuel has been recycled is moved offsite as quickly as possible, either to the next stage in the nuclear fuel recycling process or to Yucca Mountain, which remains our Nation's long-term and permanent storage facility.

DOE has not made any statements to suggest that any of those 11 sites would ever become a de facto waste storage site. On the contrary, DOE and this Congress have made clear over the years that the final end product will be permanently stored at Yucca Mountain. However, based on feedback from my constituents, who generally speaking are very excited by the potential opportunities of this initiative, there are some concerns related to long-term storage. I am sure I am not the only one who has heard these concerns, and Congress must assure these communities that their worst fears will never become a reality. This amendment would help accomplish this goal.

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

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I appreciate the recognition. I understand the gentlelady's concern and, with the observation that she is going to withdraw her amendment, have a number of points to make but will simply enter those into the RECORD.

Proceeding with construction of nuclear spent fuel recycling facilities at this time is premature.

Geologic capacity exists at Yucca Mountain to accommodate much more high level waste than currently permitted by legislation.

Spent fuel recycling is not economically viable given affordable fresh supplies of uranium fuel.

On-site storage of nuclear spent fuel is safe for 50 to 100 years, so there is no rush, but there could be cost savings from removing spent fuel from the nine decommissioned nuclear reactor sites.

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Ohio has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. I yield to the ranking member.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlelady's withdrawing of the amendment. At the time this proposal came up, I was the chairman of the committee and we worked together on this with the current chairman. GNEP was a proposal that was put out for people to raise their hand if they were interested in the project. It was never intended that the project be a permanent disposition site. So I think your people should understand that it was only an interim site. I would recommend that the record show that it is

only an interim site that is intended if they are successful in receiving a GNEP award.

Mrs. SCHMIDT. I appreciate the ranking member's comments. I would like to continue to work with you so that we can put some language into the record that would assure the folks in the 11 States where GNEP is being pursued that this is indeed an interim storage facility and not a permanent storage facility.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MRS. MUSGRAVE

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. 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. 9 offered by Mrs. MUSGRAVE:

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

SEC. 503. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 0.5 percent.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Mrs. MUSGRAVE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

My amendment would cut one-half of 1 percent spending from the Energy and Water appropriations bill. I am offering this amendment to this bill to make a cut of just one-half percent of the overall funding of the bill.

With the national debt at an all-time high, Mr. Chairman, of \$8.8 trillion, Congress is leaving a very sad legacy for the next generation. I believe that we in Congress must take responsibility for this burden by establishing Federal spending priorities and setting spending caps for some programs and eliminating unnecessary spending for others. When you look at this amount of money, when you look at this huge amount that we are spending, I believe that it is very reasonable to ask for this modest cut. We owe it to the taxpayers whose money we are spending to make a serious commitment to fiscal responsibility and we need to exercise fiscal restraint.

The simple truth is that the money we stand here today to spend is not our own. The funds that we are appropriating come from the hard-earned incomes of families across this country. The families in my district in eastern Colorado need money for groceries, to buy gas for their cars, to educate their children, and I think that when we are here on this floor talking about this issue, we ought to think about the fam-

ilies in Colorado and around the Nation that work very hard to make ends meet.

I know that there are worthy programs in this bill and I commend the work of the chairman and the ranking member, but I think we need to realize that this fiscal responsibility is what we should be exercising right now. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and really to demonstrate to the American public that we remember where this money comes from as we spend it and make our decisions here in this Chamber.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong objection to the gentlewoman's amendment and would point out a couple of things. One, as we stated in opening debate, we very carefully looked at all the accounts in this bill and, among other things, made cuts in over 57 programs to make sure that funds were available for positive programs that make a difference in people's lives. One of those areas is in the area of energy and specifically the high cost of gasoline for consumers across the country.

One of the things that we did do is to add money in this legislation, \$130 million above the President's request, to provide \$503 million for new vehicle technologies and for biofuels. Another area as far as the energy crisis was the change in the overall request relative to climate change and, again, funds were made available for such things as research, development and demonstration of new energy technologies in solar, geothermal, wind, hydropower, fossil and nuclear energy as well as research, development and demonstration of conservation technologies for buildings and industries as well as the deployment of energy conservation through weatherization in Federal buildings.

There are a lot of very positive things that we have done in this legislation to advance a positive energy agenda. The gentlewoman's amendment would be hurtful to those efforts and I am opposed to her amendment.

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

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

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

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. 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 Colorado will be postponed.

□ 1400

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. WILSON OF NEW MEXICO

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. 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. WILSON of New Mexico:

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

SEC. _____. Of the funds made available in title III under the heading "Science", \$37,000,000 is for the Medical Applications and Measurement Science Program.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I have offered an amendment, and I will tell my colleagues I intend to withdraw it at the end of my presentation, but there is an issue that has been festering between two agencies that I think Congress needs to go ahead and take action to resolve.

This amendment ensures that the Department of Energy Office of Science and the Office of Biological and Environmental Research spends \$37 million on medical isotope research in an account that is known as Medical Applications and Measurement Science. This would restore the funding to FY 2005 levels.

Medical isotopes are used extensively in imaging technology for the diagnosis and treatment of cancer, heart disease, and several neurological disorders. The program that DOE runs funds basic research in new diagnostic and therapeutic applications using nuclear isotopes. This research has identified new metabolic labels and imaging detectors that have helped identify colon cancer, brain tumors, bone cancers and many other cancers.

In addition, this research would fund new radiopharmaceuticals to attach to specific cancer cells and treat them and prevent metastasis.

Congress reduced this program in fiscal year 2006 by \$23 million because of pressures on the other part of the DOE budget, but also directed them to transfer the program over to the National Institutes of Health, particularly the National Cancer Institute. The NIH did not pick up this research; and in a recent meeting with scientists who do this research, Dr. Elias Zerhouni, who is the director at NIH, said NIH does not do this type of research; NIH cannot do this type of research. They don't have the expertise in the nuclear materials required, and also that this research must go forward.

The new director of Office of Biological and Environmental Research has said that he understands the need for DOE to conduct this research and has

said he could provide the funding within his own budget within this research at the fiscal year 2005 level if directed to do so by Congress. The National Academy of Sciences is currently conducting a review of this program, and I think this program does need to go forward.

The funds in this particular program, in the last year that it was at this level, FY 2005, funded on the basis of competitive grants programs and research projects in 40 different locations, largely universities, some national laboratories, most of them in the State of California, although also at Case Western University in Ohio in New York, and across the country, but it is critical research using radiopharmaceuticals and targets, enriched targets, that really only the Department of Energy works with. For that reason, that's the appropriate place to do this research.

Now, for technical and procedural reasons, I understand that there is a legitimate point of order against this particular amendment that's legitimate, but I did want to at least raise this issue and say we need to sort this out, that the appropriate place for this nuclear research is actually in the Department of Energy rather than at the NIH, and the NIH has said, no, we don't have the expertise to do it.

We need to sort this out to continue this highly successful research. I strongly support it, and I hope that we would be able to work with the Senate in conference to make sure that this program is appropriately funded through the Office of Science.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the ranking member of the committee.

Mr. HOBSON. I appreciate the gentleman's concerns, and we will work to try to address them in conference.

I also appreciate her withdrawing the amendment.

Mrs. WILSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. 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 of Connecticut:

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

SEC. ___ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to issue a permit or other authorization for any action that may affect land use in any locality if a request has been made to the Commission for a public hearing in the locality concerned and such request has not been granted.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. 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 19, 2007, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to thank Chairman VISCLOSKEY for all his hard work on this bill.

As a former appropriator in the Connecticut General Assembly, I know how hard this job is, and I am honored to stand next to him today.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment at the desk will bar the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or FERC, from using funds to issue permits for projects that have not been the subject of a local public hearing.

This amendment is based on a simple premise. Public policymakers cannot and should not act without the input of citizens who will be affected by the decisions that they make. As legislators, we know that we can't sample public opinion by just sitting here in Washington. We need to go back to our districts and solicit opinion, whether it be in public forums, town fairs, or even at the supermarket or the post office.

A regulatory agency should be held to the same standard. This amendment does nothing to alter or constrain the final decisionmaking authority of FERC. It just assures that the commission hears all sides before making any determination on land-use issues.

Though this amendment would help many communities where FERC has refused to hold a public hearing in an affected locality, and I know Mr. ARCURI from New York, who may not be able to join us, holds this concern as well, I come to this issue with my concern through my constituents who live surrounding the Candlewood Lake area in Connecticut, the largest inland body of water in the State.

My constituents there have been unable to secure a public hearing from FERC to air their concerns regarding a shoreline management plan proposed by the utility that owns the lake. This shoreline management plan will change how they enjoy the land surrounding their homes and the price they will pay for the privilege of living on the lake.

Local feelings on the appropriateness of the plan are mixed. However, whatever residents may think, what is clear is that they should have the opportunity to directly make their case to FERC. FERC has continued to deny requests, both from my office and from constituents to hold a local hearing, and this is unacceptable, I think, to every Member of Congress.

I understand the Appropriations Committee, as well as the Energy and Commerce Committee, may like some more time to look into this issue.

Mr. Chairman, if the chairman of the subcommittee would be willing to work

with me on this issue, I would be honored to yield to him at this point.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding very much and certainly appreciate his passion and concern about the health and safety of his constituents and this important issue to him.

The problem we have incurred on the committee, and this is not the only regulatory issue regarding FERC that has been brought to our attention, is we are not a regulatory body and obviously have jurisdictional issues that are set aside over and above the issues of substance relative to the gentleman's amendment.

But we do appreciate his concern. Certainly we would be happy to stay in touch with him, without making a commitment, that this issue will be resolved through the appropriations process. We do believe that the higher this issue could be raised as far as the public and the regulatory commission, the better off all the citizens of his community are going to be.

Again, I thank the gentleman for raising the issue and appreciate the fact that he apparently will be withdrawing his amendment.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, with the subcommittee chairman's concern on this issue, at this time I would ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

Mr. BISHOP of New York. 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. 1 offered by Mr. BISHOP of New York:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. 503. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to review the application for the Broadwater Energy proposal, dockets CP06-54-000, CP06-55-000, and CP06-56-000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentleman from New York (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am joined in offering this amendment by Mr. COURTNEY and Ms. DELAURO of Connecticut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Let me start by thanking Chairman VISCLOSKEY and Ranking Member HOBSON for their work on this bill. I think it's a first-rate appropriations bill, and I particularly want to thank them for their efforts to fully fund Brookhaven Laboratory in my district.

This amendment is a very straightforward amendment. It would prohibit

any funds in this act from being used by FERC to advance the pending application of a floating storage and re-gasification unit known as Broadwater in the middle of Long Island Sound.

We offer this amendment for several reasons. Let me cite three. The first is that there are serious and debilitating environmental impacts associated with this project. Serious environmental concerns have been raised by the EPA, by the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation, the United States Department of the Interior, the National Marine Fisheries Service, and the Army Corps of Engineers.

The second is that there are significant safety and security concerns associated with this application, and even the Coast Guard, which would be charged with securing this facility, has indicated that a much more full public discussion needs to take place in order to determine who is going to provide that security and who will fund it.

Lastly, this is the only means available to me to represent my constituents. My constituents are overwhelmingly opposed to this application, to this facility, and yet current law vests in the FERC final authority to grant licensing for this project without any input from local government at all.

This is the only means by which I as a Member of Congress can exercise the will of the constituents I represent.

So I urge my colleagues to join me and Mr. COURTNEY and Ms. DELAURO in supporting this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to Mr. COURTNEY of Connecticut.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Bishop-DeLauro-Courtney amendment.

It's unfortunate that it's necessary for the United States Congress to intercede into a pending matter before the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. However, despite repeated warnings from independent, scientific, and public safety analysts that this application for a floating liquid natural gas facility in Long Island Sound needs more investigation, FERC has refused every request for more time to study the implications of this facility in one of the most populated areas of the United States.

The need for more time was highlighted again just a few weeks ago with the release of a 43-page report by the Government Accountability Office that looked at the public safety consequences of a terrorist attack on a tanker carrying liquid natural gas. GAO reviewed what would be the effect of a liquid LNG spill and explosion.

The bottom line: more research is needed. Experts disagreed on what would happen if there was a cascading failure of an LNG tanker, and GAO recommended that the Department of Energy study this issue more thoroughly.

GAO's report should settle the question of whether applications such as Broadwater should proceed. If DOE determines from an expert opinion that a

cascading failure would cause a hazard beyond 1 mile, then this application is fatally flawed, literally. At some point it is incumbent on the Congress of the United States to act upon the recommendations of the GAO, which is an agency funded and created by us as an independent branch of government.

When GAO says that it is premature to conclude that LNGs are safe in populous areas of our Nation, then we have an obligation to act on that advice. This amendment accomplishes that goal. I strongly urge its passage.

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. We have 28 million people living within 50 miles of the Long Island Sound. It contributes more than \$5 billion to our economy annually. It provides environmental, recreational, and economic opportunity for our communities.

It is an estuary designated by Congress for its national significance. Our responsibility is to keep major and potentially dangerous industrial product out of our fragile sound. That includes the LNG Broadwater facility. This would install a floating vessel, roughly the size of Queen Mary 2, 10.2 miles off the Connecticut coast, 9 miles off the Long Island coast.

It calls for the installation of a 25-mile pipeline in the middle of prime territory for lobstering and fishing. It creates an exclusionary zone, prohibits any vessels from coming within a certain distance of the facility itself and delivery tankers. It would fall to the Coast Guard to maintain our security.

Their funds are stretched thin. Instead of being able to manage fisheries, conducting lifesaving operations, and dealing with port security, we will be diverting resources to these tankers. It would propose a new security risk.

I commend Mr. BISHOP and my colleague, Mr. COURTNEY. This amendment gives DOE the time to address these concerns.

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

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, but let me first begin my discussion by expressing my sincere respect for the gentleman who has offered the amendment, Mr. BISHOP, as well as the two speakers who have followed him in support of it, particularly my colleague on the Appropriations Committee, the chairwoman, Ms. DELAURO.

□ 1415

I would point out to the body that this is the second FERC issue that has been brought up on a regulatory matter before the subcommittee on the floor. We have had other inquiries from

Members that have not reached this level that are very similar in substance in other areas of the country. I would not pretend to deny that there is a problem, but I am not competent to sort through that fact as I am not a regulator myself, to make a determination, and do not believe that this is a venue to make those particular determinations.

The amendment before us undoes the Natural Gas Act for the orderly review and decision making process for energy infrastructure and limits energy development efforts. FERC's consideration of applications to site energy facilities does not imply that the applications will be granted, or if granted, will not require appropriate environmental protection measures. Moreover, all FERC authorizations are subject to judicial review.

I do believe that FERC's application process ought to be able to run its course. And again, I regret that I have to stand in objection to the amendment but trust that my colleagues understand the impetus for that.

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

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

Mr. HOBSON. I want to associate my comments with the chairman. I have the utmost regard for all the Members who spoke on this, but I do oppose the amendment and join with the chairman.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Bishop/Courtney/Delauro Amendment.

The amendment would unfairly target a single liquefied natural gas project, "Broadwater," that is mid-way through a very extensive Federal and State regulatory process. Interfering with this regulatory review would undermine the very process that is designed to provide a thorough assessment of environmental, safety, security and energy supply impacts of the project.

I understand the desire of the proponents of this amendment to ensure the ultimate security of their constituents, but I hope this amendment is not simply a red herring to ultimately stop further efforts to site LNG terminals across the U.S.

LNG has a record of relative safety for the last 40 years, and no LNG tanker or land-based facility has been attacked by terrorists. Since September 11, 2001, the U.S. LNG industry and federal agencies have put new measures in place to respond to the possibility of terrorism. Federal initiatives to secure LNG are still evolving, but a variety of industry and agency representatives suggest they are reducing the vulnerability of LNG to terrorism.

Here in America we only have two options to increase our supply of natural gas to meet our energy needs—we can build more LNG import plants and we can produce more gas offshore. There is no alternative to natural gas in many cases.

Unfortunately, the opponents of both options are often the same people—they oppose LNG and they oppose drilling for gas. Without increased exploration or LNG facilities, where will we receive the energy America needs in the immediate future?

Natural gas is the cleanest energy source we have besides solar or wind, and it is a critical fuel for industrial facilities and is a feedstock for the petrochemical industry that makes plastic.

If we cannot produce natural gas here, we are going to have to import gas to heat our homes and import more plastic in bulk or in consumer products. That hurts our balance of trade.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Bishop-Courtney-DeLauro Amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

Mr. BISHOP of New York. 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 New York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. JORDAN OF OHIO

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman the designee of the gentleman from California?

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Yes, the Campbell amendment. Number 14.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 14 offered by Mr. JORDAN of Ohio:

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

SEC. 503. Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of \$1,305,000,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of June 19, 2007, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. I thank the Chair, and I also want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member. I have great respect for their work, particularly the ranking member, who is a friend, colleague and actually neighbor of mine. I appreciate his work over the years here in the United States Congress.

This amendment is pretty simple. It takes spending levels in the bill back to the fiscal 2007 year levels; represents a \$1.3 billion savings to taxpayers and families across the country.

Mr. Chairman, government spends too much. And I said "government." I didn't say Republicans or Democrats. Both parties need to work on this area when it comes to public policy.

But today the Federal Government spends \$23,000 per household. Excessive spending hurts America. Deficits hurt

America, and a rising national debt hurts America.

You don't have to take my word for it. Our staff went through and we looked at the Budget Chairman, Mr. SPRATT's committee, some notes from their committee hearings on the budget. And I want to just quote from Dr. Edward Gramlich, former Governor of the Federal Reserve Board. He said this: "Deficits represent negative public saving, which tends to drive down national saving. Lower national savings means a smaller stock of capital for the future, which reduces the productivity and wages of future workers. Budget deficits lead to less economic growth and a lower level of economic activity than would otherwise be the case."

Excessive spending leads to deficits, leads to lower economic growth. Excessive spending leads to tax increases, all bad for our growing economy, all bad for American families.

And it's particularly, I think, important to recognize why this is so crucial that we get a handle on it as we think about the marketplace we find ourselves in today, the changing international market.

Just a couple of numbers. Four weeks ago the Wall Street Journal reported that China's economic growth rate, annual growth rate, is 10.4 percent. Now, think about this: one billion, 300 million people in China with a growth rate of 10.4 percent. That's what we're competing against.

There was a point in the past where elected officials could maybe enact policies that weren't in our best interest or weren't good for our economic growth. But now, because of the fact that the competition is so stiff, it's important that public policymakers get it right. Keep taxes low, keep spending under control.

In the end, Mr. Chairman, it's not just about deficits and the national debt and GDP. It's about people because, in the end, it's people who pay taxes. It's people who have to deal with this debt and the deficits that we're causing by spending at these levels.

I want to also quote from the same document from Chairman SPRATT's committee, from the Comptroller General, Mr. Walker. He said, "Deficits matter for the world we leave our children and our grandchildren." Mr. Walker said this, and I quote, "Today we are failing in one of our most important stewardship responsibilities, our duty to pass on a country better positioned to deal with the challenges of the future than the one we were given." And that's so true.

This amendment is real simple. It's going to allow families and people across this country to keep more of their money to spend on their goals, their dreams. And it's simply taking us back to last year's fiscal level.

There are all kind of families, all kinds of individuals across this country who are living on last year's budget. A simple, across-the-board amendment

that says we're going to do what so many American families have to do all the time, and we're going to live within our means.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlelady from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, one of the things that we know is that the Federal Government does spend too much money. We all hear it from our constituents. They are really aggravated with the amount of spending that they see coming out of this town, and there is a good reason for that. It is because it is their money. They earn that money and they send it to Washington, and then there is a lot of aggravation with how we choose to spend their hard-earned dollars.

And the gentleman is so correct in his amendment, moving this back to last year's levels.

Now, Mr. Chairman, one of the things that we know is it would give a \$1.3 billion savings for the American taxpayer, and we know that principles like this and operations like this work. When you go through spending reduction, it works.

Our States are great labs for finding ways to find efficiencies in government, and there's a reason for that. It's because many of our States have balanced budget amendments. And many of our States have frozen at previous years' levels, or they've been reduced 1 percent, 2 percent or 5 percent across the board.

And what they have found out is that, in their operations, they can move in and find efficiencies and find ways to seek a savings, and still have the same caliber and quality of program that they have had. But, Mr. Chairman, one of the things that they do find is that many times those programs are more effective.

So I commend Mr. JORDAN for the work that he has done to find a \$1.3 billion savings to make certain that the pressure is there on these departments to live within their means, to try to do our best, to avoid what the Democrats are wanting to pass, which is the single largest tax increase in history, and to make certain that we give a message to our constituents that we have heard them and we agree with them. Government spends too much of their hard-earned money.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I reserve my time at this time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Ohio for putting up this amendment. It's a very simple amendment that I think does well for us to consider in context with what we have to wrestle with, the consideration coming from the largest tax

increase in the history of the United States being offered, \$400 billion on the taxpayers. And I take it into context as I looked here with this amendment offering a \$1.3 billion cut in spending, going back to last year's levels, and saying let's live within our means.

I come from a Great Lakes State. When we talk about water, I do know about water. I know the impact that it can have, the impact upon all of our way of life.

But I also come from a State that's struggling at this point in time with economic conditions that comes from too large government, too much spending, too much taxation. And in the process of trying to deal with that, going the opposite direction of where they should, they're still frustrating what's going on and producing unemployment rates that rival any in history, and frustrating Michigan from having the same type of impact that we see just last week talked about in the *New York Times* of a 40-State growth rate that goes on with States that not only, because of tax cuts and spending within their means, have seen the ability not only to increase some of their services, set aside rainy day funds, but also talk about further tax cuts. That's what we need to be doing here; not considering spending more in a time in our history when we ought to be considering what comes with the future.

If we see a \$400 billion tax increase go in place, we see a tax that goes on for working, a tax that goes on if you get married, a tax that goes on if you have a child, a tax that will go on, even if you die. Those are issues of great concern.

And so to be fiscally responsible here and use an amendment that simply takes us back to a reasonable standard of expenditures, puts us in a place that we can afford and fund to do the necessary services, we do ourself well.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, we may only have one speaker on our side, so I would still reserve my time.

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY).

Mr. MCHENRY. I thank my colleague from Ohio for offering this amendment.

We're debating now on a 3.5 percent across-the-board cut to an appropriations bill. It's an amazing thing in Congress; with one vote, we can slash \$1.3 billion out of an appropriations bill.

What we're debating here is not simply a small cut. We're debating on whether or not the American taxpayers can depend on the Bush tax cuts from 2001 and 2003. We're trying to determine what kind of economic growth we'll have as a Nation, based on how much the government spends in taxes.

This is more than a debate about spending. This is a debate about the size and scope of government.

Well, let's put the facts on the table. The American Government costs \$2.7

trillion a year. That is the largest government on Earth. And further perspective here: It's the largest government in the history of mankind.

Now, to put this further into perspective, there are only two economies outside of the United States that are equal to the size of our Federal spending. That's Germany and Japan. And what is amazing about this, what is absolutely amazing about this, is that we have a Federal Government that's larger than most economies on Earth. In fact, our Federal Government spends more than the whole of China's economy.

Now, that's simply amazing. I think it shows that, while we're debating on extending the Bush tax cuts, the American people understand that we don't have a revenue problem, we have a spending problem here in the United States.

This Congress is addicted to spending. In fact, in just a week's time, they appropriated \$100 billion. Now, that's fast work even for Washington, DC.

The American people, Mr. Chairman, understand that we need to tighten our belt. A 3.5 percent across-the-board cut is a good start. That'll save \$1.3 billion of the American taxpayers' hard-earned money.

I commend my colleague for offering this amendment, and I urge its adoption.

□ 1430

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the gentleman from Ohio's amendment, and I want to thank him for offering it.

Today in this amendment, the gentleman from Ohio is offering American taxpayers a \$1.3 billion tax cut on an appropriations bill. And it is important for everyone to understand, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment is a \$1.3 billion tax cut for Americans because the Democrat budget that they have produced, which pays for these increases in their appropriations bill, this Democrat budget spends all that new money by raising taxes.

The Democrat budget assumes that the Bush tax cuts are going to all go away. And by eliminating the Bush tax cuts, the effect is the largest tax increase in American history, which the Democrat majority has orchestrated in a way that they can allow it to go away without even having to cast a vote. The budget that the Democrats use to pay for these massive increases in this appropriations bill are paid for by the biggest tax increase in American history. And, therefore, the gentleman's amendment, Congressman JORDAN's amendment, is a \$1.3 billion tax cut. And that is a critical point that I think everyone needs to make sure they understand.

When they vote for this amendment, they are voting to cut the taxes of our constituents by \$1.3 billion. And it is

really just that simple. And I could not thank him enough. It is an extraordinarily important amendment. There are vitally important functions in this Energy and Water appropriations bill that need to be funded, but this increase is not affordable at the time of record debt and deficit, and I applaud the gentleman and urge Members to vote for a \$1.3 billion tax cut.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER).

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, but he shouldn't really yield me all the time that I might consume because I might consume it all. So please inform me when I have used about 4 minutes, and then I might use an additional 1.

Mr. Chairman, each of the people who have already spoken in favor of this piece of legislation, which would take \$1.3 billion or \$1.8 billion, whichever it is, I don't remember precisely, out of the recommended budget, the budget that has been recommended by the chairman and ranking member with a unanimous vote out of the Appropriations Committee, each of the people who had spoken in favor of this amendment has made the comment that the budget resolution has raised taxes by the largest amount ever in the history of this country. Each of the Members has made that allegation.

Each of the Members knows perfectly well that you cannot raise taxes, you cannot raise taxes by that mechanism; that any raise in taxes has to be passed by the House and the Senate in exactly the same form and then signed by the President of the United States. So it is simply incorrect, and each and every Member knows that it is incorrect that the budget raises taxes, raises the largest tax increase in the history of the country.

The last gentleman who spoke pointed out that the adoption of this amendment, which would reduce this particular bill, recommended by both the chairman and the ranking member, by \$1.3 billion, that that would be a \$1.3 billion tax reduction. The gentleman who made that comment also knows that no reduction in taxes can occur except by legislation that is passed by both Houses and signed by the President. So, again, it is totally incorrect to make that allegation.

Now, the first speaker, who has offered this amendment, has said that this bill spends too much. Well, I think the measure of whether a bill spends too much is whether we are doing what is necessary for the security of this country and for the well-being of the people of America. And I think what has been done by the chairman and ranking member falls very much in the point of providing for the security of the country and also for the well-being of the American citizens.

I would point out that the chairman and the ranking member and the full

subcommittee that brings forward this legislation has reduced by over \$800 million the President's request, actually \$900 million over the President's request, in programs that have been terminated or reduced, in all of those that have been terminated and reduced. Now, what they have done, after making those reductions from the President's request and in their responsibility to provide for the budget for the country, they have then added moneys. They have added about \$400 million in the provisions for renewable energy, which have to deal with solar energy, biofuel energy, nuclear energy and geothermal, wind, and all the other good renewable energy sources which we need desperately for our national security to remove ourselves from the heavy dependence that we have on foreign oil. So that is a place where if this amendment were adopted and we were to go back to the 2007 numbers, then we would lose that increase, that very important increase of \$400 billion.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asked to be notified when he has gone past 4 minutes. The gentleman has gone past 4 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

We would lose that \$400 million of very important investments for the security and well-being of this country.

And I would just also like to point out that there are substantial increases, which the ranking member has pointed out, that deal with the deficits, the deficits in investments in our water infrastructure under the Corps of Engineers and also under the Bureau of Reclamation, those places where we have dams that are in need of investment that has not been done over recent years and investments that should be done in our ports in order to make our commerce go better, a whole series of things which the ranking member had laid out very carefully in his initial remarks in relation to this legislation. All of those things which are increases that are in this legislation, part of that \$1.3 billion, which would be removed, then those pieces of investments would thereby become unnecessary.

So I think this legislation is right on target for securing this Nation and for securing the well-being of the people of America. And I hope that the gentleman's amendment will be rejected.

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

Again, I stand in opposition to the gentleman's amendment and apologize to the gentleman for having his State of origin incorrect, especially because he is from the great State of Ohio. But I would emphasize that this is the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act for the coming year, and we are in an energy crisis and it transcends the cost of the price of gasoline at the pump. It is a true economic situation and crisis that we face. It is a national security issue that we face. My

good friend, the senior Senator from the State of Indiana, Senator LUGAR, has characterized the energy crisis we face as the albatross around our national security neck. It is also an environmental issue as far as a potential catastrophic climate change that will occur if we do not deal with the issue of CO₂.

This bill makes an investment in solving that crisis we face. It will not solve all the problems tomorrow morning, but it will put us on firm footing to do so in the future.

Let's talk about vehicle technology. The bill recommends \$93 million for hybrid electric systems, an increase of \$13 million over the President's request. Of the increase, \$10 million is for energy storage research and development for advanced batteries for electric, hybrid electric, and plug-in hybrid electric vehicles, and \$3 million is for independent test and evaluation of all vehicles developed in the upcoming demonstration phase.

This bill also includes \$49 million for advanced combustion engine research and development, an increase of \$15 million over the President's request to restore funding for heavy truck engine research that was eliminated in the administration's request.

It does include \$48 million, \$15 million over the budget, for materials technology research, to accelerate the development of cost-effective materials and manufacturing processes that contribute to fuel-efficient passenger and commercial vehicles.

It includes \$10 million more than the administration's request for nonpetroleum-based fuels and lubricants evaluation to expand and accelerate research and development for the optimum ethanol fuel.

And we also have an increase for technology integration of \$6 million in this bill for vehicle technologies and deployment, formerly the Clean Cities Program. We have moneys in here to advance geothermal technology, to demonstrate cost-share industry that will allow accelerated research into new geothermal technologies.

We have moneys in here for hydropower; for research, development, and demonstration of ocean, tidal, and in-stream hydropower energy systems. We have made an investment in this bill for electricity supply and delivery research, for applied research on semiconductor material, device and processing issues, technology acceptance and technology evaluation.

We have investment moneys in this bill for solar energy research, and the gentleman from the State of Massachusetts talked about that briefly, to develop cost-neutral designs and technologies to better integrate solar heating and lighting into building designs. We have made an investment in this bill for facilities to research, test, and demonstrate the new renewable technologies.

It would be a mistake to change these funding levels and turn the clock

back as far as trying to make progress to solve the energy problems we face in this Nation.

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

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

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to associate myself with the gentleman's comments.

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

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the minority whip from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

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

I am here in support of this amendment. This amendment is one of the things that we have to look at, one of the alternatives, to just stop this spending spree that we see ourselves on.

In just over 6 months the new majority has passed and paved the way for over \$100 billion in increased spending. We already enacted \$6.1 billion of new spending in the continuing resolution and \$17 billion of new spending in the supplemental.

□ 1445

And these appropriations bills have over \$80 billion in new spending. As Everett Dirksen once famously said, "A billion here, a billion there, before you know it you're talking about real money." And here we're talking about \$100 billion of new spending.

Mr. CAMPBELL's amendment only proposes that we reduce this spending in this particular bill to the President's level. This bill increases spending by \$1.3 billion over last year, 4.3 percent higher than last year. If you add this increase to the increases already proposed and passed by House Democrats last week, we are spending \$20.7 billion, or 15.6 percent, more than last year. Where is all this money going to go?

In this bill, \$682 million, or a 35 percent increase, for operations and maintenance within the Corps of Engineers; \$1 billion, or a 4 percent increase, to the Department of Energy; \$108 million, or an increase of 13 percent, for salaries and expenses at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. These are excessive changes in spending that this bill doesn't justify.

The only thing this amendment does is say let's go back to the President's level. Let's go back to an amount of money that, while it still provides for our immediate advances in energy and water, doesn't do this in a way that American taxpayers can't pay for it. And how does this majority intend to pay for it? The budget that would pay for it has, unarguably, the second biggest tax increase in American history, and arguably, the biggest tax increase in American history. In other words, there is no question that we intend to spend \$217 billion more money that has to be raised from new taxes. And it's

still an open question as to how close we're going to let that get to \$400 billion.

Now, this is the question: Are the American taxpayers going to be asked to provide 217 billion to 400 billion new dollars, or are we going to simply take this bill as the first step back to the President's level?

This is a good amendment. This amendment deserves the approval of our friends. I hope our friends on both sides of the aisle, the conservative Democrats, the Blue Dogs, stand up with most of the Republicans to make this amendment happen.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I stress my opposition to the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. JORDAN of Ohio. 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. WYNN

Mr. WYNN. 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. 27 offered by Mr. WYNN:

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

SEC. 503. Of the amount made available for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy for the Department of Energy, \$213,000,000 shall be made available for hydrogen technologies as authorized by section 974 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16314).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, we have a very simple amendment here today. It would basically restore \$18.4 million for hydrogen technology, which would bring the account up to the level that the administration, through the Department of Energy, recommended.

This amendment is supported by the Hydrogen Fuel Cell Caucus. I would note the leadership, particularly Mr. LARSEN, in crafting this amendment, also the work of Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina and Mr. DENT as part of the Caucus.

There are some who would say that hydrogen is too far away. In fact, hydrogen is emissions-free and it is here today. GM has 100,000 vehicles ready to go. Honda has vehicles ready to go. BMW released vehicles last year. There are buses, motorcycles, all of which are being fueled by hydrogen fuel cells.

Japan is talking about 50,000 vehicles by 2015. We need to keep pace. We need to put the money into hydrogen technology.

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

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to accept for the majority the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I am willing to accept the amendment, also.

Mr. WYNN. As an old trial lawyer, I know when to stop. Thank you, gentlemen, for the acceptance.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of the Wynn amendment to the Energy & Water Appropriations bill.

Contrary to statements in the Energy & Water Committee Report questioning the level of hydrogen technology research and development, fuel cells technology is much closer than 2050.

Mr. Chairman, our Nation took 60 years from the first Wright Brothers flight to putting a man on the Moon; it will not take us that long to make hydrogen fuel cells mainstream. Hydrogen cars and fueling stations exist; we are almost there. The funding levels in the Fiscal Year 2008 Energy & Water appropriations bill will help provide the final push we need to overcome remaining obstacles and see hydrogen cars and fueling stations become a reality.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, Hydrogen Fuel Cells are already in use in larger facilities. In my own District, the Henry Doorly Zoo uses fuel cells to generate electricity for its Lied Jungle exhibit, making it more energy efficient. Additionally, the U.S. Air Force is using fuel cell technology for its Global Observer program.

Mr. Chairman, energy security and independence have to become a reality. Hydrogen is a potentially limitless supply and a renewable, clean resource that deserves to be funded at its current level, if not more.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Chairman, I relinquish the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MS. HARMAN

Ms. HARMAN. 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. 11 offered by Ms. HARMAN:

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

SEC. 503. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to purchase light bulbs unless the light bulbs have the "ENERGY STAR" designation.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. HARMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope there is no one opposed. I offer this amendment with Mr. UPTON, Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina in

order to help the government set an example for the rest of the country by purchasing energy-efficient light bulbs.

Mr. Chairman, existing law requires Federal agencies to buy products that meet Department of Energy, Energy Star or Federal Energy Management program standards. This amendment adds teeth to that standard, stating that no funds may be used to purchase any light bulb that does not meet it. Identical language has already been adopted in prior appropriations bills. Our intention is to offer this amendment as the Upton-Harman amendment on the next appropriations bill and to continue this until we are through the appropriations cycle.

Our bottom line is: The Federal Government must set the example. This is already the law, but it needs to be the practice as well.

Let me close with the fact that incandescent bulbs, which are used by most Americans, are 10 percent efficient. This sounds like Congress. I think our goal ought to be much greater efficiency here in this body, and much greater efficiency with respect to the lighting that we use. It takes 18 seconds to change a light bulb. It will take more time than that to change Congress. But it is my hope that this amendment will pass attached to every appropriations bill.

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

Mr. UPTON. I thank the gentlelady, and I join in bipartisan spirit to get this amendment adopted as we've done on the other appropriations bills.

I might just note that this shining amendment will save the taxpayers literally \$30 for every bulb that is ultimately replaced. It is not going to require that we take existing bulbs that work out when they expire. We will put in energy-efficient Energy Star bulbs. It will save the taxpayers ultimately hundreds of millions of dollars.

This is a bipartisan amendment. We found two additional cosponsors in terms of Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina. We're also in the middle of a markup, so to be more efficient, I think both of us would like to yield back our time.

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

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

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

Mr. OLVER. I am certainly not going to use my time in this instance. I, for the majority, am willing to accept the gentlewoman and gentleman's amendment.

Mr. HOBSON. I am also willing to accept the amendment for the minority. I think it's a good amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MS. BERKLEY

Ms. BERKLEY. 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. 7 offered by Ms. BERKLEY:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. 503. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to administer the "Yucca Mountain Youth Zone" website.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Nevada.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Chairman VISCLOSKEY for his assistance on this issue and Congressman HOBSON for his agreement to accept this amendment.

My amendment is based on a simple concept—the Department of Energy, or any government entity for that matter, should not be using taxpayer funds to "educate" the children of America about one side of a very complicated and contentious issue. The Department of Energy's Web site includes a section called the "Yucca Mountain Youth Zone," featuring the cartoon character Yucca Mountain Johnny, along with games and activities designed to convince kids that the proposed Yucca Mountain nuclear waste repository is a good idea.

My position on Yucca Mountain should not be a mystery to any member of this body. I have long opposed the plan to bury nuclear waste in the Nevada desert following what I consider to be a process based on politics rather than sound science. But I recognize that reasonable people can disagree about such an important issue. What I do not accept, however, is that the Department of Energy can get away with trivializing a very serious debate by using a Nuclear Joe Camel to promote Yucca Mountain to children.

My amendment would eliminate funding for the Yucca Mountain Youth Zone Web site. Regardless of whether you support Yucca Mountain or oppose it, all members of the House should agree that this Web site is not an appropriate use of taxpayer funds.

If the Department of Energy really wants to remain in the cartoon business, I suggest they come up with a new character that would educate our children on the need for clean and renewable energy—how about Solar Sally or Geothermal George? In any case, I urge my colleagues to join me in dumping Yucca Mountain Johnny.

What I would like to do right now, in accordance with our agreement, is yield to Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to indicate that I am happy to accept the amendment.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I will not oppose the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. CONAWAY

Mr. CONAWAY. 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. 5 offered by Mr. CONAWAY: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ It is the sense of the House of Representatives that any reduction in the amount appropriated by this Act achieved as a result of amendments adopted by the House should be dedicated to deficit reduction.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

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

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, during this process of the debate over the last several hours, Member after Member on our side have come to the aisle and proposed amendments that would reduce spending off of this appropriations bill. They do it in good faith but the truth of the matter is, were any of those to pass and should any of those pass subsequent to the actual recorded votes, that money actually stays within the jurisdiction of the committee and gets spent somewhere else.

What my amendment would do is say that if we were able to succeed on one of the amendments that reduces spending or cuts spending, that that money instead of going back into the committee of jurisdiction pool or subcommittee of jurisdiction pool would actually go against the deficit. And should it be an unusual occurrence in the future with a surplus circumstance, that money would simply increase the surplus.

This is straightforward, no tricks, no gimmicks. It is just simply if the cuts are successful, that money actually does not get spent.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I just want to compliment my colleague from Texas on this superb amendment because this has always been a concern. I am proud to be a member of the Appropriations Committee. And the effort that a lot of Members have made to try to eliminate earmarks isn't going to go anywhere and save taxpayers any money unless we're able to actually eliminate the earmark or pass a cut that then shifts money into a deficit reduction account.

My colleague from west Texas is exactly right. I would encourage Mr. FLAKE and others to pay close attention to what Mr. CONAWAY is doing because this is precisely what I and others, Mr. CONAWAY has been working on this for some time, have suggested you need a deficit reduction account. You eliminate the earmark if you're wor-

ried about controlling spending. A lot of those earmarks are important and necessary and we all need to post them on our Web sites. I've been doing that for a long, long time. Every earmark I make I'm proud of, it's there on the Web site. The starting answer is "no" for all appropriations requests, but if you earn an earmark, be proud of it. But those earmarks that we want to eliminate, cut them and put them in this deficit reduction account.

Mr. CONAWAY is exactly right. This is a tremendous amendment. I hope all Members will support it because the taxpayers deserve to save this money and have it go towards reducing the deficit.

I thank you very much, Mr. CONAWAY. It's a great amendment. And I will work hard to help you pass it.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank the gentleman for his support.

I understand there is a valid point of order against this amendment. If there is any possibility whatsoever of working with the other side and trying to accomplish what my colleague on the Appropriations Committee and I would like to do, we would like to work with you.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. ANDREWS). Without objection, the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHADEGG

Mr. SHADEGG. 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. SHADEGG:

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

SEC. 503. LIMITATION ON FUNDS RELATED TO FEDERAL DAMS.

No funds appropriated in or made available by this Act may be used to study or implement any plan to breach, decommission, or remove any Federal dams producing hydropower.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

□ 1500

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by complimenting the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKEY), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON), for showing support for hydropower in the base bill.

Hydropower has long been overlooked as a source for clean energy. I am very pleased that this bill, and the report that goes along with it, support hydropower and encourage its use and its utilization.

My amendment builds off of that effort by simply saying that the existing hydropower that we have should not be decommissioned at this point in time.

As everybody in this body knows, we are very concerned about greenhouse gases, both on the Commerce Committee, where I serve, and on the Select Committee on Global Warming and Energy Independence.

We are looking at the danger posed to this country by greenhouse gases. Indeed, that is a threat to this economy, to this Nation, and to this world. My amendment simply says that hydropower manages to address that issue by producing both clean power and power which has no hydrocarbons whatsoever.

Hydropower is emission-free, and it is also completely renewable; so therefore this amendment simply says that none of the funds in this legislation shall be used to decommission any existing Federal dam which is currently producing hydroelectric power.

Now, I know of no dam that has currently been proposed to be decommissioned that is a Federal dam and is producing electric power. But it seems to me that this is an action item. This is an opportunity for us to say we are serious about greenhouse gas reduction. We are serious about renewable energy. We are serious about a clean environment. We are serious about not doing more damage by simply saying none of these funds shall be used to decommission or remove from current production any existing hydroelectric power dam that is producing electricity for Americans today.

It truly is clean, and it truly is renewable; and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate, I truly do, the gentleman's concerns regarding the breaching of hydropower dams. Certainly, this country and the government should proceed very carefully before any such decision is made.

I would point out, however, Mr. Chairman, that there are no funds in this bill for that purpose. Indeed, I would remind my colleagues that authorization and direct appropriations for this purpose would also be needed. So I do rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. But I would also point out in a positive fashion that there is \$95 million in this bill for the rehabilitation of existing hydroelectric facilities on our waterways.

I certainly do think they make a significant, and can make even a greater, contribution to the energy demands of this country. But again, Mr. Chairman, I stand in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY), the former chairman of the Clean Air Resources Board in California.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, as a former member of the Clean Air Resources Board in California, as I think a lot of people in this town know, one of the premier air pollution agencies in the world, the one thing that we have got to send a message out there is "do no harm." Even though the chairman may think that there isn't a need to send a message, I think we need to say very clearly that climate change is a threat, something we need to address. We have to be willing to make sure we do the right things now.

This amendment is really a way for us to start off right from the get-go that we are not going to allow a mistake to happen that could cause major impacts on climate emissions and that we just didn't care enough to pass this resolution.

I strongly support the amendment of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHAD-EGG) because I think we should say right off, our first step at reducing greenhouse gas emissions is to make sure we do not decommission any zero generators from this point forward unless it is part of a comprehensive plan to reduce greenhouse gases. So please, here is a motion at least we can stand up and say, we did no harm; we made sure that a mistake wasn't made.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON).

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. But I want to tell you I am very sympathetic to the gentleman's concerns. We should preserve hydropower wherever we can. We should advance hydropower. He is correct in those statements.

However, I think the amendment is too broadly written and could lead to unintended negative consequences because there may be certain structures that because of environmental reasons or economic reasons we need to take some action on.

So what I would like to suggest to everyone is that we oppose the amendment, but we work together to see, because I think the chairman shares the concern for hydropower and that we would try to work to see how we can get some language at some point that might address the problem in a more appropriate way. So I do reluctantly oppose the amendment, but I am certainly within the spirit of the amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would certainly be happy to cooperate with my colleague and ranking member, Mr. HOBSON, in that regard.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I thank both the gentlemen for their comments.

Mr. Chairman, I would yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE).

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I do hope something can be worked out here, because hydropower is the original renewable resource. And there is starting to be a bias in this country against hydropower. There is also starting to be a bias in this country in some quarters in favor of tearing dams down.

I think it is very, very important, and by the way with reference to hydropower, just look at California's greenhouse gas reduction plan. They do not give any credit for power generated by hydropower. I think that is very bad.

I think Mr. SHADEGG is on the right track. We have got to speak up for hydropower. We have got to slow down this effort to tear down dams. I know the chairman and ranking member have the best of intentions. I am glad they are running the committee. I would just like to lend my voice for this very responsible amendment that Mr. SHADEGG has offered. I hope that we can work something out.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I thank both of the gentlemen. I would be happy to work with them. I simply want to stress, we understand, and I think everyone here does, that hydropower is more efficient than virtually all other energy. Ninety percent of its available energy is converted into electricity by hydropower. By contrast, the best fossil fuel power converts only 50 percent of its energy.

Hydropower produces zero greenhouse gas emissions. And we have avoided some 160 million tons of carbon emissions by the use of hydropower here in the United States in the last year.

The report says hydropower is reliable, it is efficient, it is domestic, and it is emissions-free. Indeed, as I state in my comments, the report is very supportive of hydropower. I think this amendment is an opportunity to take a concrete step both toward renewable energy and toward clean energy that produces no greenhouse gases.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHAD-EGG).

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

Mr. SHADEGG. 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 Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. 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. 8 offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. 503. 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 Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, 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. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

How many times do we have Members come before us on this floor with an amendment, and they begin their statement by saying, here I have a commonsense amendment to this piece of legislation. Well, in this case, I do believe I have a commonsense amendment to this legislation, and in fact most Members of this House I believe would agree with that statement as well.

Why I say that is because the language of this amendment is similar, or dare I say identical, to language that I have used in previous amendments on appropriation bills in past Congresses, and these amendments, quite fortunately, have passed pretty much by voice vote in those Congresses.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would indicate to the gentleman that I am happy to accept his amendment.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I also am in support of the amendment.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate that. For those who are watching, let me let them know what the amendment does.

What this amendment does, and I appreciate both gentlemen's accepting this, is to say our Federal agencies should use common sense when they go to international conferences.

In the past, there were extravagances. There were cases when over 100 individuals, government employees, would go to these conferences overseas, costing literally millions of taxpayers' dollars to do so. We are saying, let's rein that in a little bit. Let's put a number on that. Some people say this number is too high. This number puts it at 50. So any particular agency going overseas, Africa, Asia, wherever else, let's have them not send more than 50. Some of us would like it to be lower, but we will put it at 50 of their agency employees to that conference. I think just like any business or family, they would have to absolutely exercise priorities and common sense as well. We do so here.

Mr. Chairman, I thank both gentlemen for accepting this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. 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. 12 offered by Mr. PRICE of Georgia:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. 503. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is reduced by 1 percent.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

□ 1515

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the leadership's support in allowing me to bring this amendment forward. I also want to recognize former Congressman Joel Hefley. This has come to be known as the Hefley amendment. So I want to thank former Congressman Hefley for his leadership on fiscal responsibility issues in Congresses past.

There has been a lot of talk about money on this bill, Mr. Chairman, and this is the appropriate time, because it is appropriations time. Most of the programs that we have discussed are indeed worthy programs. But I think it is imperative that we always remember where this money comes from that we are appropriating, that we are spending.

The money isn't Washington's money. The money is the money of the hardworking American taxpayer, and we ought not ever lose sight of that. As such, we ought to bend over backwards to make certain we are being as responsible as possible in its expenditure.

The big picture on this bill is the Energy and Water appropriations. The big picture is that last year this government spent, Washington spent on these programs, \$30.2 billion. That is with a "B," Mr. Chairman. This year, the proposal is to spend \$31.6 billion; \$31.6 billion, an increase of 4.3 percent.

This amendment is very simple. It says simply that we ought to decrease that overall amount by 1 percent, in an effort to save one penny on the dollar, as families all across this Nation have to do when they are having some tight fiscal times.

It would be an increase of 3.3 percent over last year. I know there are those

who would like it to be lower. I am one of those. But I think it is important that Congress ought to make a statement that we can indeed be fiscally responsible. This 3.3 percent increase, this amendment would provide for that, and would be a reduction of 1 percent over the amount in the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank a number of Members who have offered similar pieces of legislation or amendments, Congresswoman BLACKBURN, Congressman CAMPBELL, Congressman JORDAN, Congressman FEENEY, Congresswoman MUSGRAVE and Congressman HENSARLING, for their leadership on these issues.

I think this a commonsense issue. It is a matter that I believe ought to garner great support in this Congress and demonstrate to all that we indeed have an interest in fiscal responsibility. So I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the chief deputy whip of this conference.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia. It is a very straightforward amendment. It simply applies an across-the-board cut of 1 percent to this bill to send the signal that this Congress gets it; that we understand what the American people said, both during the election of last year and what they continue to say today.

As the American public continues to watch Congress, as we have now engaged upon and entered upon the spending season, as the spending and appropriations process is in full bloom, I think we owe it to the American people to do what the gentleman from Georgia says, which is to recognize that these dollars don't belong to the government. They are the hard-earned dollars of the taxpayers of this country.

Now, the underlying bill, as the gentleman said, spends considerably more than what this similar bill spent last year and this Congress spent in this bill last year. In fact, the increase in the level of spending is 10 percent in this bill alone. That is triple the rate of inflation and that means \$1.3 billion, billion with a B, taxpayer dollars, more on this one bill.

Mr. Chairman, what that means in real terms to me and to my constituents, that means more than 3 years' worth of property taxes for every household and every business in my home County of Henrico in the Richmond area of Virginia. That is an awful lot of money.

So the public expects us to return Washington to fiscal sanity. The message that was sent last November was that the public expected us to operate differently. Frankly, I don't believe that this bill moves us in that direction. But I do know one thing for sure:

that the spending in this bill, if we don't adopt this amendment, will further erode the public trust, not only in this body but in government as a whole.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in opposition. I have been listening to this debate over the past couple of days. It seems like the past couple of years. It has been a lengthy debate.

Our friends on the other side, Mr. Chairman, after running up over \$3 trillion in debt, are now going to lecture us about how we should be thrifty. You had 6 years to try to close the annual deficits, and your budget you are submitting again this year will be over \$200 billion in deficit.

Now, we are not here to be lectured to. Three trillion dollars. And the Republican House, the Republican Senate and the Republican White House in the past 6 years borrowed more money from foreign interests than all of the previous Presidents and Congresses combined.

So, my colleague from Ohio, Mr. JORDAN, who was up here earlier talking about now we have got to try to compete with China, well, it is very tough to compete with them when the Republican Party, Mr. Chairman, borrows money from them hand over fist like drunken sailors over the past 6 years.

Now we are here to clean up the mess, and our budget that we pass will balance it. What your amendment is going to do is it is going to take away from research that is going to help grow the economy. You are going to cut biomass research. You are going to cut geothermal research. You are going to cut hydro research, where your own party was just up here saying what a great thing it is. You are going to cut solar research. You are going to cut wind research. You are going to cut concentrating solar power research. Solar heating and lighting research will be cut under this. Solar PV ratings will be cut under this. Hybrid electric system. We are getting testimonials from all our constituents in our districts about how they want lower gas prices. You do that by reducing your dependence on foreign oil and investing in alternative energy. That is what we are doing in this bill, and your amendment will cut that.

Advanced combustion engine research will be cut in this, materials technology research will be cut in this, fuels technology will be cut in this, technology integration will be cut under this amendment.

This is a responsible bill that was voted by both Republicans and Democrats out of the Energy and Water Committee. It makes great invest-

ments. It turns the page on the past of not balancing your budgets, not making the investments, Mr. Chairman, and I commend you and Mr. HOBSON for putting a great bill together and stand to ask our Members to reject this amendment.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the passion of my good friend from Ohio as he talks about cut after cut after cut, and I would just remind him that this amendment, this amendment, would reduce the overall bill by 1 percent which, Mr. Chairman, as you know, is a 3.3 percent increase over last year. So nobody is talking about cutting anything.

That might be the problem here in Washington. This would be a 1 percent reduction on the remarkable amount of increased money that the majority party has brought with this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KLINE).

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership here. I think many of us miss the presence of our former colleague Mr. Hefley from Colorado, and I am very pleased to see that Mr. PRICE has stepped up to fill that gap, because what we are talking about here is trying to control runaway spending.

We are spending billions and billions of dollars, and this proposal suggests that we try to pare back 1 percent, \$316 million in this bill.

Some speakers from the other side have said when the Republicans were in charge, the Republicans spent too much. In fact, the gentleman from Ohio just reminded us of that. He is right. Republicans, when we were in the majority, spent too much.

But the Democrat answer to spend more just doesn't make sense. We are increasing spending here by billions and billions of dollars, and that apparently is backed up by a budget which is reportedly balanced in 5 years by giving us the largest tax increase in American history. That is how you balance the budget in 5 years, with the level of spending that is being proposed here today, billions of dollars too much.

My friend, the great gentleman from Georgia, is proposing a 1 percent, 1 percent across-the-board cut. I commend him for that.

We are spending too much. Let's get this under control. This is a very modest proposal. I commend him for it.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I just want to clarify something. In 2008, there will not be a tax increase. And no one has to believe me, Mr. Chairman. No one has to believe our friends on the other side. What the American people need to do is keep their tax forms from this year and compare them to their tax forms from next year. There will be zero increase in taxes.

This is a balanced budget, which the other side has not done, and it makes strategic investments so that we can create alternative energy resources here so we reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER) a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for yielding me time. I will try to cover my points in those 3 minutes.

I just want to remind the members of the committee, of the Congress, of the body, that this bill came from the subcommittee with full support of the subcommittee members, with the ranking member and the chairman in strong support, with a very good and thoughtful look at what energy and water expenditures ought to be.

There are increases in moneys that are investments in flood control, in dam safety, in putting money into dealing with our ports which need dredging, things of that sort. There are substantial increases, that is true, in renewable energy, which is the one place where we can really get at our dependence upon oil that comes from very unstable parts of this world.

There were some wonderful recommendations that in large part are a balance between nuclear nonproliferation, so important, because that is where our real danger is to the security of this country in the future, our major danger, versus some unnecessary expenditures in nuclear weapons development, nuclear weaponry development. That recommendation is here.

We have had about 12 hours now of debate in this committee with 50 amendments, with offers of amendments to cut and reduce, offers of amendments to increase expenditures, to shift expenditures. There are some that have been adopted. Most of them have been refused. But everybody has had a chance. And the basic body of the bill remains as it was, as it was recommended by the chairman and the ranking member of the committee with the support of the subcommittee and the Appropriations Committee.

Here now we have a 1 percent reduction which attempts at this late date, after all those amendments have been dealt with one by one, increases and decreases, and the issues have been discussed, then to reduce by 1 percent, \$300-plus million, which then has an effect on all those earlier decisions that have been made by this committee as a whole.

So I would hope that this amendment would not be adopted. I think that this is a basically irresponsible way of going about budgeting. If you can't deal with the issues and then come to a conclusion on the budget that you have adopted in that process, then one should not do what is being proposed here. I hope that the amendment will be resoundingly defeated.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, if I may inquire of the time remaining on each side.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Indiana has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank the Chair.

I appreciate again the comments of my good friend from Ohio, who previously talked about there being no tax increase in 2008, and he urged the American people to take a look at their tax bill.

He is right. There won't be, because of Washington shenanigans. Because what we do here is budget in a 5-year window, and in fact the largest tax increase in the history of our Nation will hit the American people, curiously, Mr. Chairman, after the next election.

But you can check the record. It is indeed there, and all the American people have to do is recognize that, and they will. And they will.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to my good friend the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

□ 1530

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very enlightening debate. Fortunately, I think the American people are smart enough to understand this debate. They understand that, for example, even though there won't be a tax increase before the election in 2008, that policies that get adopted this year will force tax increases in future years. I think they understand that.

I want to comment on the remarks of the committee Chair who just spoke. I think he made a compelling case for leaving the priorities that are in this bill precisely where they are. I think your committee, with the help of the minority, worked diligently to produce a sound product, a product that attempts to allocate the resources amongst the various priorities.

But there will come a time when this Nation wakes up. There will come a time when we will have to be responsible about spending on this floor.

The speaker before the last speaker criticized Republicans and said, "You spent too much on your watch," and he was dead right.

This is the Hefley amendment. I voted for the Hefley amendment every time, trying to get us to cut 1 percent. Let me explain why. Because in 1994 when I was elected to Congress, and in 1995 and in 1996, we went across America, Republicans and Democrats alike, and we asked the American people if they wanted us to continue spending at that pace or if they were willing to see us reduce that pace of spending to reduce the burden on our children and our grandchildren.

One after another of them rose and said, "Don't cut my program"; but one after another of them, every single one of them that I heard, at field hearings in Prescott, Arizona, and in Wyoming

and Montana, said that if the cuts are even, if the cuts are evenly spread and fair to everyone, then, yes, you are right. We have to rein in spending to a level we can live with. That is what this amendment does. It is responsible. It is good public policy. I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

Mr. VISCLÖSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I would like to clarify. The other side is trying to say that if there are tax increases in the future, it all has to do with this bill which we just increased by a few hundred million. It has nothing to do with the \$3 trillion debt that was run up in the last 6 years, Mr. Chairman. The 2007 tax returns versus next year's, the American people need to look at them, no increase. Our friends are saying "the largest tax increase in the history of the United States" and it happens 2 years from now. I thought history was in the past. For 2008, check your returns, no tax increases.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY).

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, the American people have listened to Democrats and Republicans blame each other about budget crises. I became a Member in 1995. I left for 5 years. How things change. The parties change names, but it is the same tactics.

The American people want us working together on the budget. This amendment is a minimal effort of just saying to the American people, look, we recognize that even the best operation and the best budget can still be operated on 99 percent of what was projected. It is a minimalist kind of approach to this. If you can't vote for a 1 percent across-the-board cut, go to your town hall meetings, go into your communities and say, well, I really didn't want to do it because of what it symbolized. The fact is that this is the minimum of what we can do to say, look, we are trying to get back in the discipline of doing the right thing by the American taxpayer.

And if you can't vote for a 1 percent, how can you expect in the long run to be able to control the Federal budget, and that is exactly what the constituency wants us to do.

So I just say dump the Republican and Democrat argument. You get back to the fact that you have a motion that says quite clearly: we will make the effort of a 1 percent reduction across the board. That is a very small, little step towards fiscal responsibility and let's get together, Democrats and Republicans, and do the right thing and support the new Hefley amendment as authored by the gentleman from Georgia. If you can't do that, please don't think you can stand up and carry the mantle of self-righteousness when it comes to budget. We all bear the responsibility. Even those of us who weren't here bear the responsibility of doing the right thing and dumping the jargon about

being Democrat or Republican and the other guy is at fault. We all bear that responsibility, and the voters and the taxpayers will blame all of us, regardless of our party affiliation, if we can't even make this minimal stance of a 1 percent across-the-board.

Mr. VISCLÖSKY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time. I have one remaining speaker, and it is my understanding it is my prerogative to close.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, is it the chairman's prerogative to close?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Yes, the chairman is defending the bill, and it is his prerogative to close.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, let me first say I support this 1 percent, just like I did last year and the year before. Just to make sure that the American public understands, this is 1 percent off of the nearly 5 percent increase. So it isn't even a reduction from last year's number of 1 percent. It is simply shaving 1 percent off of the increase.

I came down here because I heard some of the speakers on the other side, or at least one, that was talking about they had to correct the problems of the Republicans spending like drunken sailors, which kind of amazed me considering that the debate on the House floor in the last 2 years on appropriations was how we weren't giving enough money.

When I looked up to see what the Republican bill was last year when we were in the majority, it was a 1.5-percent increase versus the nearly 5 percent this time. So they are up here talking about an increase of about 2½ times, maybe three times what we originally proposed last year. And by the way, I supported the 1 percent when it was only a 1.5-percent increase below the rate of inflation. I think that is the type of drunken spending that the American taxpayers told us in the last election that they did not want. They want that type of fiscal restraint, not two or three times the rate of inflation. They want fiscal responsibility injected back into our reasoning and the bills that we are passing.

So I think a reduction of this 4.5-, 4.7-percent increase is simply the responsible thing to do.

The gentleman from Georgia, I appreciate you bringing this 1 percent. I think that this is something that the voters, strike voters, the American public thinks we should be doing this year. We come off the heels last week of voting for bills with double-digit increases. So this is a time to inject some reasonableness.

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

I think this has been a helpful debate. I want to recognize the efforts of Congressman Hefley in the past and urge my colleagues to support the former Hefley amendment of a 1-percent reduction in the increase, Mr.

Chairman. As I remind our colleagues, the portion appropriated for this area of Federal spending last year was \$30.2 billion. This year the request in this bill is for \$31.6 billion. This amendment would simply reduce it by 1 percent. It would be a 3.3-percent increase. It would be a symbolic decrease, but it would be a recognition that Washington needs to get its fiscal house in order.

My good friends on the other side of the aisle talk about the importance of reducing spending. But yet we see a significant increase over, as the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) just said, significantly over what we brought last year. Yes, it would be a symbolic decrease, but it would ever so slightly reduce that slope, that increasing slope of Federal spending. I think that is indeed what the American people desire.

Spending in this bill, as in other appropriations bills that are coming before us, will be allocating money, Mr. Chairman, that the Congress doesn't have. The Congress doesn't have it, and it continues to spend more than it takes in. I think it is imperative that we harken back and remember that wonderful Reagan admonition that Washington spends too much, it is not that it doesn't gain enough revenue. There is certainly enough revenue to provide for appropriate services.

And I will be the first to tell my colleagues that there are wonderful programs within this bill. The question is whether or not we are going to demonstrate to the American people that we have the fiscal responsibility, the reasonable standards in terms of what ought to be spent at the Federal level based upon what has been spent in the past and the incredible hardworking American taxpayers who send their money year after year after year. I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense 1-percent reduction.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to a member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR).

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

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, Joel Hefley was a dear friend of mine. We worked together on the Ethics Committee. I have to tell you, Joel and I would talk about his 1 percent across-the-board cuts. While the Republicans were in the majority, they failed. They failed because Republicans and Democrats knew that in this particular bill, Energy and Water, you had the chairman and the vice chairman working in cooperation with Republicans and Democrats looking at the priorities and developing a bill that would invest in the infrastructure of America.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, for many years the investment in infrastructure has either been static, and in many cases has been declining. Hearing after hearing after hearing, we had

businessmen, barge owners, operators, grain operators coming to the committee and saying you need to invest more money in the infrastructure of America because it is the commerce that the Mississippi River handles. It is the commerce that comes into our harbors. It is the commerce that is driving America and making it a productive country.

And so when you have the business community, elected officials coming to you and telling you that there is a decline in the investment in infrastructure, it is the Subcommittee on Energy and Water that begins to respond to that need.

As an example, in Brunswick, Georgia, the request came that we need to deepen the harbor so that the harbor can allow more ships to come in and be able to continue that driving engine, commerce.

In Sacramento, California, we have had untold numbers of public officials come to tell us you need to invest in flood control because we are this close to being over our heads in water. Again, an investment in infrastructure.

In Kentucky we had a Congressman in our markup in to ask why is it that my particular flood control project, an investment in infrastructure, is not being considered in an earmark. We are being threatened by not having this flood control structure. Again, an investment in infrastructure to protect our communities.

We had people from New York and New Jersey: we need to deepen the harbor. We have to make sure that the ships coming from overseas not only have secured cargo, but that we have cargo coming in so that the commerce can continue to develop.

Oakland Harbor, Los Angeles Harbor, Long Beach Harbor, Galveston, Corpus Christi, New Orleans.

The New Orleans elected officials came and said we need development of flood control structures in New Orleans in order to protect if there is another hurricane.

But the one that impressed me the most was the people along the Mississippi. They said grain, coal, a number of products go up and down the Mississippi. It is the blood line of commerce for this country. And the problem we have is that our locks are not working properly.

So in this bill we are investing in improving, and in some cases bringing in new locks, so that from the most northern point of this country to the most southern point of this country along the Mississippi River, we can have commerce, so grain can be moved, coal can be moved, so this country can be competitive on a global basis.

□ 1545

So I tell you, Mr. Chairman, this work, the Energy and Water Subcommittee bill that is before us, it deals with infrastructure development. A 1 percent cut would begin to deny many of these improvements that we

have, improvements that the American public have asked us to do because they know it is a sound investment. They want to make sure that commerce continues. They want to make sure that they're protected.

And as Joel Hefley would probably tell me, ED, I couldn't do it in the majority, I probably won't do it in the minority, because the American people think that 1 percent is not the proper way to go, because I would like to have that money that belongs to me to be invested in order that we protect our communities and ensure that we have commerce.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I appreciate the gentleman's comments very much.

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

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

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. 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 Georgia will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. WILSON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. 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. 15 offered by Mr. WILSON of South Carolina:

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

SEC. 503. Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of \$1,130,000,000.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I want to thank Congressman JOHN CAMPBELL of California who originally was the proponent of this amendment. I am very happy to adopt this amendment because I believe that it truly expresses the concerns of the people of our country.

The Energy and Water appropriations bill, which spends \$31.6 billion, is \$1.13 billion, or 3.7 percent over the President's request. This amendment would reduce overall funding in the bill to the President's request, thus saving taxpayers \$1.13 billion. If this amendment passes, the total amount of spending in the Energy and Water bill will still be \$175 million greater than last year.

By enacting the largest tax increase in American history, the Democrat

budget allows for \$23 billion in spending over that of the President's budget request. This amendment is designed to save the taxpayers \$1.13 billion which will reduce some of the unnecessary increases in Federal spending this year which is fueled by the huge tax increases. This is an amendment that is an across-the-board reduction that does not destroy, interrupt or terminate needed projects, many that we just heard about that are very, very worthy. But it does provide for our Federal administrators to reduce expenditures by limiting travel, delaying filling employee vacancies, postponing equipment purchases and other innovative and creative initiatives to save taxpayers' money. Even the reduction of growth is an increase of spending of \$175 million.

Prior to being elected to Congress, I served in the State senate of my home State and over and over again we would work toward across-the-board budget cuts and each time that we were able to achieve these, we were able to maintain the programs to benefit the citizens of our State; but, indeed, the programs were not terminated, they were made better. I have faith in government employees that they can accommodate a 3.7 percent reduction without hurting recipients of worthy projects.

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana is recognized for 15 minutes.

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota, Congressman JOHN KLINE.

Mr. KLINE of Minnesota. I thank my friend and colleague, Mr. WILSON, for his leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I rise because we have had a debate here about how much money we're spending and how much we're taxing. There seems to be some confusion about that. We on this side of the aisle have been accused of having spent too much money. And, as I said in discussing an earlier amendment, I fully agree. The Republican majority spent too much money. But what we have before us is a proposal to spend even more money while we're getting criticism for having spent too much, and I have a hard time balancing those out.

We need to get spending under control. And we've had my colleagues, colleague after colleague have come to the floor to propose amendments to make modest reductions in what appears to be runaway spending, billions of dollars too much. And then we've had an argument that said, well, we're not taxing too much because we're not going to add to the tax burden in 2008. I suppose that remains to be seen before the process is over, but I think it's

undeniable that the Democrats passed a budget which in order to balance in 5 years results in the largest tax increase in American history. And as the spending goes up to make that match in the end, they force all of the tax cuts which we have fought so hard to get into place, that have spurred this economy and caused jobs to be created and rapid growth in the economy, all those tax cuts would go away, taxes would go up, and we would in fact see the largest tax increase in American history. So we have a huge tax increase, huge spending, that's not the way to see this economy grow. Let's take some steps to curb this explosive rate of spending and stop the semantic arguments here. Let's slow down this runaway spending.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Inquiry. Does the chairman have any witnesses at this time or any further testimony?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I simply have two speakers and would prefer to reserve at this moment.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, again what we're talking about with this particular amendment is to reduce the overall expenditures to the President's request, which is a reduction of \$1.13 billion. It's a 3.7 percent reduction. But actually because this is the request of the President, there has been an increase of nearly \$175 million. We've heard the presentation, very eloquent, a few minutes ago of many of the wonderful programs and projects, and when you think of Energy and Water appropriations, I think of extraordinarily important appropriations, indeed, the infrastructure of our country, it's so important, as to the alternative fuels, promoting the alternative fuels. But, indeed, I have seen firsthand in my experience working in public office since 1984, you can reduce and still provide for the services to be provided.

I know that again in my State experience one time, we had a midyear budget crisis where, in fact, the State budget was reduced by 7½ percent and we had previously proposed that there be a budget reduction of 1 percent. Unfortunately, it was turned down. It was incredible that, indeed, with the 7½ percent across-the-board cut by people of another political party from me, it worked. And the services were still provided. That was, in effect, almost a 15 percent across-the-board cut.

And so what we are proposing today, I believe, is very reasonable and responsible and in the interest of the taxpayers of the United States.

At this time I am happy to yield to the minority leader of the House of Representatives, a person who is so widely respected, the Congressman from Ohio, JOHN BOEHNER.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The distinguished minority leader is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BOEHNER. I appreciate my colleague for yielding and I appreciate the work he is doing bringing this amendment to the floor.

I came to Washington 17 years ago because I thought government was too big, I thought it spent too much and didn't think that it was being held accountable. And the reason I am here this afternoon on this bill is because this amendment offered by Mr. WILSON and Mr. CAMPBELL will reduce the overall spending level in this bill to the President's request.

The President submitted a budget back in January that said we can balance the budget over the next 5 years without raising taxes. But to do that, it's dependent upon us holding the line on spending. Even at the President's level, there is an increase over last year, and I believe that bringing the level of spending down in this bill to what the President requested puts this bill in a position to actually move through the process and become law.

If you looked over the course of this year, our friends on the other side of the aisle have a budget that will balance over the next 5 years, but with the largest tax increase in American history. If we want to review the bidding on spending here in Washington this year, you go back to February with a CR that was some \$6 billion over the President's request. And then we can look at the supplemental spending bill for Iraq and Katrina and other things that was \$17 billion over the President's request. And now if we look at the appropriations process that we're in the midst of, we have an additional \$20 billion over and above where the President is.

At the end of the day, the American people want to keep more of the money that they earn and want to send less of that money here to Washington. And I think to the extent we can hold the line on spending, we're protecting the taxpayers, protecting their wallets.

I think this is a modest amendment that reduces the spending in this bill by some \$1.13 billion, it's the right move, and our colleagues ought to support the amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to my good friend and colleague from New York, a member of the subcommittee, Mr. ISRAEL.

Mr. ISRAEL. I thank my distinguished chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I have listened very carefully to my friends from the other side suggest that this bill is just too expensive, that it needs to be cut. Well, let me tell you what's far more expensive.

Thirty years ago, President Carter told the American people that we were going to declare the moral equivalent of war on foreign oil. And the only thing we've managed to do in the 30 years since then is double our imports of oil from the Middle East and cut investments in renewable research and development by about 80 percent. So we tried it your way. We cut those investments 80 percent in the past 30 years. And what's the result? We've

doubled our imports of foreign oil from the Persian Gulf.

You want to know why this is so expensive a problem? It is a military vulnerability. Two years ago, the Department of Defense spent \$10.6 billion on basic energy costs because of this dependence on foreign oil. \$10.6 billion paid for by the taxpayer. Of that, the Air Force spent half, \$4.7 billion, on one thing: buying fuel, which is also paid for by the American taxpayer.

Now, I believe, as many of my friends do, in robust military budgets. I am a very strong supporter of our military and I believe we need to spend what it takes to defend freedom, and my friends would agree. The problem is this: Because of the fact that we tried it their way and our dependence on foreign oil has actually increased, we're in a position right now where we are borrowing money from China to fund our military budgets to buy oil from the Persian Gulf to fuel our military to protect us from China and the Persian Gulf. A \$550 billion military budget and we have to borrow the money from our adversaries. And, guess what, our taxpayers have to pay the interest on the money that we're borrowing from our adversaries to fuel our military to protect us from our adversaries. It makes no sense whatsoever. We've tried it their way, Mr. Chairman, and it hasn't worked.

I don't believe any one of my colleagues would suggest that we should cut the Department of Defense budget. We all believe in national security, and I'm with my colleagues on that.

□ 1600

But as a matter of national security, we should not cut this budget either, because this budget is a national security budget, because it is not acceptable that a Stryker combat vehicle that is ferrying our troops into some very dangerous environments gets between 5 and 10 miles to the gallon, sounds like a 1957 Buick and is a loud, moving target. It is not acceptable that our C-17s burn 3,000 gallons of fuel an hour and that we have to rely on our adversaries to fuel those systems.

I would appeal to my colleagues on the other side that just as they are strong supporters of the Department of Defense and would never think to suggest just a 1 or 2 percent reduction in military budgets, the same should hold true on this.

I would add one other thing, if I may, Mr. Chairman. One of the things that worries all of us, and worries our military planners, is not just the threats that we see in Iran, and we passed a resolution earlier today that I supported that would take a hard line on Iran and its development, attempted development on nuclear weapons, not just those things, but loose nukes. But the fact that there is a tremendous quantity of nuclear materials proliferating around the world that we have to find, identify and secure, because we don't want a rogue nation packing

those loose nukes into a suitcase and bringing them across our borders.

Well, this bill contains funding for the Global Threat Reduction Initiative, whose mission is to locate, secure and remove and facilitate disposal of high-risk vulnerable nuclear material and equipment locations. It does increase the President's funding level. I think the American people would want us to find the money to secure those loose nukes. Now, maybe that means there is a little less money to go to Halliburton and no-bid contracts.

My final point is this: the other side continues to say that this is a tax increase. It is not a tax increase. It will not be a tax increase. The other side is not accurately explaining this to the American people, is the most diplomatic way I can put it.

I will say this, it does require different priorities. The other side has no problem allowing big corporations to register themselves in offshore P.O. boxes so that they can avoid paying their fair share of taxes. The other side has no problem funding and bull-doing money to Halliburton in no-bid contracts. The other side had no problem shoveling tax cuts to the richest oil company executives on Earth.

If the money was there for that, the money is there for this bill. Maybe we need to take the money from those priorities and put them into this priority.

For America's energy security, for a strong future, and to get our troops out of those Stryker combat vehicles that are loud gas guzzlers and put them on something safer. This bill makes those investments. Those investments are, ultimately, in our national security.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to reduce the size of this bill, the cost of this bill.

I have got to tell you I grew up in the late 1970s. I remember pretty distinctly the policies of Jimmy Carter. I remember the high unemployment rates. I remember the high inflation rates.

I recall getting my driver's license and getting that 1970 station wagon to drive and waiting in a line for gas two blocks long; and when you got there, there was one pump yet working and the others had the 11 by 8 piece of paper that said "out of gas" on it. I think those are the policies which some of my friends on the left are advocating today. I just have to openly wonder how well Honda Civics would work in the sand in Iraq if we can't use military vehicles because of their gas mileage.

But let's get back to the real issue of what we're talking about here today, and that's ways of controlling spending. Yes, it is showing a difference between the majority party and the minority party in the sense of spending.

We are here fighting to reduce the size of their bill. We would like to bring it to last year's level where it

was only a 1.6 percent increase, and they were yakking about how we needed to spend more, and when they got in control, they were able to do that.

They have a bill here before us today that increases the spending way above the President's request. This amendment just simply brings it down, \$1.13 billion to the President's request. So either way we can fight to reduce the size of their bills, and last week's bill. Again, they were both double-digit increases.

I think this type of debate is healthy. It also does show, as one of the previous speakers mentioned, that there are policy differences. There are priority differences between the two parties, and we are showing how we are the party of fiscal responsibility.

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, indeed, as I am here, proposing a cut of around 3.7 percent, this is across the board. Actually, it's an affirmation of the significance of the projects that are in the bill.

I am not saying they should be terminated. I am saying that they should be stalled. I am certainly not indicating they should be interrupted or destroyed. My being here is to propose that there be a reduction in spending, except that it's really a reduction to the President's recommendation, which is an increase in spending of \$175 million.

But it is a savings to the taxpayers of \$1.13 billion. That's, indeed, a key reason that I ran for Congress was to, indeed, protect the taxpayers, look out for the taxpayers, make sure that the government programs that are so worthy are handled well.

At this time, I yield such time as he may consume to the Congressman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. Chairman, let's be clear what we are doing here: we are not cutting anything. We are proposing to do less of an increase in this bill than what has been proposed by the majority party.

Just to illustrate, as I have done before, what I will do again, because I keep hearing talk about cuts: one equals one; two is more than one, even if you want three. This bill, what we have proposed is to have two, is to spend more than the one that was spent before, to spend two. There are some people who would like to spend three. We think that's too much.

We think that we have a deficit. We think that we have seen the majority party propose to increase taxes by however much money they happen to spend. We think they should spend less. We think government should spend less so that the taxpayers can keep more of their own money that they earned.

Mr. Chairman, we can get this budget under control. We can get this deficit under control without cutting spending and without raising taxes, if we just

control how much we increase the spending by.

Instead of increasing it by 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 percent, 9, over 9 percent, which overall has been proposed in this budget, if, instead, we only increase it by 6, not a bad increase, but just increase it by 6, and we do that year after year, we will eliminate this deficit without digging more into the taxpayers' pockets, because we already dig into their pockets too much.

So that's what this whole debate, that's what the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina is about, just controlling the growth of spending to something that is reasonable but manageable and will enable people to keep their own money and this government to return to a fiscal responsibility position without deficits.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, we have had a lot of debate and discussion about this legislation over the last 2 days. I certainly have tried to emphasize that it represents an investment in this country. Some of that investment is represented by cuts we made, over 50 cuts in programs we did not feel were commensurate with the value of the monies that the taxpayers have sent to the United States Government.

Many of those other dollars have been invested in programs we believe inure to the benefit of people's health and safety, to the movement of commerce and to the growth of our economy.

I am going to be the last speaker on our side on this amendment and would conclude in another vein, and that is the national security of our country. I think most people, when they look at the Department of Energy, believe that you have a Department that spends all of its money on energy and energy research.

As our colleagues know, this simply is not true. Only \$1 out of about every \$10 inure to that purpose. Most of it deals with cleaning up nuclear waste. Much of it is keeping our nuclear arsenal secure, as well as making sure that it is safe and reliable.

Our national security is at stake when we consider many of the elements in this bill. We are charged in this subcommittee to try to make wise decisions as to what pertains to people and this country's security and what does not.

I would draw attention to a fundamental issue that affects every one of us, and that is the possibility of the nuclear conflict. There is a proposal pending by the administration to build a new nuclear weapon.

We had to make what I think is a very profound decision on behalf of the people of this country as to what course of action should we take. We decided, in a bipartisan fashion on this subcommittee, to not proceed for a number of reasons. One is essentially what the perspective of our allies and

those who do not have our interests at heart internationally would be if we proceed.

In testimony before the subcommittee, former chairman of the Armed Services Committee in the Senate, Sam Nunn, who is only one of two people I have ever met in my 57 years who has been nominated for a Nobel Peace Prize, the other being my senior Senator in Indiana, Senator LUGAR, said that on the RRW itself, the new nuclear weapon, if Congress gives a green light to this in our current world environment, I believe this will be misunderstood by our allies, exploited by our adversaries, complicate our work to prevent the spread and the use of nuclear weapons. I will not fund additional work on RRW at this time.

Another concern we had on the subcommittee is what is our strategy for the use or, hopefully not the use, of those weapons, as well as our strategy as far as eliminating weapons internationally. We have not developed as a Nation and as a government a new strategy subsequent to the end of the Cold War. We have had regional conflicts thereafter in policies like Kosovo. We have had the events of 9/11, and we find ourselves in conflict the most today.

We should have a broad national policy, not the policy of the Bush administration or any administration, but a national policy that stands the test of time through various administrations, as our last one did for half a century, and a strategy that also lasts through Congresses controlled by Republicans, Congresses controlled by Democrats over a generation; and that strategy does not exist.

I am very heartened that the Armed Services Committee, under the leadership, particularly, of Subcommittee Chairman TAUSCHER, as well as her ranking member, Mr. EVERETT, on your side of the aisle, has asked for a commission to study that very issue.

I am also very concerned that in the past, beginning in the late 1990s, the taxpayers of this country have been asked to invest billions of dollars in the so-called Stockpile Stewardship Program that I support. It is to ensure this we do not have to perform nuclear tests, but to ensure the safety and reliability of our nuclear weapons.

But we were also told, by several administrations of both parties and by the Department of Energy for over a decade, that we need the National Ignition Facility built. Well, it's 6 years behind schedule, and it's 226 percent over budget by a factor of \$2.428 billion.

We were told by several administrations and the Department of Energy, both parties, that we need the Microsystems Science Engineering and Applications Lab at Sandia National Laboratory. That is currently 29.5 percent over budget.

We were told by administrations of both parties that we need a dual-axis radiographic hydrotest facility. That is now 6 years behind. That is 35 percent

over budget. None of them have been completed. None of them are going to come in on time.

□ 1615

I would grant that the Advanced Simulation and Computational Initiative has taken hold and has produced results and has been a valuable investment.

To now, after more than a decade of investment that has not come to total fruition, to make a hard turn in the road and start spending new money on new construction without a strategy would be a mistake. And this subcommittee has made a determination not to waste the American taxpayers' dollars on that project.

We have asked, and it began 2 years ago under the leadership of then-Chairman HOBSON, that we have an arsenal of 10,000 nuclear warheads, we have a Cold War complex. We need to rationalize and, in effect, downsize that to meet the new threats to make sure that we are nimble, that we are safe, and that we save the taxpayers as much money as possible.

The administration has come back in and said, well, let us build a new nuclear weapon by 2012. And you know what? We're going to take care of the rationalization of the complex, and we're going to downsize and we're going to do that in 2030.

My point is, I wish the administration and, in this case particularly, the Department of Energy, had as much aggression and commitment to downsizing the complex as they do on developing a weapon.

And what they also would suggest that we do, before we downsize is, well, let's begin construction of this new nuclear weapon in the existing complex. So now we will have the old and we will have the new. And I think everyone, Mr. Chairman, knows the end of that story. Nothing will ever change.

It's hard to attach an exact dollar and figure on that critical issue of our national security. But many of the dollars we have saved and not spent, and we have cut in this bill, is to make sure that we take the right approach as far as our nuclear strategy and our nuclear safety, and I am very proud of that.

I see the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) on his feet. And if he would want time, I would be happy to yield to him.

Mr. HOBSON. I just wanted to take a moment to comment that I really appreciate the Chairman's very thoughtful comments, especially on all the issues that he talked about, but certainly, when it comes to NNSA and the lack of management of the weapons systems.

The gentleman remarked to me over here, do we have 9,000 weapons, or 10,000 weapons? Well, the number we've been trying to get out for a long time, cause it's a good news story. But we can't tell you here how good news the story is, because it's still secure. And we've tried for a number of years to get

out this issue of how many weapons we have and to get this complex sized appropriately.

But we're very disturbed, in a bipartisan way, about the management of the entire Department of Energy. And I want to associate myself with the gentleman's comments and his opposition to the amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. And Mr. Chairman, I want people to truly appreciate Mr. HOBSON's dedication as a member of not only this subcommittee, and as chairman for 4 years, but as a member of the Defense Subcommittee when there was a similar proposal several years ago and he thought it was the incorrect proposal. He stopped what I think was incorrect public policy from taking place. He saved the taxpayers of this country money.

And the only reason today I believe we have even a 20-30 proposition from the administration as far as downsizing the complex, that I find totally unsatisfactory but at least it is a proposal, is because of the work that Mr. HOBSON did. And I thank him for that very much, and do ask my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. 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 South Carolina will be postponed.

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:
Page 40, after line 18, insert the following:
SEC. 503. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Secretary of Energy to designate any geographic area as a national interest electric transmission corridor under section 216(a) of the Federal Power Act (as added by section 1221 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005), and none of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to take any action related to the processing or issuance of a permit under section 216(b) of the Federal Power Act.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, June 19, 2007, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to extend my appreciation and gratitude to Chairman VISCLOSKY and Ranking Member HOBSON for putting together a very fine bill.

However, what we want to do is oppose a certain part of this, denying funding for monopolistic corporations to impede upon States rights and people's private personal proper rights. It's an important amendment and I ask everyone to consider it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, this is going to be the only vote that you're going to have on this issue. When the power lines are coming through your district, and this is coming through your district, how will you explain to your constituents, to your neighbors, your friends, your local elected officials, your farmers, that you had a chance to slow this down and you didn't do it?

How are you going to tell them that you sided with the power companies and not with the citizens?

This is a time out. It will give us a chance to reexamine the process.

These corridors divide communities, neighborhoods. They destroy landscapes. In fact, the current corridor in the Mid-Atlantic includes Antietam, where 20,000 people died in 1 day. We need to make sure that we take time to do it right, and don't bow to the scare tactics and the false Dear Colleague letters.

This is your first and likely your only vote on this issue. Don't let this vote come back to haunt you. Voting against the Hinchey amendment means you don't want to make sure these corridors are sited properly.

I strongly urge the Members to vote aye for the Hinchey amendment.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Chairman, I urge support of the Hinchey-Wolf amendment to force the DOE to take a time-out from its rush to subject giant stretches of this country to eminent domain for energy interests.

In my State, in my district, the New York Regional Interconnect, for instance, NIRE, is an internationally financed private entity which will receive eminent domain rights to seize private land for private profit. It would remove the State environmental review process and all property rights and States rights from the equation and give that all to FERC. I think this is something that needs much closer examination.

New York City, I would reassure my colleagues from downstate, does not need NIRE to have power, especially not this route. In fact, there are alternate routes that the State could and would look at if it had the time that it would normally have under CCRA.

I urge support for the Hinchey-Wolf amendment in the interest of property rights and States rights.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts rise as the designee of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. OLVER. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Member from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Hinchey-Wolf amendment.

Today, more than ever, America needs a transmission grid that will deliver reliable and affordable electricity to consumers across the Nation. The Energy Information Agency projects that electricity consumption will increase 43 percent by 2030. Other studies project growth and demand to grow by 19 percent over the next 10 years, while power capacity will grow by only 6 percent over that same time. It stands to reason we're going to have to move power where we have excess to where we need it.

Recognizing the fact the Energy Policy Act of 2005, EPACT, allowed for the designation of national interest corridors where congestion in the electricity grid is jeopardizing reliable service and raising the cost to electricity consumers, this designation is not a mandate that a transmission line be built but, instead, an incentive for stakeholders to address the grid capacity issues. FERC is authorized to get involved only if the State is unwilling to or cannot act, then only after exhaustive Federal considerations.

The Hinchey-Wolf amendment, unfortunately, seeks to block funding for the National Electricity Transmission Corridors as contained in the authorizing legislation. Failing to address congestion and transmission infrastructure will do absolutely nothing for electricity consumers who will see their energy bills continue to climb in the future. And more blackouts.

Our constituents deserve a robust energy transmission infrastructure, and EPACT encourages congested States to resolve the problems in a timely manner. And we know the issue of blackouts, particularly in mid-America to the Northeast.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the Hinchey-Wolf amendment because all it will do is raise electric prices because we can't move power where we really need it.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI).

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of this amendment. And I'd like to start off by saying to my colleague that I respect a great deal from Texas, this amendment is not about sharing power. It's not about giving power from one part of the country to another. It's about how do we do it. Do we do it in a thoughtful way? Do we do it in a reasonable way? Or do we do it in a way by using eminent domain, by running high power lines over people's land, by taking people's land? Is that the American way? Is that the way we want to have our energy policy dictated to the States and the localities? I think not.

I think there is a better way to do it. There is a more thoughtful way to do it. We are facing such a plan in New York, and it's ill-conceived and poorly thought out. And that's not the way we should be running our energy policy in this country. It should be in a more thoughtful way.

I strongly support this amendment because we need to stand up to the power companies and not let them take our land and not let them run power lines over people's property.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to yield 2 minutes to a member of the committee, Mr. PETERSON.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I think this is one of the more important amendments we're going to deal with today.

America needs available power, and especially electric power. We have a system that has not worked. The legislation doesn't give the Federal Government the right to usurp States rights. It only gets involved when multiple States can't get their job done. I was in State government for 19 years, and I wouldn't bet the farm on four PUCs adequately performing on a time basis so we could connect our grid.

Here's what Bill Richardson said in 2001. "The United States has a first-rate economy. We're the Superpower of the world, the best military, a booming technological economy, but we've got a grid that is antiquated, that is Third World, that needs beefing up. We've got very weak power transmission lines to connect our generation capacity."

And here's what Sam Bodman said in 2006, a year ago. "The Nation is currently facing serious near problems in adequately delivering electricity to its customers."

It means we have to fix the grid. And we've been unable to get States to work together collectively. This is a process that only kicks in when the States can't get their job done.

Connecting this country is a national issue. I don't want my State in charge of the national grid. I had a Governor's person come into my office protesting a power line that was proposed. It had been off of the table by the PGM for a year and a half and they didn't even know it. It wasn't even up for consideration. And the three States that were involved in the little piece that was left was not that State.

Folks, there's a lot of disinformation out here. The connectivity of our electric system is vital to our economic future and we need a process. This was put in the energy bill because it wasn't working, because we couldn't upgrade our grid.

And two Secretaries of Energy and leaders across this country, the Edison Institute, all say, don't pass this amendment.

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

□ 1630

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, it is pretty clear from the record of their

activities that the Department of Energy has been in cahoots with the electric utilities and they are running roughshod over Americans everywhere.

My subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Domestic Policy, held a hearing on this exact matter, and we heard about concerns about the law and about the Department of Energy's implementation.

These concerns include whether the Department of Energy would take into account the protection of national parks, State parks, conservation easements, and historical sites like battlefields when determining where an electric transmission corridor should be designated. The answer is they don't.

Whether the Department of Energy is considering the effects of a corridor designation on the private property rights of landowners. They did not.

Whether the Department is considering the environmental impact of corridor designations. The answer is they did not.

Whether the Department of Energy is considering alternatives to constructing new electric transmission lines, like demand-side management, distributed generation, and energy efficiency. They did not.

Whether the Department has adequately considered the actual benefit utility consumers would receive. They did not.

Support the Hinchey amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment.

The 2005 energy law required the Department of Energy to identify geographical areas throughout the country where congestion in the electric grid is raising prices and creating reliability concerns.

Ladies and gentlemen, I don't think I have to tell anybody here on the floor that we have an energy crisis in this country, and there are a host of reasons why we have an energy crisis in this country. And I think most of us understand that, frankly, there is not one silver bullet that is going to resolve these issues.

The designation of this 2005 energy law creates interest of corridors, clearly vests States with the primary responsibility for siting transmission lines and considering what local or regional benefits and consequences exist.

I think it is clear that in the 2005 law that we are seeking to amend here that the national designation does not, does not, usurp State authority for siting transmission lines. Yet we have a lot of challenges on a regional basis.

In California we are attempting to try to work with Arizona to the mutual benefit of citizens living in both States to try to allow for the conductivity of that energy back and forth as well as to try to maintain the stability of much-needed electricity for our constituents in the Southwest.

This amendment, I think, would do great harm to that. And that is pre-

cisely why I think the 2005 law was designed to address short-sighted and narrow interests blocking the public good.

I ask that you reject this amendment.

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

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition of this amendment.

As a member of the Energy Committee, I want to debunk a couple of myths that have been perpetrated today in the debate. First of all, that this was done hastily and thoughtlessly. The fact of the matter is the issue of the transmission of electricity has been an issue for many years. Many hearings have been held, much debate. It was part of the Energy Act. What we have to do is resolve the issue how we get energy from generator A to consumer B. In between we have to figure out how to do that.

Myth number two is that this runs roughshod over States' and communities' rights. The reality is that they are involved in the process. They are involved in working with FERC, and FERC has to work with them on the siting issues. And only when there is a conflict do they get to break that conflict by rising above it.

We in this Nation have to figure out how we get electricity from point A to consumer B. Think of this corridor as a transportation highway. And when we think of it as a highway, we understand why we have to do it this way.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. PASTOR).

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

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hinchey amendment.

In Arizona, which is one of the fastest-growing States, we, as a growing State, have enough energy and power to meet the power needs of our State. But what has happened is that since California has a moratorium on building generating plants, the tendency is to have power plants be built in Arizona to generate power and then power lines to be taken into California.

Very recently, about 1½ months ago, the Arizona State Corporation Commission, which has the responsibility for siting the power lines, rejected, and it was an issue of local control in that the power lines that were being proposed would have endangered the wildlife. There were problems with the enhancement features of our land.

The issue for me is local control; so that is why I support the Hinchey amendment.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI).

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Chairman, again, I rise in very strong opposition to this bill.

This bill does so few things in terms of getting power to where it needs to be. They talk about the fact that the original 1221 was intended to help get power to places that need it to help alleviate congestion. But, in fact, the NYRI proposal in New York State does nothing whatsoever to prevent congestion. Rather, it does more to create congestion than to alleviate it.

I strongly support the Hinchey-Wolf amendment because I believe that using eminent domain to take people's property in order to run power lines over it is the wrong thing. It is not the American way. It is not what we came to Congress for. And I strongly oppose that.

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

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to point out, in response to a couple of remarks that were made, this project that Mr. ARCURI, Mr. HINCHEY, and I are concerned with, which could happen anywhere in the country to any of you, is not an interstate project. It occurs entirely within New York State, mysteriously starting in Utica and mysteriously ending in the little town of Campbell Hall. The other shoes have not dropped yet. But in New York State's Environmental Quality Review Act, nothing gets approved in under a year.

The proposal in section 1221 that after a year it kicks up authority to FERC is patently meant to usurp State authority. You can't get a subdivision, a power plant, a landfill, hardly any public project approved that fast. It usually takes a draft environmental impact statement; public comment; a final environmental impact statement; and at long last, approval. But two years is the shortest that I have ever seen. So to have this be one year means to me that the law was written to usurp State authority.

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

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

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. TOM DAVIS).

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment barring funding in this bill to be used to designate any area as a "national interest electric transmission corridor," or a NIET. NIET designation and the corresponding authority that has been given to FERC blatantly usurps States rights to designate and site transmission lines in accordance with what is best for its citizenry. There is a well-established successful history of States executing this authority, and there is no real reason to take it away.

I understand there needs to be a holistic approach to our energy policy,

but absent clear and definitive reasons to grant this authority to FERC, why are we allowing this Federal entity to circumvent State siting decisions, State comprehensive energy plans, and State efforts to promote energy efficiency and independence? It is clear more analysis and consideration is needed.

This amendment would not strike this provision forever. Rather, it would allow us more time to have debate, oversight, and public comment on the issue. When this provision was passed in the last Congress by the Senate and signed into law, it was a small piece of a broad energy overhaul. It received no debate on this floor and no vote in this body. Now, with the prospect of towering transmission lines running through 214 counties in 11 States across our Nation, and that is just the first chapter, we must take a time out to re-examine this provision.

What will you tell your constituents when these towering lines are denied by your State regulators, but mandated by FERC? You had your vote today and you need to vote for this amendment.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. Vote "yes" to allow us to give needed consideration to the broad ramifications of proposed NIET corridors and ensure that the rights of States are not unduly trampled.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH).

Mr. WALSH of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment.

Section 1221 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 is an abridgement of the rights of State and local governments to influence Federal policy as it pertains to their communities. In fact, section 1221, regarding the siting of overhead electricity transmission lines, permits the FERC to outright ignore State decisions and local considerations.

We are elected to represent a select constituency and our States, to advocate for their needs, and to advance our national interest. In this instance those responsibilities collide.

I recognize that the Federal Government can and should do more to modernize our Nation's aging and congested electric power infrastructure. But the Northeast corridor proposal negatively impacts the environment, decreases property values, poses health risks, and hurts local property tax revenue. What is worse is that it provides State and local regulatory agencies no ability to involve themselves.

By failing to support this amendment, Members of Congress will, in essence, allow unknown bureaucrats in Washington, huddled around a faceless map, to make critical decisions that affect the lives and financial well-being of thousands of American families. Surely that wasn't our Founding Fathers' intent. There has to be a better way than to circumvent a State's decisions and disregard property owners'

rights. By supporting this amendment, we create time to find that better way.

Mr. HOBSON. Might I inquire how much time I have left.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HOBSON. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. Chairman, I might say I am doing this out of courtesy to these gentlemen. I happen to oppose the amendment, but I think they have a right to be heard.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman.

We are not asking for a repeal. We are asking for time.

Again, this section, and it is amazing, was never voted on in the House. The power industry lobbyists have been roaming this Hill. Your constituents are back in their districts expecting you to represent them.

□ 1645

The corridor goes over and includes Gettysburg, where Lincoln gave the Gettysburg Address. Antietam, 20,000 people died. No environmental impact statement. No consideration of energy efficiency technology. No consideration for historic lands. It is an assault on property rights.

In the last Congress, we all got worked up on the Kelo decision. This is, in essence, whereby they can do this. And someone said, well, you go through the State. The power companies won't really try to go through the States. They will pro forma it, knowing that they can go to FERC and FERC will do it.

Here's what the FERC administrator said: "The authority to lawfully deny a permit is critically important to the States for ensuring that the interests of the local communities and the citizens are protected."

What the Commission does today, it's a significant inroad in traditional State transmission citing authority. It gives States two options: Either issue a permit, or we will do it for them. Obviously, there is no choice.

I strongly urge, in the interest of all these things we're talking about, a vote for the Hinchey amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Chairman, I have 3½ minutes left and understand I have the right to close. What I would like to do is to yield that 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New York before he seeks recognition, and would simply emphasize to the membership that I am doing this as a courtesy. I am in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. But I would yield my remaining time to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HINCHEY. I want to express my deep appreciation to Chairman VISCLOSKEY, not just for his excellent work in putting this appropriations bill together, but also for yielding me this time.

It's important for every Member of this House to focus their attention on what is happening here and what we are trying to do.

What we are dealing with here in the context of this appropriations bill, which, if this amendment is successful, will function out there for only 1 year, what we are attempting to deal with is an obscure provision in the 2005 Energy Policy Act, which hardly any Member of this House, I bet, understood when that bill was passed because of the obscurity of this provision.

What does this provision do? This provision tramples on States rights. It says if any State, any State in the Nation is unable to agree to a location for a high-tension transmission line, or if they stipulate that certain corrections have to be made, if that takes more than 1 year, which it would in almost every case, then the Federal Energy Agency steps in and they designate where the corridor will go, overriding States rights. I believe that this provision is contrary to a very significant provision in the United States Constitution, and this provision overrides States rights. That alone is good reason to vote for this amendment.

But beyond that, that provision in the Energy Policy Act of 2005, which this amendment would stop in its tracks for just 1 year so that we could give it further consideration, that provision stipulates that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission can exercise eminent domain on people's private personal property. That means that FERC can condemn anyone's private personal property in order to establish one of these high-tension transmission corridors. That in itself is bad enough.

But that provision in the Energy Policy Act of 2005 goes even further. It says that FERC, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, can grant that power of condemnation of individual citizens' private personal property rights to a private corporation so that the private corporation can now go in and declare eminent domain and condemn people's private personal property.

This provision in this Energy Policy Act overrides States rights and the individual rights of private American citizens. It was put in there inappropriately. Hardly anybody was aware of it when that bill passed. Many of us voted against it nevertheless. Still, it is part of the law.

What we are saying here in this amendment to this appropriations bill is give us another year to look at this issue. Let this issue be considered more carefully. We should not have this kind of impediment against States rights and people's private personal property rights.

I ask you, on behalf of all of your constituents, please join us in support of this amendment.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, those of us who lived through the brown-outs and rolling black-outs during the California energy crisis remember well how difficult the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission was to deal with, and it pains me to vote for a national policy that I hope will not need to be used.

However, after carefully reviewing the issue, I do not see a better alternative. My vote is a vote to keep the lights on in Southern California.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Hinchey-Wolf amendment and thank the authors for highlighting Section 1221 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005, which could allow DOE to designate large transmission corridors across the country and override States' decisions about transmission line placement.

Mr. Chairman, we all recognize that the energy requirements of our growing economy will place increasing demands on existing transmission facilities. In this regard, modernization is an important goal.

But we want to make certain that our State, county and local communities are fully engaged in the process to determine where transmission lines are located. Local leaders and property-owners have the clearest view of how these lines will affect their communities.

The goal of this amendment is to allow additional time for consideration of DOE and FERC's implementation process, so that there will be more complete deliberation and consideration of this potential regulation.

Municipal, county, and State officials want and need to be full partners in the process that leads to the siting of new transmission lines.

I urge support of the Hinchey-Wolf amendment.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. I yield back the balance of my time.

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.

Mr. HINCHEY. 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 New York will be postponed.

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Alaska.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to comment on the last speaker from New York about States rights and private property rights.

The taking of land is dear to me. And this Congress took 147 million acres of land in 1980 and made it into wilderness, parks and refuges. I bring that up because, of that 147, 27 of them were picked by the State. But we did it. That was private property.

But I am, Mr. Chairman, dismayed by this Congress, including Members of my own party, who voted today to eliminate funding for the Denali Commission and cripple the economic life to hundreds of small and impoverished communities throughout rural Alaska.

I am standing here today in the well defending the funding for the Denali

Commission because the Federal Government has, time and time again, as I mentioned, limited the ability of Alaskans to provide for themselves. We have trillions of dollars' worth of resources in our State; we haven't been able to produce them. This Congress has said no to ANWR. Many of the speakers who just spoke voted no on ANWR, no to any new mining, no to more Alaskan oil and natural gas. Not letting Alaskans provide for themselves is economic terrorism by this body.

We sent over 15.5 billion barrels of oil through the pipeline. At today's prices, that's equivalent to \$1.1 trillion. We have trillions of dollars' worth more of energy. If the State were allowed to manage its own resources, we wouldn't need the commission. And we wouldn't be sending trillions of American dollars overseas, to countries that hate us, for the energy Americans could be producing at home.

Unfortunately, energy ignorance in this body is increasing almost as fast as our dependence on foreign oil. Until Alaska is permitted to produce its own resources for themselves and for America, Alaskans will need the Denali Commission.

In 1998, Congress passed the Denali Commission Act. It provides job training and other economic development services for rural communities, chiefly in troubled communities, where unemployment exceeds 50 percent. It promotes rural development by providing power generation and transmission facilities, modern communication systems, water and sewer systems, and other infrastructure needs.

To give you an idea, my State of Alaska is 656,425 square miles, more than twice the size of Texas. Individual Alaskans own less than 1 percent of their land. The Federal Government owns over 60 percent. Flush toilets are just a luxury, and the Denali Commission tries to provide good sanitation to all Alaskans that do not have the ability to have potable water or remove the sewage they create. The fact is, I doubt if any of you have ever heard of a honey bucket.

How many of my colleagues have communities in their districts with no water and sewer? Well, Mr. Chairman, I have several. The Denali Commission has brought these systems to many of my rural communities, but there are still over 150 areas that suffer from poor sanitation and a lack of safe drinking water.

There are rural communities that are completely isolated, and my Alaskans can only get to and from their homes by boat or by small plane. There are no roads connecting these communities outside of Anchorage and Fairbanks.

The Commission also works carefully to ensure these communities have telephones, a reliable supply of electricity, and in some cases, Internet access.

Mr. Chairman, these are all things we in the Lower 48 take for granted, but for thousands of Alaskans they are luxuries.

In 2006, the Denali Commission leveraged its funding to develop basic infrastructure in over 100 Alaska communities. It invested money towards replacing aging fuel tanks and upgrading rural power plants, while at the same time pushing for wind generation, hydro, geothermal and biomass energy projects.

In addition to constructing several essential village primary care clinics, the Denali Commission funded major design initiatives for needed replacement hospitals in Nome and Barrow. It has now completed clinics in over 65 of these remote communities.

The Commission also provided funding to construct housing for teachers in nine frontier communities, which is essential for recruiting and retaining teachers to the remote areas of my State. The Commission worked tirelessly each year to make sure that my Alaskans are not treated like second-class citizens. The amendment will cripple the Denali Commission's ability to provide these basic resources and cripple many rural communities that are already on crutches.

Mr. Chairman, I can say this respectfully for one thing. We talk a lot about the economics of this Nation and energy. This Congress has lacked in a positive way. I am deeply disturbed that this amendment was adopted by my own party and by the opposite party. I hope you reconsider this when we go to conference.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

An amendment by Mr. PORTER of Nevada.

Amendment No. 18 by Ms. FOXX of North Carolina.

An amendment by Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

Amendment No. 17 by Mr. NEUGEBAUER of Texas.

Amendment No. 9 by Mrs. MUSGRAVE of Colorado.

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. BISHOP of New York.

Amendment No. 14 by Mr. JORDAN of Ohio.

An amendment by Mr. SHADEGG of Arizona.

Amendment No. 12 by Mr. PRICE of Georgia.

Amendment No. 15 by Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

An 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 OFFERED BY MR. PORTER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PORTER:
Page 21, strike line 22 and all that follows through page 24, line 9.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 80, noes 351, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 516]

AYES—80

- Abercrombie
- Ackerman
- Alexander
- Berkley
- Berman
- Bishop (UT)
- Blumenauer
- Campbell (CA)
- Cannon
- Capps
- Chandler
- Christensen
- Cohen
- Conyers
- Crowley
- Davis (CA)
- DeFazio
- DeLauro
- Doggett
- Engel
- Eshoo
- Farr
- Filner
- Gallegly
- Giffords
- Gillibrand
- Gohmert
- Grijalva
- Hall (NY)
- Harman
- Heller
- Hirono
- Holt
- Honda
- Jackson (IL)
- Jackson-Lee (TX)
- Jones (OH)
- Kucinich
- Lantos
- Lee
- Lewis (GA)
- Lofgren, Zoe
- Markey
- Matheson
- McCotter
- McDermott
- McGovern
- McKeon
- Meehan
- Miller, George
- Nadler
- Pallone
- Paul

NOES—351

- Aderholt
- Akin
- Allen
- Altmire
- Andrews
- Arcuri
- Baca
- Bachmann
- Bachus
- Baird
- Baker
- Baldwin
- Barrett (SC)
- Barrow
- Bartlett (MD)
- Barton (TX)
- Berry
- Biggert
- Bilbray
- Bilirakis
- Bishop (GA)
- Bishop (NY)
- Blackburn
- Blunt
- Boehner
- Bonner
- Bono
- Boozman
- Bordallo
- Boren
- Boswell
- Boucher
- Boustany
- Boyd (FL)
- Boyd (KS)
- Brady (PA)
- Brady (TX)
- Bralely (IA)
- Brown (SC)
- Brown, Corrine
- Brown-Waite,
- Ginny
- Buchanan
- Burgess
- Burton (IN)
- Butterfield
- Buyer
- Calvert
- Camp (MI)
- Cantor
- Capito
- Capuano
- Cardoza
- Carnahan
- Carney
- Carson
- Carter
- Castle
- Castor
- Chabot
- Clarke
- Clay
- Cleaver
- Clyburn
- Coble
- Cole (OK)
- Conaway
- Cooper
- Costa
- Costello
- Courtney
- Cramer
- Crenshaw
- Cubin
- Cuellar
- Culberson
- Cummings
- Davis (AL)
- Davis (IL)
- Davis (KY)
- Davis, David
- Davis, Lincoln
- Davis, Tom
- Deal (GA)
- DeGette
- Delahunt
- Dent
- Diaz-Balart, L.
- Dicks
- Dingell
- Donnelly
- Doolittle
- Doyle
- Drake
- Dreier
- Duncan
- Edwards
- Ehlers
- Ellison
- Ellsworth
- Emanuel
- Emerson
- English (PA)
- Etheridge
- Everett
- Faleomavaega
- Fallin
- Fattah
- Feeny
- Ferguson
- Flake
- Forbes
- Fortenberry
- Fortuño
- Fossella
- Foxx
- Frank (MA)
- Franks (AZ)
- Frelinghuysen
- Garrett (N.J.)
- Gerlach
- Gilchrest
- Gillmor
- Gingrey
- Gonzalez
- Goode
- Goodlatte
- Gordon
- Granger
- Graves
- Green, Al
- Green, Gene
- Gutierrez
- Hall (TX)
- Hare
- Hastert
- Hastings (FL)
- Hastings (WA)
- Hayes
- Hensarling
- Herger
- Herseth Sandlin
- Higgins
- Hill
- Hinchey
- Hinojosa
- Hobson
- Hodes
- Hoekstra
- Holden
- Hooley
- Hoyer
- Hulshof

- Hunter
- Inglis (SC)
- Inslee
- Israel
- Issa
- Jefferson
- Jindal
- Johnson (GA)
- Johnson (IL)
- Johnson, E. B.
- Johnson, Sam
- Jones (NC)
- Jordan
- Kagen
- Kanjorski
- Kaptur
- Keller
- Kennedy
- Kildee
- Kilpatrick
- Kind
- King (IA)
- King (NY)
- Kingston
- Kirk
- Klein (FL)
- Kline (MN)
- Knollenberg
- Kuhl (NY)
- LaHood
- Lamborn
- Lampson
- Langevin
- Larsen (WA)
- Larson (CT)
- Latham
- LaTourette
- Levin
- Lewis (CA)
- Lewis (KY)
- Linder
- Lipinski
- LoBiondo
- Loeb sack
- Lowe
- Lucas
- Lungren, Daniel E.
- Lynch
- Mack
- Mahoney (FL)
- Maloney (NY)
- Manzullo
- Marchant
- Marshall
- Matsui
- McCarthy (CA)
- McCarthy (NY)
- McCaul (TX)
- McCollum (MN)
- McCrery
- McHenry
- McHugh
- McIntyre
- McMorris
- Rodgers
- McNerney
- McNulty
- Meek (FL)
- Meeks (NY)
- Melancon
- Mica
- Michaud
- Miller (FL)
- Miller (MI)
- Miller (NC)
- Miller, Gary
- Mitchell
- Mollohan
- Moore (KS)
- Moore (WI)
- Moran (KS)
- Moran (VA)
- Murphy (CT)
- Murphy, Patrick
- Murphy, Tim
- Murtha
- Musgrave
- Myrick
- Napolitano
- Neal (MA)
- Neugebauer
- Norton
- Nunes
- Oberstar
- Obey
- Olver
- Pascrell
- Pastor
- Pence
- Perlmutter
- Peterson (MN)
- Peterson (PA)
- Petri
- Pickering
- Pitts
- Platts
- Poe
- Pomeroy
- Price (GA)
- Price (NC)
- Pryce (OH)
- Putnam
- Radanovich
- Rahall
- Ramstad
- Rangel
- Regula
- Rehberg
- Reichert
- Renzi
- Reyes
- Reynolds
- Rogers (KY)
- Rogers (MI)
- Rohrabacher
- Ros-Lehtinen
- Roskam
- Ross
- Roybal-Allard
- Royce
- Ruppersberger
- Rush
- Ryan (OH)
- Ryan (WI)
- Sali
- Sánchez, Linda T.
- Sarbanes
- Saxton
- Schmidt
- Schwartz
- Scott (GA)
- Scott (VA)
- Sensenbrenner
- Serrano
- Sessions
- Sestak
- Shadegg
- Shays
- Shimkus
- Shuler
- Shuster
- Simpson
- Skelton
- Slaughter
- Smith (NE)
- Smith (NJ)
- Smith (TX)
- Smith (WA)
- Snyder
- Solis
- Space
- Spratt
- Stark
- Stearns
- Stupak
- Sutton
- Tancred
- Tanner
- Tauscher
- Petri
- Taylor
- Terry
- Thompson (MS)
- Thornberry
- Tiahrt
- Tiberi
- Towns
- Turner
- Upton
- Van Hollen
- Visclosky
- Walberg
- Walden (OR)
- Walsh (NY)
- Walz (MN)
- Wamp
- Wasserman
- Schultz
- Watt
- Welch (VT)
- Weldon (FL)
- Weller
- Westmoreland
- Whitfield
- Wicker
- Wilson (NM)
- Wilson (OH)
- Wilson (SC)
- Wolf
- Wu
- Wynn
- Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

- Bean
- Becerra
- Davis, Jo Ann
- Diaz-Balart, M.
- Ortiz
- Sullivan

□ 1724

Ms. ROYBALL-ALLARD, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mrs. CAPITO and Messrs. LARSON of Connecticut, REYNOLDS, BROWN of South Carolina, KILDEE, RUPPERSBERGER, SHULER, WALDEN of Oregon, TOWNS, TOM DAVIS of Virginia and ELLISON changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LEE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Messrs. THOMPSON of California, PALLONE, ALEXANDER, BERMAN, RODRIGUEZ, GRIJALVA, ENGEL, SIREs, MCDERMOTT, JACKSON of Illinois, WEINER, MEEHAN, CONYERS, COHEN, LANTOS and CAMPBELL of

California changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MS. FOXX

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 134, noes 293, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 517]

AYES—134

Akin	Foxx	Miller, Gary
Alexander	Franks (AZ)	Moran (KS)
Bachmann	Gallegly	Musgrave
Barrett (SC)	Garrett (NJ)	Myrick
Bartlett (MD)	Gillmor	Neugebauer
Bean	Gingrey	Nunes
Bilbray	Gohmert	Paul
Bilirakis	Goode	Pearce
Bishop (UT)	Goodlatte	Pence
Blackburn	Graves	Petri
Boehner	Hayes	Pickering
Bonner	Heller	Pitts
Bono	Hensarling	Platts
Boozman	Hergert	Poe
Brady (TX)	Hoekstra	Price (GA)
Brown-Waite,	Hulshof	Putnam
Ginny	Inglis (SC)	Ramstad
Buchanan	Jindal	Rehberg
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Reynolds
Burton (IN)	Jones (NC)	Rogers (AL)
Buyer	Jordan	Rogers (MI)
Camp (MI)	Keller	Rohrabacher
Campbell (CA)	King (IA)	Roskam
Cannon	Kingston	Royce
Cantor	Kline (MN)	Ryan (WI)
Capito	Knollenberg	Sali
Chabot	Lamborn	Schmidt
Coble	Lewis (KY)	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Linder	Sessions
Cooper	Lungren, Daniel	Shadegg
Cubin	E.	Shimkus
Culberson	Mack	Smith (NE)
Davis (KY)	Manzullo	Smith (TX)
Davis, David	Marchant	Stearns
Deal (GA)	Matheson	Tancredo
Diaz-Balart, L.	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCaul (TX)	Tiahrt
Drake	McCotter	Upton
Dreier	McCrery	Walberg
Duncan	McHenry	Waldon (FL)
Ellsworth	McKeon	Welder
Feeney	McMorris	Weller
Flake	Rodgers	Westmoreland
Forbes	Mica	Whitfield
Fortuño	Miller (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Fossella	Miller (MI)	Young (FL)

NOES—293

Abercrombie	Berkley	Brady (PA)
Ackerman	Berman	Braley (IA)
Aderholt	Berry	Brown (SC)
Allen	Biggart	Brown, Corrine
Altmire	Bishop (GA)	Butterfield
Andrews	Bishop (NY)	Calvert
Arcuri	Blumenauer	Capps
Baca	Bordallo	Capuano
Bachus	Boren	Cardoza
Baird	Boswell	Carnahan
Baker	Boucher	Carney
Baldwin	Boustany	Carson
Barrow	Boyd (FL)	Carter
Barton (TX)	Boyda (KS)	Castle

Castor	Inslee	Price (NC)
Chandler	Israel	Pryce (OH)
Christensen	Issa	Rahall
Clarke	Jackson (IL)	Rangel
Clay	Jackson-Lee	Regula
Cleaver	(TX)	Reichert
Clyburn	Jefferson	Renzi
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Reyes
Cole (OK)	Johnson (IL)	Rodriguez
Conyers	Johnson, E. B.	Rogers (KY)
Costa	Jones (OH)	Ross
Costello	Kagen	Rothman
Courtney	Kanjorski	Roybal-Allard
Cramer	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Crenshaw	Kennedy	Rush
Crowley	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Cuellar	Kilpatrick	Salazar
Cummings	Kind	Sánchez, Linda
Davis (AL)	King (NY)	T.
Davis (CA)	Kirk	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis (IL)	Klein (FL)	Sarbanes
Davis, Lincoln	Kucinich	Saxton
Davis, Tom	Kuhl (NY)	Schakowsky
DeFazio	LaHood	Schiff
DeGette	Lampson	Schwartz
Delahunt	Langevin	Scott (GA)
DeLauro	Lantos	Scott (VA)
Dent	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Dicks	Larson (CT)	Sestak
Dingell	Latham	Shays
Doggett	LaTourette	Shea-Porter
Donnelly	Lee	Sherman
Doolittle	Levin	Shuler
Doyle	Lewis (CA)	Simpson
Edwards	Lewis (GA)	Sires
Ehlers	Lipinski	Skelton
Ellison	LoBiondo	Slaughter
Emanuel	Loeback	Smith (NJ)
Emerson	Lofgren, Zoe	Smith (WA)
Engel	Lowey	Snyder
English (PA)	Lucas	Solis
Eshoo	Lynch	Souder
Etheridge	Maloney (FL)	Space
Everett	Maloney (NY)	Spratt
Faleomavaega	Markey	Stark
Fallin	Marshall	Stupak
Farr	Matsui	Sutton
Fattah	McCarthy (NY)	Tanner
Ferguson	McCollum (MN)	Tauscher
Filner	McDermott	Taylor
Fortenberry	McGovern	Thompson (CA)
Frank (MA)	McHugh	Thompson (MS)
Frelinghuysen	McIntyre	Thornberry
Gerlach	McNerney	Tiberi
Giffords	McNulty	Tierney
Gilchrest	Meehan	Towns
Gillibrand	Meeke (FL)	Turner
Gonzalez	Meeks (NY)	Udall (CO)
Gordon	Melancon	Udall (NM)
Granger	Michaud	Van Hollen
Green, Al	Miller (NC)	Velázquez
Green, Gene	Miller, George	Visclosky
Grijalva	Mitchell	Walden (OR)
Gutierrez	Mollohan	Walsh (NY)
Hall (NY)	Moore (KS)	Walz (MN)
Hall (TX)	Moore (WI)	Wamp
Hare	Moran (VA)	Wasserman
Harman	Murphy (CT)	Schultz
Hastert	Murphy, Patrick	Waters
Hastings (FL)	Murphy, Tim	Watson
Hastings (WA)	Murtha	Watt
Herseht Sandlin	Nadler	Waxman
Higgins	Napolitano	Weiner
Hill	Neal (MA)	Welch (VT)
Hinchev	Norton	Wexler
Hinojosa	Oberstar	Olver
Hirono	Oliver	Wilson (NM)
Hobson	Pallone	Wilson (OH)
Hodes	Pascrell	Wolf
Holden	Pastor	Woolsey
Holt	Perlmutter	Wu
Honda	Peterson (MN)	Wynn
Hookey	Peterson (PA)	Yarmuth
Hoyer	Pomeroy	Young (AK)
Hunter	Porter	

NOT VOTING—10

Becerra	Ortiz	Shuster
Blunt	Payne	Sullivan
Davis, Jo Ann	Radanovich	
Obey	Ros-Lehtinen	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1727

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. UDALL OF NEW MEXICO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 121, noes 312, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 518]

AYES—121

Aderholt	Fortuño	Melancon
Akin	Fossella	Miller (FL)
Alexander	Foxx	Miller (MI)
Andrews	Franks (AZ)	Miller, Gary
Bachmann	Garrett (NJ)	Mitchell
Baker	Gerlach	Moran (KS)
Barrett (SC)	Gilchrest	Musgrave
Barrow	Gillibrand	Myrick
Bartlett (MD)	Gillmor	Pearce
Berkley	Gingrey	Pence
Bilirakis	Gohmert	Peterson (MN)
Bishop (UT)	Graves	Pickering
Blunt	Hall (TX)	Pitts
Boehner	Heller	Poe
Bono	Hensarling	Price (GA)
Boozman	Hergert	Rahall
Boren	Hoekstra	Ramstad
Boswell	Hulshof	Rogers (MI)
Boustany	Hunter	Roskam
Brady (TX)	Issa	Royce
Burgess	Jindal	Ryan (WI)
Burton (IN)	Jordan	Salazar
Buyer	Kind	Scott (VA)
Cannon	King (NY)	Sessions
Cantor	Kline (MN)	Shadegg
Carter	Lamborn	Shays
Castle	LaTourette	Shimkus
Chabot	Lewis (CA)	Souder
Chandler	Linder	Space
Cole (OK)	Lucas	Stearns
Cubin	Lungren, Daniel	E.
Davis, David	E.	Tancredo
Davis, Lincoln	Mack	Thompson (CA)
Dent	Marshall	Towns
Diaz-Balart, L.	Matheson	Udall (CO)
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCarthy (CA)	Udall (NM)
Duncan	McCaul (TX)	Walberg
Fallin	McCollum (MN)	Walden (OR)
Feeney	McCotter	Weller
Filner	McCrery	Westmoreland
Flake	McHenry	Wilson (NM)

NOES—312

Abercrombie	Boyd (FL)	Clarke
Ackerman	Boyda (KS)	Clay
Allen	Brady (PA)	Cleaver
Altmire	Braley (IA)	Clyburn
Arcuri	Brown (SC)	Coble
Baca	Brown, Corrine	Cohen
Bachus	Brown-Waite,	Conaway
Baird	Ginny	Conyers
Baldwin	Buchanan	Cooper
Barton (TX)	Butterfield	Costa
Bean	Calvert	Costello
Berman	Camp (MI)	Courtney
Berry	Campbell (CA)	Cramer
Biggart	Capito	Crenshaw
Bilbray	Capps	Crowley
Bishop (GA)	Capuano	Cuellar
Bishop (NY)	Cardoza	Culberson
Blackburn	Carnahan	Cummings
Blumenauer	Carney	Davis (AL)
Bonner	Carson	Davis (CA)
Bordallo	Castor	Davis (IL)
Boucher	Christensen	Davis (KY)

Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Forbes
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Giffords
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Herseht Sandlin
Hill
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick

King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Wicker
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Becerra Ortiz
Davis, Jo Ann Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1734

Messrs. CROWLEY, MOORE of Kansas, THOMPSON of Mississippi, TOM DAVIS of Virginia and Ms. JACKSON-

LEE of Texas changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. BOOZMAN, MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida and MORAN of Kansas changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. NEUGEBAUER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 133, noes 298, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 519]

AYES—133

Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blunt
Boehner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Chabot
Conaway
Cooper
Culberson
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doggett
Doolittle
Dreier
Fallin
Feeney
Flake
Fortuño
Foxy
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gohmert

NOES—298

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca

Granger
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Lamborn
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Matheson
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Paul

NOT VOTING—6

Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Bonner
Bordallo
Boren

Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Calvert
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Donnelly
Doyle
Drake
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall (NY)
Hare

NOT VOTING—6

Gutierrez
Larsen (WA)
Ortiz
Sullivan

Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Herseht Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCormack (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Pomeroy
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN
The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1738

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MRS. MUSGRAVE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished 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 Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 166, noes 267, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 520]

AYES—166

Aderholt	Forbes	McMorris
Akin	Fortenberry	Rodgers
Altmire	Fortuño	Mica
Bachmann	Fossella	Miller (FL)
Bachus	Fox	Miller, Gary
Barrett (SC)	Franks (AZ)	Mitchell
Bartlett (MD)	Frelinghuysen	Moran (KS)
Bean	Garrett (NJ)	Murphy, Patrick
Biggert	Gerlach	Musgrave
Bilbray	Gillmor	Myrick
Bilirakis	Gingrey	Neugebauer
Bishop (UT)	Gohmert	Nunes
Blackburn	Goode	Paul
Blunt	Goodlatte	Pearce
Boehner	Granger	Pence
Bonner	Graves	Peterson (PA)
Bono	Hall (TX)	Petri
Boozman	Hastert	Pickering
Brady (TX)	Hastings (WA)	Pitts
Brown-Waite,	Hayes	Platts
Ginny	Heller	Poe
Buchanan	Hensarling	Price (GA)
Burton (IN)	Herger	Putnam
Buyer	Hill	Radanovich
Calvert	Hoekstra	Ramstad
Camp (MI)	Hulshof	Reynolds
Campbell (CA)	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Cannon	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (MI)
Cantor	Issa	Rohrabacher
Capito	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Castle	Jordan	Royce
Chabot	Kagen	Ryan (WI)
Coble	Keller	Sali
Cole (OK)	King (IA)	Schmidt
Conaway	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Cooper	Kirk	Sessions
Crenshaw	Kline (MN)	Shadegg
Cubin	Knollenberg	Shays
Culberson	Lamborn	Shimkus
Davis (KY)	Lewis (KY)	Shuler
Davis, David	Linder	Shuster
Davis, Tom	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Deal (GA)	Lungren, Daniel	Smith (TX)
Dent	E.	Souder
Diaz-Balart, L.	Mack	Stearns
Diaz-Balart, M.	Manzullo	Tancredo
Donnelly	Marchant	Tanner
Drake	Matheson	Taylor
Dreier	McCarthy (CA)	Terry
Duncan	McCaul (TX)	Thornberry
Ellsworth	McCotter	Tiahrt
Everett	McCrery	Tiberi
Fallin	McHenry	Upton
Feeney	McKeon	Walberg
Flake		

Walden (OR)
Weldon (FL)

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Frank (MA)
Gallegly
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene

Becerra
Davis, Jo Ann

Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)

NOES—267

Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseht Sandlin
Higgins
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Latham
Costa
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meehan
Meeke (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton

NOT VOTING—4

Ortiz
Sullivan

Wolf
Young (FL)

Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
 T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman
 Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN
The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1743

Mr. SALI and Mr. HUNTER changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF NEW YORK

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 146, noes 285, answered “present” 1, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 521]

AYES—146

Abercrombie	Holt	Payne
Ackerman	Honda	Perlmutter
Arcuri	Hoyer	Peterson (MN)
Baca	Inslee	Pomeroy
Baird	Israel	Rodriguez
Baldwin	Jackson (IL)	Rothman
Barrow	Jackson-Lee	Roybal-Allard
Berkley	(TX)	Ruppersberger
Berman	Kagen	Sánchez, Linda
Berry	Kennedy	T.
Bishop (NY)	Kind	Sanchez, Loretta
Boswell	Kingston	Sarbanes
Brady (PA)	Kucinich	Schakowsky
Braley (IA)	Langevin	Schiff
Capps	Lantos	Schwartz
Capuano	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Cardoza	Larson (CT)	Sensenbrenner
Carney	Lee	Sestak
Castor	Levin	Sestak
Chandler	Lewis (GA)	Shays
Christensen	LoBiondo	Shea-Porter
Clarke	Loeb sack	Shuler
Clay	Lofgren, Zoe	Sires
Clever	Lowey	Skelton
Cohen	Lynch	Slaughter
Courtney	Maloney (NY)	Smith (NJ)
Davis (CA)	Markey	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	Matsui	Solis
DeLauro	McDermott	Space
Doggett	McGovern	Stark
Donnelly	McNerney	Stupak
Emanuel	McNulty	Sutton
Eshoo	Meehan	Taylor
Etheridge	Meeks (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Faleomavaega	Melancon	Tierney
Farr	Miller (NC)	Towns
Fattah	Miller, George	Udall (CO)
Ferguson	Mollohan	Udall (CO)
Filner	Moore (KS)	Velázquez
Frank (MA)	Moore (WI)	Walz (MN)
Gallegly	Moran (VA)	Wasserman
Giffords	Murphy (CT)	Schultz
Gilchrest	Murphy, Tim	Watson
Gillibrand	Murtha	Waxman
Gonzalez	Nadler	Welch (VT)
Gordon	Napolitano	Wexler
Green, Al	Neal (MA)	Wilson (SC)
Green, Gene	Norton	Woolsey
		Wu
		Yarmuth
		Young (FL)

NOES—285

Aderholt Feeny Miller (FL)
 Akin Ferguson Miller (MI)
 Alexander Flake Miller, Gary
 Allen Forbes Mollohan
 Altmire Fortenberry Moran (KS)
 Andrews Fortuño Murphy, Tim
 Bachmann Fossella Murtha
 Bachus Foxx Musgrave
 Baker Franks (AZ) Neugebauer
 Barrett (SC) Frelinghuysen Norton
 Bartlett (MD) Gallegly Nunes
 Barton (TX) Garrett (NJ) Oberstar
 Bean Gerlach Obey
 Biggert Giffords Pastor
 Bilbray Gilchrist Pearce
 Bilirakis Gillmor Pence
 Bishop (GA) Gingrey Peterson (PA)
 Bishop (UT) Gohmert Petri
 Blackburn Gonzalez Pickering
 BlumenaUER Goode Pitts
 Blunt Goodlatte Platts
 Boehner Gordon Poe
 Bonner Granger Porter
 Bono Graves Price (GA)
 Boozman Green, Gene Price (NC)
 Bordallo Gutierrez Pryce (OH)
 Boren Hall (TX) Putnam
 Boucher Hastert Radanovich
 Boustany Hastings (FL) Rahall
 Boyd (FL) Hastings (WA) Ramstad
 Boyda (KS) Hayes Rangel
 Brady (TX) Heller Regula
 Brown (SC) Hensarling Rehberg
 Brown, Corrine Herger Reichert
 Brown-Waite, Hinojosa Renzi
 Ginny Hobson Reyes
 Buchanan Hoekstra Reynolds
 Burgess Holden Rogers (AL)
 Burton (IN) Hooley Rogers (KY)
 Butterfield Hulshof Rogers (MI)
 Buyer Hunter Rohrabacher
 Calvert Inglis (SC) Ros-Lehtinen
 Camp (MI) Issa Roskam
 Campbell (CA) Jefferson Ross
 Cannon Jindal Royce
 Cantor Johnson (GA) Rush
 Capito Johnson (IL) Ryan (OH)
 Carnahan Johnson, E. B. Ryan (WI)
 Carson Johnson, Sam Salazar
 Carter Jones (NC) Sali
 Castle Jones (OH) Saxton
 Chabot Jordan Schmidt
 Clyburn Kanjorski Scott (GA)
 Coble Kaptur Serrano
 Cole (OK) Keller Sessions
 Conaway Kildee Shadegg
 Conyers Kilpatrick Sherman
 Cooper King (IA) Shimkus
 Costa King (NY) Shuster
 Costello Kirk Simpson
 Cramer Klein (FL) Smith (NE)
 Crenshaw Kline (MN) Smith (TX)
 Crowley Knollenberg Snyder
 Cubin Kuhl (NY) Souder
 Cuellar LaHood Spratt
 Culberson Lamborn Stearns
 Cummings Lampson TancredO
 Davis (AL) Latham Tanner
 Davis (IL) LaTourette Tauscher
 Davis (KY) Lewis (CA) Terry
 Davis, David Lewis (KY) Thompson (MS)
 Davis, Lincoln Linder Thornberry
 Davis, Tom Lipinski Tiahrt
 Deal (GA) Lucas Tiberi
 DeGette Lungren, Daniel Turner
 Delahunt E. Udall (NM)
 Dent Mack Upton
 Diaz-Balart, L. Mahoney (FL) Van Hollen
 Diaz-Balart, M. Manzullo Vislosky
 Dicks Marchant Walberg
 Dingell Marshall Walden (OR)
 Doolittle Matheson Walsh (NY)
 Doyle McCarthy (CA) Wamp
 Drake McCaul (TX) Waters
 Dreier McCollum (MN) Watt
 Duncan McCotter Weiner
 Edwards McCreery Weldon (FL)
 Ehlers McHenry Weller
 Ellison McHugh Westmoreland
 Ellsworth McIntyre Whitfield
 Emerson McKeon Wicker
 Engel McMorris Wilson (NM)
 English (PA) Rodgers Wilson (OH)
 Everett Meek (FL) Wolf
 Fallin Mica Wynn
 Fattah Michaud Young (AK)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

McCarthy (NY)

NOT VOTING—5

Becerra Ortiz Sullivan
 Davis, Jo Ann Paul

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1749

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

Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California changed her vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. JORDAN OF OHIO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 129, noes 301, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 522]

AYES—129

Akin Foxx Miller, Gary
 Bachmann Franks (AZ) Moran (KS)
 Bachus Gallegly Musgrave
 Barrett (SC) Garrett (NJ) Myrick
 Bartlett (MD) Gohmert Neugebauer
 Bilbray Goode Pearce
 Bilirakis Goodlatte Pence
 Bishop (UT) Granger Peterson (PA)
 Blackburn Graves Petri
 Blunt Hall (TX) Pickering
 Boehner Hastert Pitts
 Bonner Hayes Platts
 Bono Heller Poe
 Boozman Hensarling Price (GA)
 Brady (TX) Herger Putnam
 Brown-Waite, Hoekstra Radanovich
 Ginny Hunter Inglis (SC) Ramstad
 Buchanan Johnson, Sam Reynolds
 Burton (IN) Jordan Rogers (MI)
 Buyer Campbell (CA) Rohrabacher
 Camp (MI) Kagen Roskam
 Cannon Keller Royce
 Cantor King (IA) Ryan (WI)
 Chabot Kline (MN) Sali
 Coble Lamborn Schmidt
 Cole (OK) Lewis (KY) Sensenbrenner
 Conaway Linder Sessions
 Cubin Lucas Shadegg
 Culberson Lungren, Daniel Shimkus
 Davis (KY) E. Shuster
 Davis, David Mack Smith (NE)
 Davis, Tom Manzanillo Smith (TX)
 Deal (GA) Marchant Souder
 Diaz-Balart, M. McCarthy (CA) Stearns
 Drake McCaul (TX) TancredO
 Dreier McCotter Terry
 Duncan McHenry Tiberi
 Everrett McKeon Upton
 Fallin McMorris Walberg
 Feeny Rodgers Walden (OR)
 Forbes Mica Weldon (FL)
 Fortuño Miller (FL) Westmoreland
 Fossella Miller (MI) Wilson (SC)

NOES—301

Abercrombie Giffords Moran (VA)
 Ackerman Gilchrist Murphy (CT)
 Aderholt Gillibrand Murphy, Patrick
 Alexander Gillmor Murphy, Tim
 Allen Gingrey Murtha
 Altmire Gonzalez Nadler
 Andrews Gordon Napolitano
 Arcuri Green, Al Neal (MA)
 Baca Green, Gene Norton
 Baird Grijalva Oberstar
 Baker Gutierrez Obey
 Baldwin Hall (NY) Olver
 Barrow Hare Pallone
 Barton (TX) Harman Pascrell
 Bean Hastings (FL) Pastor
 Berkley Hastings (WA) Payne
 Berman Herseth Sandlin Perlmutter
 Berry Higgins Peterson (MN)
 Biggert Hill Pomeroy
 Bishop (GA) Hinchey Porter
 Bishop (NY) Hinojosa Price (NC)
 BlumenaUER Hirono Pryce (OH)
 Bordallo Hobson Rahall
 Boren Hodes Rangel
 Boswell Holden Regula
 Boucher Holt Rehberg
 Boustany Honda Reichert
 Boyd (FL) Hooley Renzi
 Boyda (KS) Hoyer Reyes
 Brady (PA) Hulshof Rodriguez
 Braley (IA) Insee Rogers (AL)
 Brown (SC) Israel Rogers (KY)
 Brown, Corrine Jackson (IL) Ros-Lehtinen
 Burgess Jackson-Lee Ross
 Butterfield (TX) Rothman
 Calvert Jefferson Roybal-Allard
 Capito Jindal Ruppersberger
 Capuano Johnson (GA) Rush
 Cardoza Johnson (IL) Ryan (OH)
 Carnahan Johnson, E. B. Salazar
 Carney Jones (NC) Sanchez, Linda
 Carson Jones (OH) T.
 Carter Kanjorski Sanchez, Loretta
 Castle Kaptur Sarbanes
 Castor Kennedy Saxton
 Chandler Kildee Schakowsky
 Christensen Kilpatrick Schiff
 Clarke Kind Schwartz
 Clay King (NY) Scott (GA)
 Cleaver Kingston Scott (VA)
 Clyburn Kirk Serrano
 Cohen Klein (FL) Sestak
 Conyers Knollenberg Shays
 Cooper Kucinich Shea-Porter
 Costa Kuhl (NY) Sherman
 Costello LaHood Shuler
 Courtney Lampson Simpson
 Cramer Langevin Sires
 Crenshaw Lantos Skelton
 Crowley Crenshaw Slaughter
 Cuellar Larson (CT) Smith (NJ)
 Cummings Cuellar Latham Smith (WA)
 Davis (AL) LaTourette Snyder
 Davis (CA) Lee Solis
 Davis (IL) Levin Space
 Davis (KY) Lewis (CA) Spratt
 Davis, David Lewis (GA) Stark
 Davis, Lincoln Lipinski Stupak
 Davis, Tom Lipinski Stupak
 Deal (GA) LoBiondo Sutton
 DeGette Loeb sack Tanner
 Delahunt Loeb sack Tauscher
 Dent Lofgren, Zoe Taylor
 Diaz-Balart, L. Lynch Thompson (CA)
 Dicks Mahoney (FL) Thompson (MS)
 Dingell Maloney (NY) Thornberry
 Doggett Markey Tiahrt
 Donnelly Marshall Tierney
 Doolittle Matheson Towns
 Doyle Matsui Turner
 Edwards McCarthy (NY) Udall (CO)
 Ehlers McCollum (MN) Udall (NM)
 Ellison McDermott Van Hollen
 Ellsworth McGovern Velázquez
 Emanuel McHugh Vislosky
 Emerson McIntyre Walsh (NY)
 Engel McNeerney Walz (MN)
 English (PA) McNulty Wamp
 Eshoo Meehan Wasserman
 Etheridge Meek (FL) Schultz
 Faleomavaega Meeks (NY) Waters
 Farr Melancon Watson
 Fattah Michaud Watt
 Ferguson Miller (NC) Waxman
 Filner Miller, George Weiner
 Fortenberry Mitchell Welch (VT)
 Frank (MA) Mollohan Weller
 Frelinghuysen Moore (KS) Wexler
 Gerlach Moore (WI) Whitfield

Wicker Woolsey Young (AK)
Wilson (NM) Wu Young (FL)
Wilson (OH) Wynn
Wolf Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Becerra McCrery Sullivan
Davis, Jo Ann Ortiz
Flake Paul

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1752

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHADEGG

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 157, noes 274, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 523]

AYES—157

Aderholt Fallin Matheson
Akin Ferguson McCarthy (CA)
Alexander Flake McCaul (TX)
Bachmann Forbes McCotter
Baker Fortuño McCrery
Barrett (SC) Fossella McHenry
Barton (TX) Foxx McKeon
Bilbray Franks (AZ) McMorris
Bilirakis Gallegly Rodgers
Bishop (UT) Garrett (NJ) Mica
Blackburn Giffords Miller (FL)
Blunt Gingrey Miller (MI)
Boehner Gohmert Miller, Gary
Bonner Goode Mitchell
Bono Goodlatte Moran (KS)
Boozman Graves Murphy, Tim
Boustany Hall (NY) Musgrave
Brady (TX) Hall (TX) Neugebauer
Brown (SC) Hastert Nunes
Brown-Waite, Hastings (WA) Pearce
Ginny Hayes Pence
Buchanan Heller Peterson (PA)
Burgess Hensarling Pickering
Burton (IN) Herger Pitts
Buyer Hoekstra Poe
Calvert Hulshof Price (GA)
Campbell (CA) Hunter Putnam
Cannon Inglis (SC) Radanovich
Cantor Issa Regula
Castle Jindal Rehberg
Chabot Johnson, Sam Reichert
Coble Jordan Renzi
Cole (OK) Keller Reynolds
Conaway King (IA) Rogers (AL)
Costa King (NY) Rogers (KY)
Cubin Kingston Rogers (MI)
Culberson Kline (MN) Rohrabacher
Davis (KY) Kuhl (NY) Roskam
Davis, David Lamborn Royce
Deal (GA) Lewis (KY) Ryan (WI)
Dent Linder Sali
Diaz-Balart, L. LoBiondo Saxton
Diaz-Balart, M. Lucas Schmidt
Doolittle Mack Sensenbrenner
Drake Manzullo Sessions
Dreier Marchant Shadegg

Shimkus Thornberry
Smith (NE) Tiahrt
Smith (TX) Towns
Souder Upton
Stearns Walberg
Tancredo Walden (OR)
Terry Weldon (FL)

NOES—274

Abercrombie Gilchrest
Ackerman Gillibrand
Allen Gillmor
Altmire Gonzalez
Andrews Gordon
Arcuri Granger
Baca Green, Al
Bachus Green, Gene
Baird Grijalva
Baldwin Gutierrez
Barrow Hare
Bartlett (MD) Harman
Bean Hastings (FL)
Berkley Herseeth Sandlin
Berman Higgins
Berry Hill
Biggert Hinchey
Bishop (GA) Hinojosa
Bishop (NY) Hirono
Blumenauer Hobson
Bordallo Hodes
Boren Holden
Boswell Holt
Boucher Honda
Boyd (FL) Hooley
Boya (KS) Hoyer
Brady (PA) Inslee
Braley (IA) Israel
Brown, Corrine Jackson (IL)
Butterfield Jackson-Lee
Camp (MI) (TX)
Capito Jefferson
Capps Johnson (GA)
Capuano Johnson (IL)
Cardoza Johnson, E. B.
Carnahan Jones (NC)
Carney Jones (OH)
Carson Kagen
Carter Kanjorski
Castor Kaptur
Chandler Kennedy
Christensen Kildee
Clarke Kilpatrick
Clay Kind
Cleaver Kirk
Clyburn Klein (FL)
Cohen Knollenberg
Conyers Kucinich
Cooper LaHood
Costello Lampson
Courtney Langevin
Cramer Lantos
Crenshaw Larsen (WA)
Crowley Larson (CT)
Cuellar Latham
Cummings Lathourette
Davis (AL) Lee
Davis (CA) Levin
Davis (IL) Lewis (CA)
Davis, Lincoln Lewis (GA)
Davis, Tom Lipinski
DeFazio Loeb sack
DeGette Lofgren, Zoe
Delahunt Loney
DeLauro Lungren, Daniel
Dicks E.
Dingell Lynch
Doggett Mahoney (FL)
Donnelly Maloney (NY)
Doyle Markey
Duncan Marshall
Edwards Matsui
Ehlers McCarthy (NY)
Ellison McCollum (MN)
Ellsworth McDermott
Emanuel McGovern
Emerson McHugh
Engel McIntyre
English (PA) McNerney
Eshoo McNulty
Etheridge Meehan
Everett Meek (FL)
Faleomavaega Meeks (NY)
Farr Melancon
Fattah Michaud
Finler Miller (NC)
Fortenberry Miller, George
Frank (MA) Mollohan
Frelinghuysen Moore (KS)
Gerlach Moore (WI)

Westmoreland Weller
Whitfield Wexler
Wilson (NM) Wicker
Wilson (SC) Wu

NOT VOTING—6

Becerra Feeney Paul
Davis, Jo Ann Ortiz Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). One minute remains on this vote.

□ 1757

Mrs. MYRICK changed her vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 158, noes 275, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 524]

AYES—158

Aderholt Duncan Manzano
Akin Everett Marchant
Altmire Fallin Matheson
Bachmann Feeney McCarthy (CA)
Bachus Flake McCaul (TX)
Barrett (SC) Forbes McCotter
Bartlett (MD) Fortuño McCrery
Bean Fossella McHenry
Biggert Foxx McKeon
Bilbray Franks (AZ) McMorris
Bilirakis Frelinghuysen Rodgers
Bishop (UT) Gallegly Mica
Blackburn Garrett (NJ) Miller (FL)
Blunt Gerlach Miller (MI)
Boehner Gillmor Miller, Gary
Bonner Gingrey Mitchell
Bono Gohmert Moran (KS)
Boozman Goode Murphy, Patrick
Brady (TX) Goodlatte Musgrave
Brown-Waite, Granger Myrick
Ginny Graves Neugebauer
Buchanan Hall (TX) Nunes
Burton (IN) Hastings (WA) Paul
Buyer Hayes Pearce
Calvert Heller Pence
Camp (MI) Hensarling Peterson (PA)
Campbell (CA) Herger Petri
Cannon Hoekstra Pickering
Cantor Hulshof Pitts
Capito Inglis (SC) Platts
Castle Issa Poe
Chabot Johnson, Sam Price (GA)
Coble Jordan Putnam
Cole (OK) Kagen Radanovich
Conaway Keller Ramstad
Cubin King (IA) Reynolds
Culberson Kingston Rogers (AL)
Davis (KY) Kirk Rogers (MI)
Davis, David Kline (MN) Rohrabacher
Deal (GA) Lamborn Roskam
Dent Lewis (KY) Royce
Diaz-Balart, L. Linder Ryan (WI)
Diaz-Balart, M. Lucas Sali
Donnelly Lungren, Daniel Schmidt
Drake E. Sensenbrenner
Dreier Mack Sessions

Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder

Stearns
Tancredo
Tanner
Taylor
Terry
Thornberry
Tiberi
Upton

Walberg
Walden (OR)
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Young (FL)

Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)

Becerra
Davis, Jo Ann

Wilson (OH)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu

Wynn
Yarmuth
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—4

Ortiz
Sullivan

NOES—295

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleave
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gilchrist
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey

Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslie
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCormack (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha

Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wolf

NOES—275

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleave
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gilchrist

Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hunter
Inslie
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (NY)
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCormack (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)

Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiahrt
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN
The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). One minute remains in this vote.

□ 1801

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

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. WILSON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 138, noes 295, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 525]

AYES—138

Aderholt
Akin
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite,
Ginny
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cuberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Flake

Forbes
Fortuño
Fossella
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Kagen
Keller
King (IA)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Lamborn
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)

Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Reynolds
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wilson (SC)

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bean
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Butterfield
Calvert
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castor
Chandler
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleave
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrist
Gillibrand
Gillmor
Gingrey

Woolsey Wynn Young (AK)
Wu Yarmuth Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—4

Becerra Ortiz
Davis, Jo Ann Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1806

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HINCHEY

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished 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 Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 257, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 526]

AYES—174

Ackerman Gerlach McDermott
Allen Giffords McGovern
Andrews Gilchrist McHugh
Arcuri Gillibrand McNerney
Baird Gonzalez McNulty
Baldwin Green, Al Meehan
Berman Grijalva Meek (FL)
Bishop (NY) Gutierrez Meeks (NY)
Blumenauer Hall (NY) Michaud
Boswell Hastings (FL) Miller (NC)
Brady (PA) Higgins Miller, George
Capito Hinchey Mitchell
Capps Hirono Moore (WI)
Capuano Hodes Moran (VA)
Carney Holden Murphy (CT)
Carson Holt Murphy, Patrick
Castle Hoolley Murphy, Tim
Castor Hoyer Murtha
Chandler Israel Musgrave
Christensen Jackson (IL) Nadler
Clarke Jackson-Lee Napolitano
Clay (TX) Neal (MA)
Cleaver Johnson (GA) Oberstar
Cohen Jones (NC) Obey
Conyers Kagen Olver
Courtney Kanjorski Pallone
Cummings Kaptur Pascrell
Davis (CA) Kennedy Pastor
Davis, Tom Kind Paul
DeFazio Kirk Payne
DeGette Kucinich Perlmutter
Delahunt Kuhl (NY) Petri
DeLauro Langevin Pitts
Dicks Larson (CT) Platts
Doggett LaTourette Porter
Donnelly Lee Price (NC)
Drake Levin Ramstad
Ellison Lewis (GA) Reichert
Emanuel Lipinski Rodriguez
Engel LoBiondo Rothman
Eshoo Loeb sack Sarbanes
Etheridge Lofgren, Zoe Saxton
Farr Lowey Schakowsky
Fattah Mahoney (FL) Schwartz
Ferguson Maloney (NY) Scott (VA)
Filner Marshall Sestak
Forbes Matsui Shays
Fortuño McCarthy (NY) Shea-Porter
Frelinghuysen McCollum (MN) Shuler
Garrett (NJ) McCotter Sires

Slaughter Thompson (CA)
Smith (NJ) Thompson (MS)
Solis Tierney
Spratt Udall (CO)
Stark Udall (NM)
Stupak Van Hollen
Tanner Walsh (NY)
Tauscher Wasserman
Taylor Schultz

NOES—257

Abercrombie Feeney Neugebauer
Aderholt Flake Norton
Akin Fortenberry Nunes
Alexander Fossella Pearce
Altmire Foxx Pence
Baca Frank (MA) Peterson (MN)
Bachmann Franks (AZ) Peterson (PA)
Bachus Gallegly Pickering
Baker Gillmor Poe
Barrett (SC) Gingrey Pomeroy
Barrow Gohmert Price (GA)
Bartlett (MD) Goode Pryce (OH)
Barton (TX) Goodlatte Putnam
Bean Gordon Radanovich
Berkley Granger Rahall
Berry Graves Rangel
Biggart Green, Gene Regula
Bilbray Hall (TX) Rehberg
Bilirakis Hare Renzi
Bishop (GA) Harman Reyes
Bishop (UT) Hastert Reynolds
Blackburn Hastings (WA) Rogers (AL)
Blunt Hayes Rogers (KY)
Boehner Heller Rogers (MI)
Bonner Hensarling Rohrabacher
Bono Herger Ros-Lehtinen
Boozman Herse th Sandlin Roskam
Bordallo Hill Ross
Boren Hinojosa Roybal-Allard
Boucher Hobson Royce
Boustany Hoekstra Ruppertsberger
Boyd (FL) Honda Rush
Boyd (KS) Hulshof Ryan (OH)
Brady (TX) Hunter Ryan (WI)
Braley (IA) Inglis (SC) Salazar
Brown (SC) Inslee Sali
Brown, Corrine Issa Sánchez, Linda
Brown-Waite, T. Sanchez, Loretta
Ginny Schiff
Buchanan Johnson (IL) Schmidt
Burgess Johnson, E. B. Scott (GA)
Burton (IN) Johnson, Sam Sensenbrenner
Butterfield Jordan Serrano
Buyer Keller Sessions
Calvert Kildee Shadegg
Camp (MI) Kilpatrick Sherman
Campbell (CA) King (IA) Shimkus
Cantor King (NY) Shuster
Cardoza Kingston Simpson
Carnahan Klein (FL) Skelton
Carter Kline (MN) Smith (NE)
Chabot Knollenberg Smith (TX)
Clyburn LaHood Smith (WA)
Coble Lamborn Snyder
Cole (OK) Lampson Souder
Conaway Larsen (WA) Space
Cooper Latham Stearns
Costa Lewis (CA) Sutton
Costello Lewis (KY) Tancredo
Cramer Linder Terry
Crenshaw Lucas Thornberry
Crowley Lungren, Daniel Tiahrt
Cubin E. Tiberi
Cuellar Lynch Towns
Culberson Mack Turner
Davis (AL) Manzullo Upton
Davis (IL) Marchant Velázquez
Davis (KY) Markey Visclosky
Davis, David Matheson Walberg
Davis, Lincoln McCarthy (CA) Walden (OR)
Deal (GA) McCaul (TX) Walz (MN)
Dent McCreery Wamp
Diaz-Balart, M. McHenry Watson
Dingell McIntyre Watt
Doolittle McKeon Weiner
Doyle McMorris Weldon (FL)
Dreier Rodgers Weller
Duncan Melancon Westmoreland
Edwards Mica Wexler
Ehlers Miller (FL) Whitfield
Ellsworth Miller (MI) Wicker
Emerson Miller, Gary Wilson (NM)
English (PA) Mollohan Wilson (OH)
Everett Moore (KS) Wilson (SC)
Faleomavaega Moran (KS) Young (AK)
Fallin Myrick Young (FL)

Waxman
Welch (VT)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—6

Becerra Diaz-Balart, L. Ortiz
Davis, Jo Ann Jones (OH) Sullivan

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1810

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in strong support of H.R. 2641, the “Energy and Water Appropriations Act of 2007.” I also rise to express my sincere appreciation to Mr. VISCLOSKEY, the chairman of the Energy and Water Subcommittee and his Ranking Member, Mr. HOBSON of Ohio, for working together in a constructive effort to renew America’s dependence on foreign oil and cutting greenhouse gas emissions.

Moreover, this bill merits our support because it increases the Nation’s commitment to long-term basic research by increasing the Federal investment that is so critical to developing the next generation of scientific breakthroughs. Federal funding for research and development has declined steadily over the last decade, and sound science has been compromised by political interference. This legislation takes a giant step toward reversing this disturbing trend.

Mr. Chairman, in the 1970s, our Nation faced an energy crisis unlike any we had ever experienced before. The OPEC oil embargo of 1973 led to skyrocketing prices, long gas lines, gas sales only every other day, and shortages where gas was simply unavailable. We experienced another oil shock in the late 1970s and under the leadership of President Jimmy Carter, America responded with unprecedented initiatives for energy research. But over the years, gas prices came down, incentive was lost, and these efforts fell by the wayside.

Today, we again face an energy crisis, only this time it is coupled with the enormous challenge of addressing the reality of global climate change. H.R. 2641 attempts to face these twin crises with over three billion dollars to address global climate change—researching its effects and working on technologies to slow it down—and investment in renewable energy programs that both reduce greenhouse gases and help our Nation meet its energy needs.

The bill cuts funding for poorly thought-out plans for nuclear weapons recognizing that because of the enormous cost and the importance to our national security they require smart strategies not blank checks. Instead it works to keep Americans safe with a 75 percent increase in funding for nuclear non-proliferation efforts. It also funds the Army Corps of Engineers, strengthening our Nation’s navigation infrastructure and improving flood control programs.

Before I highlight some of the more attractive provisions of this legislation, which by the way contains no earmarks, let me explain briefly why this energy and water legislation is so near and dear to the people I represent in the 18th Congressional District of Texas.

In the past 2 years, Houston, the center of my district, has experienced some of the most devastating acts of nature in its history.

Six years ago this month, in June 2001, Tropical Storm Allison hit Southeast Texas. Until Hurricane Katrina, this storm would become the costliest tropical storm in U.S. history. Flash flooding initiated quite rapidly during Houston's rush hour late Friday afternoon and on into the evening hours. Widespread street flooding was the initial threat, but the high rainfall amounts forced almost all the major Houston area bayou systems into severe flooding, with some to record levels. All major freeways in the Houston area were severely flooded at at least one location during this event. During this single event alone, rainfall in Harris County ranged from just 2 inches in the extreme west to in excess of 20 inches over Green's Bayou in the east. Countywide, the average rainfall was 8 inches with over two-thirds of the county receiving over 10 inches.

The total damage across Southeast Texas approached \$5 billion (\$4.88 billion in Harris County alone). Twenty-two deaths were caused by Allison, with each of these fatalities occurred in Harris County. At this time, thunderstorms began to train and merge across the Houston metro area, and the system evolved into a powerful complex right over the most populated portion of our CWA that evening. This complex progressed south and east into the early morning hours of Saturday, June 9. Very heavy rainfall was observed for up to 10 hours in some locations, and rainfall rates of 4 inches or more per hour were observed throughout the night. A station in northeast Houston recorded over 26 inches of rain in almost 10 hours.

In response, the Tropical Storm Allison Recovery Project was launched. TSARP is a joint study effort by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, and the Harris County Flood Control District, the District. The purpose of the TSARP project is to develop technical products that will assist the local community in recovery from the devastating flooding, and provide the community with a greater understanding of flooding and flood risks. The end product of the study is new Flood Insurance Rate Maps.

TSARP mission statement is: To assist residents of Harris County in recovery from Tropical Storm Allison and minimize damages from future floods by investigating the flood event and by developing current, accurate, and timely flood hazard information.

TSARP used state-of-the-art technology. TSARP has yielded many products that will help us better understand our flood risk. These products will assist citizens in making important decisions, and will assist public agencies in infrastructure planning. The hoped for end result of TSARP is a more informed and disaster resistant community and one that is better prepared.

Purchasing flood insurance before June 18 allowed people to "grandfather" their existing floodplain status and pay lower premiums for flood insurance. Once the maps became official on June 18, residents and business owners whose properties are categorized in higher-risk flood zones on the new maps may pay higher rates.

According to FEMA, a "Regulatory Floodway" means the channel of a river or other watercourse and the adjacent land areas that must be reserved in order to discharge the base flood without cumulatively increasing the water surface elevation more than a des-

ignated height. Communities must regulate development in these floodways to ensure that there are no increases in upstream flood elevations. For streams and other watercourses where FEMA has provided Base Flood Elevations, BFEs, but no floodway has been designated, the community must review floodplain development on a case-by-case basis to ensure that increases in water surface elevations do not occur, or identify the need to adopt a floodway if adequate information is available.

FEMA regulations say "Communities must regulate development in these floodways to ensure that there are no increases in upstream flood elevations." The City of Houston interprets that as no development within the floodway. This is not necessarily correct. Construction can take place but it cannot obstruct the water. Elevating the structure gets the same effect but the city denies this as they said (debris may collect under the structure). They will only allow a remodeling permit if the improvements do not exceed 50 percent of the structures value.

There is one neighborhood along White Oak Bayou that is greatly affected. The homes are of higher value than most of the district. Alternatives to resolve their issue includes widening the bayou or diverting floodwater.

The Harris County Flood District is now investigating these alternatives. Otherwise, the only solution would be a change in the city's ordinance allowing construction in the floodway.

I am looking forward to working with colleagues on the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee to explore ways and means of resolving this problem so that Houstonians will not be forced out of their homes and unable to afford flood insurance.

Mr. Chairman, let me provide this partial listing of some of the many good provisions in this legislation. First, H.R. 2641 will improve U.S. waterways and flood protection by increasing funding for the Army Corps of Engineers by \$713.4 million above the President's request to address a \$1 billion backlog of operations and needed maintenance. This backlog needs to be addressed to sustain the coastal and inland navigation infrastructure critical to the U.S. economy, and the gaps in flood protection highlighted in Hurricane Katrina.

Second, the legislation will help reduce dependence on foreign oil and cut greenhouse gas emissions. Renewable energy and energy efficiency programs are funded at \$1.9 billion—a 50 percent increase in energy efficiency and renewable energy programs. This is in addition to the additional \$300 million added in the FY 2007 joint resolution. In contrast, the President's FY 2008 request for renewable energy and energy efficiency research is the same as it was in 2001 in real terms.

Funding for research and development of alternative fuels such as corn based and cellulosic ethanol and biodiesel is increased by 40 percent above the President's request. Solar Energy demonstration projects receive a 34 percent increase above the President's request. There is also \$22 million to research new ways of generating power from water flow, and \$44.3 million for geothermal energy, neither of which were funded in the President's request. (This is on top of the \$95 million for upgrades to existing hydropower dams funded under the Army Corps.)

I could go on and on. This thoughtful legislation provides funding to invest in new vehicle technology; energy efficient buildings; weatherization; carbon capture and sequestration; and climate change science. And it cuts wasteful spending as well.

For example, H.R. 2641 directs the Energy Department to develop a concrete plan to improve its contract management. The Energy Department has been on the GAO list of programs that are at high-risk for waste, fraud, abuse and mismanagement for seventeen years in a row.

The bill also cuts Global Nuclear Energy Partnership, GNEP, funding by \$285 million below the President's request and \$47.5 million below 2007 for this initiative to reprocess spent nuclear fuel and burn long-lived radioactive materials. There are concerns that this project is unsafe, will cost tens of billions of dollars, and could make it far easier for terrorists to obtain plutonium to make nuclear weapons.

The bill also secures substantial savings by cutting wasteful and unnecessary nuclear weapons programs by \$5.9 billion, \$632 million below the President's request and \$396 million below 2007. It cuts to 37 specific weapons program accounts, including the Reliable Replacement Warhead program. The existing stockpile will continue to provide the Nation's nuclear deterrent for the next two decades, and certainly until the President develops a strategic nuclear weapons plan to transform the nuclear weapons complex away from its expensive Cold War configuration to a more affordable, sustainable structure.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 2641 and urge my colleagues to join me. I thank Chairman VISCLOSKEY for his fine work in bringing this exceptional legislation to the House floor where it should receive an overwhelmingly favorable vote.

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. 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. ALTMIRE) having assumed the chair, Mr. ANDREWS, Acting 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. 2641) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EMMETT TILL UNSOLVED CIVIL RIGHTS CRIME ACT OF 2007

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the title to H.R. 923 is amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the investigation of certain unsolved civil rights crimes, and for other purposes."

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2764,

and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
FOREIGN OPERATIONS AND RE-
LATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIA-
TIONS ACT, 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 498 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2764.

□ 1814

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2764) making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, with Mr. CAPUANO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I'm pleased to present to the House H.R. 2764, the fiscal year 2008 appropriations bill for the Department of State, foreign operations and related programs.

I'm particularly pleased that the appropriations bill that I bring to the floor as chairwoman of the State Foreign Operations Subcommittee reflects a bipartisan process, and that the ranking member, FRANK WOLF, was instrumental in pulling this bill together, as well as a very talented and engaged subcommittee.

I'm very proud of our product. The bill before you totals \$34.243 billion in new discretionary budget authority, \$2.9 billion above fiscal year 2007, not counting supplemental appropriations, and \$700 million below the President's request. This is the largest increase over the prior year enacted level that this subcommittee has received in over a decade. I appreciate Chairman OBEY's recognition of the importance of this bill and the programs it funds.

The bill includes over \$7 billion to address our strategic priorities and national security interests, as well as increases for programs that promote development and reduce low global poverty, meet humanitarian needs, and respond to urgent health crises, priorities at the core of our interests abroad.

For the war on terror, this bill includes \$2.656 billion in economic assistance for our strategic partners and \$4.509 billion in military assistance. While the bill includes \$1.057 billion for Afghanistan, there are no additional funds for Iraq. In light of the \$2.86 billion provided for Iraq reconstruction in the recently passed supplemental appropriations bill, and the \$2.89 billion requested by the administration in the 2008 supplemental, I feel extremely strongly that there is no need at this time for additional funds for the same purposes in this bill, given the extraordinary needs to be met around the world.

The bill includes over \$4.7 billion to support State Department operations, both in the United States and abroad. The recommendation fully funds the President's request for worldwide security upgrades, and provides \$364 million for public diplomacy efforts at the State Department, as well as \$501 million for educational and cultural exchanges.

The bill also provides \$6.517 billion for global health. Addressing tuberculosis, avian flu, HIV/AIDS and other health threats is one of the best preventive measures to protect the health of the United States. We provide \$5.082 billion for international HIV/AIDS efforts, which, in addition to appropriations in other bills, brings the total for international HIV/AIDS to \$5.876 billion. This is \$550 million above the President's fiscal year 2008 budget request, and includes \$850 million for the global fund to fight AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria.

The bill also includes \$1.73 billion for development programs managed by the U.S. Agency for International Development, an increase of \$225 million above the fiscal year 2007 enacted level. The increased resources will fund an initiative on basic education for developing countries, as well as an expansion of safe water and environment programs.

As many of you know, basic education has been one of my top priorities for years and, I'm pleased to say, a top priority of the members of this committee. I'm convinced that access to quality primary education not only improves an individual's chances for a better, more productive life, it creates a more tolerant and informed citizenry. I've provided a total of \$750 million for basic education in the bill, an increase of \$200 million from the fiscal year 2007 House-passed bill.

This bill also provides \$501 million for the environment and clean energy programs, including \$106 million for the global environmental facility, and \$175 million for biodiversity programs at USAID. We've also included a provision that encourages the Export-Import Bank to support projects in renewable energy and other environmentally beneficial products. This initiative could result in an estimated \$1 billion in additional green exports in 2008.

There is \$1.8 billion for the Millennium Challenge Account. This is a \$1.2

billion reduction from the request, but \$48 million above the fiscal year 2007 enacted level. I'm supportive of the MCA. I want to make this very clear. And while I believe the MCA is under the strong and capable management of Ambassador Danilovich, I would like to see more results on the ground from the \$6 billion that has already been appropriated, \$2.1 billion of which is not yet even obligated, before we significantly scale-up the MCA. The reduction to MCA helps us address the shortfalls for development assistance and health accounts. We have also funded a basic education initiative as well as expansion of safe water and environmental programs.

With an investment of over \$5 billion in the 6 years that Plan Colombia has been in effect, the numbers of hectares involved in coca production has increased by 42 percent. Because our efforts to combat narcotics in Colombia have been ineffective for some time, this bill restructures assistance for Colombia. We cut overall funding by 10 percent, or \$59 million, and shift greater resources to the development, interdiction, rule of law and justice programs. It is time for the Colombians to take ownership over their eradication and military assistance programs, and this cut reflects that position.

The bill provides over \$5.4 billion for Africa, including a total of \$949.3 million for Sudan, \$210.5 million of which is for Darfur, \$104 million above the request. We have provided \$100 million in increased funding for the African Union Force in Darfur.

This bill allows us to fully meet the President's request for Israel and Egypt. And I want to make it clear that Egypt is a friend, an important ally in the war on terror and a partner for peace in the Middle East. However, there are growing concerns about the independence of its judiciary, police abuses, and the smuggling operation from Egypt into Gaza. As a result, this bill requires the Secretary of State to certify that steps are being taken to address these issues before a portion of the military aid to Egypt can be released.

Lastly, as you know, U.S. Government assistance for family planning is prohibited for groups that provide, promote, refer or counsel on abortions. Groups that merely exercise their legal rights to advocate for policies such as the legalization of abortion are denied U.S. assistance. This bill provides an exemption to those restrictions simply for the provision of contraceptive commodities. Foreign family planning organizations, which have been denied USAID family planning funds, could receive contraceptives from USAID to help reduce unintended and high-risk pregnancies, abortions and the spread of HIV, as well as save the lives of mothers and infants.

This provision does not amend any of the provisions in existing law that prohibit assistance for abortions or otherwise restrict family planning funds.

They're all there; 10 of them are all there; and 5 for restricting family planning; 10 to be sure that there's no money for abortion, and 5 to restrict family planning. All there.

Mr. Chairman, this package of foreign assistance before you preserves our Nation's interests, reflects the values and priorities of the American people, and most importantly, helps to protect the security of Americans at home and abroad. It was developed in a

bipartisan manner, and I expect it to have wide support as it passes the House.

In closing, let me say again that it has been a pleasure working with Ranking Member WOLF and the minority staff, Christine Kojac, Rob Blair, Mike Ringler, Alice Hogans and Molly Miller. I would like to thank my vice chair, JESSE JACKSON, Jr. for his hard work on this bill. I greatly appreciate the outstanding work and support of

Nisha Desai, Lucy Heenan, Craig Higgins, Steve Marchese, Michele Sumilas, Mark Lopes and Celia Alvarado. They're all competent, professional and really a joy to work with. The work we have accomplished together in this bill will help make America more secure and will improve the lives of millions throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to submit this bill, and urge your favorable consideration.

State - Foreign Operations - and Related Programs Appropriations Act - FY 2008 (H.R. 2764)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCY					
DEPARTMENT OF STATE					
Administration of Foreign Affairs					
Diplomatic and consular programs.....	3,656,564	3,977,940	3,820,018	+163,454	-157,922
(Transfer out).....	(-3,949)	---	---	(+3,949)	---
Worldwide security upgrades.....	681,949	964,760	964,760	+282,811	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28).....	870,658	---	---	-870,658	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28) (Transfer out).....	(-20,000)	---	---	(+20,000)	---
Total, Diplomatic and consular programs.....	5,209,171	4,942,700	4,784,778	-424,393	-157,922
Emergency appropriations.....	870,658	---	---	-870,658	---
Capital investment fund.....	58,143	70,743	59,062	+919	-11,681
Office of Inspector General.....	29,914	32,508	32,508	+2,594	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28).....	36,500	---	---	-36,500	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28) Special IG for Iraq reconstruction (By transfer).....	(35,000)	---	---	(-35,000)	---
Educational and cultural exchange programs.....	445,671	486,400	501,400	+55,729	+15,000
(Transfer out).....	---	---	(-6,000)	(-6,000)	(-6,000)
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28).....	20,000	---	---	-20,000	---
Representation allowances.....	8,175	8,175	8,175	---	---
Protection of foreign missions and officials.....	9,270	18,000	28,000	+18,730	+10,000
Embassy security, construction, and maintenance.....	592,277	792,534	729,898	+137,621	-62,636
Worldwide security upgrades.....	898,575	806,900	806,900	-91,675	---
Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service.....	4,940	19,000	14,000	+9,060	-5,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28) (By transfer).....	(20,000)	---	---	(-20,000)	---
Repatriation Loans Program Account:					
Direct loans subsidy.....	703	678	678	-25	---
Administrative expenses.....	599	607	607	+8	---
Total, Repatriation loans program account.....	1,302	1,285	1,285	-17	---
Payment to the American Institute in Taiwan.....	15,826	16,351	16,351	+525	---
Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund.....	125,000	122,500	158,900	+33,900	+36,400
Total, Administration of Foreign Affairs.....	7,454,764	7,317,096	7,141,257	-313,507	-175,839
International Organizations					
Contributions to international organizations, current year assessment.....	1,151,318	1,354,400	1,354,400	+203,082	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28).....	50,000	---	---	-50,000	---
Contributions for international peacekeeping activities, current year.....	1,135,275	1,107,000	1,302,000	+166,725	+195,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28).....	283,000	---	---	-283,000	---
Total, International Organizations.....	2,619,593	2,461,400	2,656,400	+36,807	+195,000
Emergency appropriations.....	333,000	---	---	-333,000	---
International Commissions					
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:					
Salaries and expenses.....	27,718	30,430	30,430	+2,712	---
Construction.....	5,232	71,725	15,725	+10,493	-56,000
American sections, international commissions.....	9,962	10,395	10,630	+668	+235
International fisheries commissions.....	23,694	21,000	26,000	+2,306	+5,000
Total, International commissions.....	66,606	133,550	82,785	+16,179	-50,765

State - Foreign Operations - and Related Programs Appropriations Act - FY 2008 (H.R. 2764)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Other					
Payment to the Asia Foundation.....	13,821	10,000	15,000	+1,179	+5,000
Center for Middle Eastern-Western dialogue.....	750	875	875	+125	---
Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship program.....	494	500	500	+6	---
Israeli Arab scholarship program.....	370	375	375	+5	---
East-West Center.....	18,994	10,000	---	-18,994	-10,000
National Endowment for Democracy.....	74,042	80,000	80,000	+5,958	---
Total, Department of State.....	10,249,434	10,013,796	9,977,192	-272,242	-36,604
Emergency appropriations.....	1,260,158	---	---	-1,260,158	---
Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad					
Salaries and expenses.....	493	499	499	+6	---
Commission on International Religious Freedom					
Salaries and expenses.....	3,000	3,300	3,400	+400	+100
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28) (By transfer).....	(258)	---	---	(-258)	---
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe					
Salaries and expenses.....	2,004	2,037	2,037	+33	---
Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,876	2,000	2,000	+124	---
United States - China Economic and Security Review Commission					
Salaries and expenses.....	2,962	4,000	4,000	+1,038	---
United States Senate-China United States Senate Interparliamentary Groups					
Salaries and expenses.....	149	---	---	-149	---
United States Institute of Peace					
Operating expenses.....	22,064	30,000	25,000	+2,936	-5,000
RELATED AGENCIES					
Broadcasting Board of Governors					
International Broadcasting Operations.....	639,126	618,777	671,632	+32,506	+52,855
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28).....	10,000	---	---	-10,000	---
Broadcasting to Cuba.....	---	38,700	---	---	-38,700
Broadcasting capital improvements.....	7,624	10,748	10,748	+3,124	---
Total, Broadcasting Board of Governors.....	656,750	668,225	682,380	+25,630	+14,155
Total, title I, Department of State and Related Agencies.....	10,938,732	10,723,857	10,696,508	-242,224	-27,349
Appropriations.....	(9,668,574)	(10,723,857)	(10,696,508)	(+1,027,934)	(-27,349)
Emergency appropriations.....	1,270,158	---	---	-1,270,158	---
(Transfer out).....	(-3,949)	---	(-6,000)	(-2,051)	(-6,000)

State - Foreign Operations - and Related Programs Appropriations Act - FY 2008 (H.R. 2764)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE II - EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE					
EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES					
Subsidy appropriation.....	26,382	68,000	68,000	+41,618	---
Administrative expenses.....	72,468	78,000	78,000	+5,532	---
Inspector General.....	990	1,000	1,000	+10	---
Negative subsidy.....	-45,000	---	---	+45,000	---
Offsetting collections.....	---	-146,000	-146,000	-146,000	---
Total, Export-Import Bank of the United States..	54,840	1,000	1,000	-53,840	---
OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION					
Noncredit account:					
Administrative expenses.....	41,851	47,500	47,500	+5,649	---
Insurance fees and other offsetting collections...	-258,000	-236,000	-237,000	+21,000	-1,000
Subsidy appropriation.....	20,073	29,000	20,000	-73	-9,000
Total, Overseas Private Investment Corporation..	-196,076	-159,500	-169,500	+26,576	-10,000
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
Trade and development agency.....	50,391	50,400	50,400	+9	---
Total, title II Export and investment assistance	-90,845	-108,100	-118,100	-27,255	-10,000
TITLE III - BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE					
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
United States Agency for International Development					
Child survival and health programs fund.....	1,718,150	1,564,279	1,955,150	+237,000	+390,871
Global fund contribution.....	(247,500)	---	(250,000)	(+2,500)	(+250,000)
(Transfer out).....	(-5,940)	---	(-6,000)	(-60)	(-6,000)
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28).....	161,000	---	---	-161,000	---
Development assistance.....	1,508,760	1,041,248	1,733,760	+225,000	+692,512
(Transfer out).....	(-20,790)	(-21,000)	(-21,000)	(-210)	---
International disaster assistance.....	361,350	297,300	322,350	-39,000	+25,050
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28).....	165,000	---	---	-165,000	---
Transition Initiatives.....	39,600	37,200	40,000	+400	+2,800
Development Credit Authority:					
(By transfer).....	(20,790)	(21,000)	(21,000)	(+210)	---
Administrative expenses.....	7,920	7,400	7,400	-520	---
Subtotal, Development assistance.....	3,961,780	2,947,427	4,058,660	+96,880	+1,111,233
Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund.....	38,700	36,400	---	-38,700	-36,400
Operating expenses of the U.S. Agency for International Development.....	626,832	609,000	625,700	-1,132	+16,700
(By transfer).....	(5,940)	(6,000)	(6,000)	(+60)	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28).....	8,700	---	---	-8,700	---
Capital Investment Fund.....	69,300	126,000	87,300	+18,000	-38,700
Operating expenses of the U.S. Agency for Inter- national Development Office of Inspector General....	35,640	38,000	38,000	+2,360	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28).....	3,500	---	---	-3,500	---
Total, USAID.....	4,744,452	3,756,827	4,809,660	+65,208	+1,052,833
Emergency appropriations.....	338,200	---	---	-338,200	---

State - Foreign Operations - and Related Programs Appropriations Act - FY 2008 (H.R. 2764)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Other Bilateral Economic Assistance					
Economic support fund:					
Israel.....	120,000	---	---	-120,000	---
Egypt.....	455,000	415,000	415,000	-40,000	---
Other.....	1,880,010	2,904,567	2,241,506	+361,496	-663,061
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28).....	2,624,300	---	---	-2,624,300	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28) (By transfer) Dept. of Defense.....	(110,000)	---	---	(-110,000)	---
Subtotal, Economic support fund.....	5,079,310	3,319,567	2,656,506	-2,422,804	-663,061
International Fund for Ireland.....	13,365	---	15,000	+1,635	+15,000
Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States... Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28).....	273,900 214,000	289,322 ---	297,332 ---	+23,432 -214,000	+8,010 ---
Assistance for the Independent States of the former Soviet Union.....	452,000	351,585	397,585	-54,415	+46,000
Total, Other Bilateral Economic Assistance.....	6,032,575	3,960,474	3,366,423	-2,666,152	-594,051
Emergency appropriations.....	2,838,300	---	---	-2,838,300	---
INDEPENDENT AGENCIES					
Inter-American Foundation					
Appropriation.....	19,305	19,000	19,000	-305	---
African Development Foundation					
Appropriation.....	22,770	30,000	30,000	+7,230	---
Peace Corps					
Appropriation.....	319,640	333,500	333,500	+13,860	---
Millenium Challenge Corporation					
Appropriation.....	1,752,300	3,000,000	1,800,000	+47,700	-1,200,000
Department of State					
Global HIV/AIDS initiative.....	3,246,520	4,150,000	4,450,000	+1,203,480	+300,000
Global fund contribution.....	(377,500)	---	(300,000)	(-77,500)	(+300,000)
Democracy Fund.....	94,050	---	---	-94,050	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28).....	260,000	---	---	-260,000	---
International narcotics control and law enforcement... Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28).....	472,616 252,000	634,600 ---	568,475 ---	+95,859 -252,000	-66,125 ---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28) (Rescission).....	-13,000	---	---	+13,000	---
Andean Counterdrug Initiative.....	721,500	442,812	312,460	-409,040	-130,352
Migration and refugee assistance..... Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28).....	833,033 130,500	773,500 ---	829,900 ---	-3,133 -130,500	+56,400 ---
United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund.....	55,000	55,000	45,000	-10,000	-10,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28).....	55,000	---	---	-55,000	---
Nonproliferation, anti-terrorism, demining and related programs.....	405,999	464,000	467,000	+61,001	+3,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28).....	57,500	---	---	-57,500	---
Subtotal, Department of State.....	6,570,718	6,519,912	6,672,835	+102,117	+152,923
Emergency appropriations.....	755,000	---	---	-755,000	---

State - Foreign Operations - and Related Programs Appropriations Act - FY 2008 (H.R. 2764)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request

Department of the Treasury					
International Affairs Technical Assistance.....	19,800	24,800	18,000	-1,800	-6,800
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28).....	2,750	---	---	-2,750	---
Debt restructuring.....	64,350	207,300	200,300	+135,950	-7,000
Subtotal, Department of the Treasury.....	86,900	232,100	218,300	+131,400	-13,800
=====					
Total, title III, Bilateral economic assistance.	19,548,660	17,851,813	17,249,718	-2,298,942	-602,095
Appropriations.....	(15,627,410)	(17,851,813)	(17,249,718)	(+1,622,308)	(-602,095)
Emergency appropriations.....	(3,921,250)	---	---	(-3,921,250)	---
(By transfer).....	(26,730)	(27,000)	(27,000)	(+270)	---
(Transfer out).....	(-26,730)	(-21,000)	(-27,000)	(-270)	(-6,000)

TITLE IV - MILITARY ASSISTANCE					
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
International Military Education and Training.....	85,877	89,500	85,076	-801	-4,424
Foreign Military Financing Program:					
Grants:					
Israel.....	2,340,000	2,400,000	2,400,000	+60,000	---
Egypt.....	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	---	---
Other.....	910,800	836,000	809,236	-101,564	-26,764
Subtotal, Grants.....	4,550,800	4,536,000	4,509,236	-41,564	-26,764
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(41,600)	(41,900)	(41,900)	(+300)	---
(by transfer).....	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28).....	265,000	---	---	-265,000	---
Total, Foreign Military Financing.....	4,815,800	4,536,000	4,509,236	-306,564	-26,764
Peacekeeping operations.....	223,250	221,200	293,200	+69,950	+72,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28).....	230,000	---	---	-230,000	---
Subtotal, Peacekeeping operations.....	453,250	221,200	293,200	-160,050	+72,000
=====					
Total, title IV, Military assistance.....	5,354,927	4,846,700	4,887,512	-467,415	+40,812
Appropriations.....	(4,859,927)	(4,846,700)	(4,887,512)	(+27,585)	(+40,812)
Emergency appropriations.....	(495,000)	---	---	(-495,000)	---
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(41,600)	(41,900)	(41,900)	(+300)	---
=====					
TITLE V - MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE					
FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT					
International Financial Institutions					
World Bank Group					
Contribution to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development:					
Global Environment Facility.....	79,200	106,763	106,763	+27,563	---
Contribution to the International Development Association.....	940,500	1,060,000	950,000	+9,500	-110,000
Contribution to Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency.....	---	1,082	---	---	-1,082
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)....	(8,127)	(7,300)	(7,300)	(-827)	---
Total, World Bank Group.....	1,019,700	1,167,845	1,056,763	+37,063	-111,082

State - Foreign Operations - and Related Programs Appropriations Act - FY 2008 (H.R. 2764)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request

Contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank:					
Contribution to the Enterprise for the Americas					
Multilateral Investment Fund.....	1,725	29,232	25,000	+23,275	-4,232
Inter-American Investment Corporation.....	---	7,264	---	---	-7,264
Total, Inter-American Development Bank.....	1,725	36,496	25,000	+23,275	-11,496
Contribution to the Asian Development Fund.....	99,000	133,906	115,306	+16,306	-18,600
Contribution to the African Development Bank:					
Paid-in capital.....	3,602	2,037	2,037	-1,565	---
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)....	(88,334)	(31,919)	(31,919)	(-56,415)	---
Contribution to the African Development Fund.....	134,343	140,584	135,684	+1,341	-4,900
Total, African Development Bank.....	137,945	142,621	137,721	-224	-4,900
Contribution to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development:					
Paid-in capital.....	---	10	---	---	-10
(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)....	(2,250)	---	---	(-2,250)	---
Contribution to the International Fund for Agricultural Development.....	14,850	18,072	18,072	+3,222	---
Total, International Financial Institutions.....	1,273,220	1,498,950	1,352,862	+79,642	-146,088
International Organizations and Programs					
Appropriation.....	326,163	289,400	333,400	+7,237	+44,000
Total, title V, Multilateral economic assistance.....	1,599,383	1,788,350	1,686,262	+86,879	-102,088
(Limitation on callable capital subscript).....	(98,711)	(39,219)	(39,219)	(-59,492)	---
=====					
TITLE VI - GENERAL PROVISIONS					
Expenditure transfer (Sec. 540).....	---	---	---	---	---
Sec. 6084 Security in Asia.....	9,900	---	---	-9,900	---
Rescission.....	-231,350	---	---	+231,350	---
ATB pay raise (Sec. 111 of HJ Res. 20).....	-1,746	---	---	+1,746	---
Total, title VI, General Provisions.....	-223,196	---	---	+223,196	---
Appropriations.....	(8,154)	---	---	(-8,154)	---
=====					
Grand total.....	37,127,661	35,102,620	34,401,900	-2,725,761	-700,720
Appropriations.....	(31,672,603)	(35,102,620)	(34,401,900)	(+2,729,297)	(-700,720)
Emergency appropriations.....	(5,686,408)	---	---	(-5,686,408)	---
Rescissions.....	(-231,350)	---	---	(+231,350)	---
(By transfer).....	(26,730)	(27,000)	(27,000)	(+270)	---
(Transfer out).....	(-30,679)	(-21,000)	(-33,000)	(-2,321)	(-12,000)
(Limitation on administrative expenses).....	(41,600)	(41,900)	(41,900)	(+300)	---
(Limitation on callable capital subscript).....	(98,711)	(39,219)	(39,219)	(-59,492)	---

State - Foreign Operations - and Related Programs Appropriations Act - FY 2008 (H.R. 2764)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2007 Enacted	FY 2008 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP					
Scorekeeping adjustments:					
Undistributed FY08 Emergency appropriations.....	---	3,302,000	---	---	-3,302,000
Emergency appropriations.....	-5,689,908	-3,302,000	---	+5,689,908	+3,302,000
Diplomatic and consular fee proposal.....	---	---	---	---	---
ATB adjustment.....	---	---	---	---	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 110-28) Inter- national Affairs function.....	110,000	---	---	-110,000	---
Total, adjustments.....	-5,579,908	---	---	+5,579,908	---

Total (including adjustments).....	31,547,753	35,102,620	34,401,900	+2,854,147	-700,720
Amounts in this bill.....	(37,127,661)	(35,102,620)	(34,401,900)	(-2,725,761)	(-700,720)
Scorekeeping adjustments.....	(-5,579,908)	---	---	(+5,579,908)	---
Prior year outlays.....	---	---	---	---	---
=====					
Total mandatory and discretionary.....	31,547,753	35,102,620	34,401,900	+2,854,147	-700,720
Mandatory.....	(163,700)	(158,900)	(158,900)	(-4,800)	---
Discretionary.....	(31,384,053)	(34,943,720)	(34,243,000)	(+2,858,947)	(-700,720)
=====					
RECAP BY FUNCTION					
Mandatory.....	163,700	158,900	158,900	-4,800	---
Prior year outlays.....	---	---	---	---	---
Total, Mandatory.....	163,700	158,900	158,900	-4,800	---

Discretionary.....	31,384,053	34,943,720	34,243,000	+2,858,947	-700,720
Prior year outlays.....	---	---	---	---	---
Total, Discretionary.....	31,384,053	34,943,720	34,243,000	+2,858,947	-700,720
=====					
Grand total, Mandatory and Discretionary.....	31,547,753	35,102,620	34,401,900	+2,854,147	-700,720
=====					
DISCRETIONARY 302(b) ALLOCATION					
302(b) allocation.....	---	---	34,243,000	+34,243,000	+34,243,000
Over/under allocation.....	31,384,053	34,943,720	---	-31,384,053	-34,943,720

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1830

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

Let me start by commending the chairwoman on putting together a thoughtful bill, her first as the chairwoman of this new and important subcommittee. I must also recognize the chairwoman's continuation of this subcommittee's bipartisan tradition, as well as stating how much I appreciate the chairwoman's willingness to listen to our concerns and accommodate them as much as possible.

Overall, I think it is a very good bill, but I do have some concerns.

First and foremost, I believe this bill sends a terrible message to the State Department's officers and foreign service nationals and our military fighting in Iraq. The report accompanying the bill clearly states that there is no funding provided for Iraq. I intend to offer an amendment to restore \$158 million of the \$391 million that the President requested. I believe that not providing the requested funding for counterterrorism and de-mining activities is shortsighted and potentially dangerous. This program has trained more than 1,000 Iraqis in explosive detection and removal, therefore helping to protect the lives of our military and also improving public safety to reduce insurgent access to deadly munitions.

No funds are provided to develop effective civilian law enforcement and anti-terrorism programs in Iraq, specifically to focus on strengthening terrorist financing and money laundering.

No funds are provided to continue English language training and professional training for military officers in the United States. This training focuses on international human rights, fostering respect for civilian control of the military and the rule of law. Such funding is crucial if public statements by Members about wanting Iraqis to be able to defend themselves are, in fact, accurate and not purely rhetorical.

Also, this fits into the recommendations made by the Iraq Study Group, and when the resolution came up a while back that the other side had, I think 220-some Members said they supported the Iraq Study Group.

Well, no funding is provided to help Iraq manage their national budget, a crucial step towards Iraq self-reliance. No funding is included to enable Iraq to stimulate local economies to counter the impact of the insurgents. Assistance was requested and denied that would help Iraq create jobs in the agriculture sector and create food production, thereby stimulating Iraq's second largest economic sector after the oil area. These funds would directly weaken the insurgent base in rural areas, which we all on both sides want to do.

Finally, no funding is included to help national reconciliation, political reform, and fair provincial elections in 2008 and fair national elections in 2009. Additional funding was requested to

develop the Iraqi criminal justice system. These necessary funds would allow the Iraqi government to identify, bring to justice, and incarcerate insurgents and terrorists who are trying to destabilize the country. So, hopefully, we can adopt that amendment.

The second issue of concern for me is there are new provisions regarding funding for family planning programs overseas. The President clearly stated in a May 3, 2007, letter to the Speaker of the House that he would veto any legislation that weakens current Federal policies and laws on abortion. As a result of these language changes alone, I believe the bill will now be vetoed, which is unfortunate because there are so many good things in the bill.

Thirdly, the bill does not include any funding to support the recommendations by Commission for Assistance to a Free Cuba. The Castro regime is the only nondemocratically elected government in the Western Hemisphere. So now is the time to demonstrate a commitment to the future of freedom for Cuba and to fund the programs that will facilitate peaceful democratic transition. And, again, this has nothing to do with the whole trade issue that this place talks about or the whole travel issue. This is to help the democratic movement in Cuba.

In conclusion, I believe this bill has the potential to do a lot of good, and I want to say that this bill will help save a lot of lives not only here but around the world. This is the work of the Lord. And I know Members are going to come down and are going to be against the bill. And I hope that we can change some of these things to prevent a veto, but this bill, eventually when it passes, assuming it will be vetoed, is really to feed the poor, the hungry, the naked, the sick. Almost a better title would be a Matthew 25 bill. So it has the potential to do a lot of good, and I hope to work with Chairwoman LOWEY to ensure the State Department has what it needs to do these things, the war on terror, to provide humanitarian assistance to the most needy, and to improve human rights around the world.

And Members on our side are offering amendments with regard to cutting. This is actually under the allocation with regard to the administration.

I look forward to working with the chairwoman to resolve the differences.

I also want to thank Nisha Desai, Craig Higgins, Steve Markes, Michel Sumilas, Celia, Rob, and also Christine, who were too embarrassed to put their names down. I wanted to put them down too. And I also want to thank the full committee staff on both sides, who have been very helpful.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to our distinguished vice chairman, a very hardworking member of our subcommittee, my partner in this effort, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I rise to voice my strong support for H.R. 2764, The State, Foreign Operations and Related Programs Appropriations bill. I can think of few things we do on an annual basis that are more important and crucial to the success of U.S. foreign policy than passing this bill.

I would be remiss if I did not begin my comments by thanking the chairwoman, Congresswoman NITA LOWEY, the first woman to chair this subcommittee and, in a very short time already, its most extraordinary chairman. I also want to thank Ranking Member WOLF and the majority and minority subcommittee staff for helping to produce a great bill.

Despite the fact that the allocation for this bill is \$700 million below the President's request, this is a well-written, well-measured bill, taking into account the concerns of both the majority and the minority. However, I am worried about the amendments I have seen that want to cut some of the vital programs in this bill in the name of fiscal discipline.

I am worried, Mr. Chairman, because yesterday around the world nearly 15,000 to 20,000 people died of extreme poverty. Today around the world 15,000 to 20,000 people will die of extreme poverty. Tomorrow around the world 15,000 to 20,000 people will die of extreme poverty. Extreme poverty like malnutrition and disease are claiming tens of thousands of lives every day.

This bill has a real opportunity to reverse these facts. Look at what has been done to date with our foreign aid bill. Smallpox eradication began in the 1960s; control of river blindness in the 1970s; increased child immunizations in the 1980s; initiatives to fight Guinea worm, trachoma, and leprosy in the 1990s; and the effort to end polio in this decade. Measurable results produced with the dollars in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, let me point out some of the highlights of this measure. This bill before us today makes significant improvements in our aid package to Colombia, especially for Afro-Colombians, by emphasizing alternative development and rule of law, programs that work.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, provides increases for both our multilateral and bilateral peacekeeping obligations. These funds will provide security for trouble spots like the Darfur region of Sudan and the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

This bill provides increases for global health programs that fight the scourge of HIV, TB, and malaria. This bill provides increases for development assistance programs. Some of these funds are educating children and providing clean drinking water and sanitation around the world.

The increases in this bill are the least we can do. I don't understand why some Members plan to offer amendments that cut some of the increases in

key development programs, tearing apart the majority party as tax and spenders. Our former colleague from Illinois, my friend John Porter, used the term "noblesse oblige," the belief that the wealthy and the privileged are obliged to help those who are less fortunate. In Luke chapter 12, verse 48, Jesus simply says, "To whom much is given, much is expected." In Matthew chapter 6, verse 21, Jesus said, "For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." If this verse is true, what does it say about these amendments that want to cut these crucial programs that are improving millions of lives around the world? I have a master's degree in theology from the Chicago Theological Seminary, and I have read my Bible from cover to cover. And nowhere does it say, "only clothe the naked and feed the poor after you have cut taxes for very wealthy people."

In 1984, referring to Marxist-ruled Ethiopia, President Ronald Reagan said, "A hungry child knows no politics." All he knows is that he is hungry.

I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 2764, the State, Foreign Operations Appropriations bill. I hope that Democrats and Republicans will rally behind an extraordinary product created by the chairman of this committee, the ranking member of this committee, and the extraordinary Foreign Operations staff.

Mr. WOLF. Before I yield to Mr. LEWIS, I want to comment on the gentleman's remarks. I wouldn't question what his interpretation is, but in Luke it says "To whom much is given, much is required." Some versions say "expected," but it is actually a requirement, and we know a requirement in college, you have to do it to pass. So I think the authentic version says "To whom much is given, much is required." But I see it makes the gentleman's statement much more powerful, and I appreciate the reference.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the former chairman and the ranking member, who has been very generous and very interested in this subcommittee's work, Mr. LEWIS.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WOLF and Madam Chairman, I can't tell you how much I respect the work that the two of you have done together, and to join on the floor with my friend JESSIE JACKSON in expressing support for this bill, indeed, is a privilege.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise today to support H.R. 2764, the State, Foreign Operations and Related Programs Appropriations bill for the fiscal year 2008.

I want to express my appreciation for the work of Mrs. LOWEY as well as Mr. WOLF. They are a demonstration project of what we can do when we set partisanship aside and work together on behalf of really our responsibility to lead in this world.

This bill is the primary legislative vehicle through which Congress reviews the U.S. international affairs budget and influences our foreign policy. It provides a total of \$34.243 billion including \$10.76 billion for State Department operations, international broadcasting, and related agencies, and \$23.62 billion for foreign assistance programs. The total is \$2.95 billion over last year's level and \$700 million less than the President's request.

This bill addresses critical issues such as the AIDS pandemic, Child Survival and Health programs, anti-narcotics programs, and our efforts in the global war on terror.

Mr. Chairman, it is important that we realize what a critical role this bill plays in the well-being of the world and the security of our Nation. The United States is the last remaining superpower and the sole voice of freedom and democracy around the world. What we do in this bill saves the lives of countless numbers of people in nations that are less fortunate than ours. These funds stabilize fragile democracies around the globe and help our allies in the global war on terror.

Now, I know most Members feel they weren't elected to support international assistance programs. In fact, Mr. Chairman, I am sure there are many Members who feel that the United States should dramatically reduce the amount of money we spend around the world and focus our resources on domestic priorities. This sort of isolationist point of view has no place in today's shrinking world. One needs only to look to Europe as an example of a once powerful and influential nation withdrew its resources from around the world and focused inward. What has since been termed as the "French model" resulted in massive inflation, high unemployment rates within the country, and severe internal crises. The United States should not follow the "French model," a misguided path that essentially has caused the French to disappear as a powerful force in the world.

□ 1845

I remember as a young man attending UCLA I was fortunate to participate in a program that preceded the Peace Corps called Project India. As I joined other young students in traveling to villages around a country where poverty and ever-present caste systems were always visible, I was struck by the importance that personal freedom and opportunity have on the human condition, especially if you had the good fortune of being born in the United States of America.

Today, India has outlawed the caste system and is the largest democracy in the world, as well as our strong ally in the global war on terror. I am particularly pleased that in any congressional district there are large numbers of my constituents who are actively involved, advocating for increases in our international assistance program.

In recent meetings with the Results Group, with CARE, Bread for the World and others, I have noticed that more and more people are beginning to understand that they, too, have a role in our role for leadership in the world. They are the voices from the grass roots, a perspective that we need as Americans to recognize that we must continue to lead in the world, for indeed, without our leadership, the poor of the world will suffer most.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support this fabulous demonstration of work on both sides of the aisle together.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California, a valuable member of our subcommittee, who has focused his intellect on nuclear non-proliferation, on counterterrorism and on demining and I look forward to working together for many years on this committee (Mr. SCHIFF).

Mr. SCHIFF. I want to begin by commending Chairwoman LOWEY for her extraordinary work on this bill and the really exemplary way that she has chaired this committee. I also want to commend our ranking member, Mr. WOLF.

Our Chair and ranking member have crafted a bill that I think reflects the bipartisan approach to America's engagement in the world that we should have. It supports a view that I share that a healthier, better educated and more secure developing world means a safer world for America.

After several years where diplomacy was marginalized and the men and women of the State Department were relegated to junior-partner status in the national security policymaking apparatus, this committee is moving our policy towards a new primacy for diplomacy.

This bill is important to our efforts to fight terrorism, foster peaceful diplomacy, and improve the quality of life for millions of the world's most vulnerable citizens.

The bill recognizes the inextricable ties between development and security. It is mindful of the fact that we are ultimately locked in a struggle for hearts and minds and that an excessive reliance on military force as the primary lever of American policy can be counterproductive, and that terrorists often seek to draw an American military response and may be strengthened by it.

I also want to point to two provisions that I think have broad implications for the global environment and the quest to stem the proliferation of small arms and light weapons.

The bill supports innovative new approaches to fostering renewable energy that Steve Israel and I have advocated by including a provision to encourage the Export-Import Bank to seek out investments in renewable energy and other environmentally beneficial products. This initiative could result in an estimated \$1 billion in additional green exports in 2008 and will encourage the

use of renewable energy worldwide while helping the U.S. producers of renewable energy and green products. This is a step forward in our competitiveness and a step forward for the environment.

The bill also includes language that supports the Small Arms/Light Weapons destruction program, a State Department initiative to destroy grenades, guns and man-portable air defense systems that might otherwise fall into hostile hands. By funding this important program, we have increased our commitment to countering the proliferation of small arms and light weapons, weapons that could end up in the hands of terrorists, criminals and human rights-abusing governments around the world.

I thank the chair and ranking member for their extraordinary efforts.

Mr. WOLF. I recognize the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding. I appreciate the opportunity to speak this evening.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak to the importance of this bill and the many issues associated with U.S. foreign policy.

As a member of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee for over 12 years, I commend first the new chairwoman, Mrs. LOWEY, as well as the new ranking member, Mr. WOLF, for putting together a good bill with the allocations that they received. But let me be clear. The chairwoman and the ranking member have done a commendable job crafting our foreign assistance policies, and I support most of this bill. However, there are a few provisions that are in strong contrast to my views.

First let me highlight the provisions I strongly support. The bill fully funds the administration's request for Israel and Egypt. Ten years ago, the U.S. entered into a proportional agreement with the two countries. This bill marks the last year of this agreement. I am pleased that Congress has met its obligations to these two important allies in the Middle East.

The committee has also fully funded the Refugee Resettlement Program in Israel at \$40 million. And further, this legislation almost doubles the President's request for Armenia. This funding is absolutely crucial as Armenia is still dealing with an illegal blockade by its neighbors, Turkey and Azerbaijan. Armenia's economy has suffered, but U.S. assistance has helped stymie the economic detriment of these blockades.

The administration continues to deny Armenia adequate economic support in their request, and I commend the chairwoman again for seeing the importance of our ally, Armenia, and increasing economic funding for the country. Chairwoman LOWEY has also continued military parity between Armenia and Azerbaijan, which sends a strong signal that the United States

does not condone Azerbaijan's military threats towards Armenia.

Now, there are also a number of provisions and funding levels within this bill that trouble me. First among them is funding for the Millennium Challenge Account.

In 2004, Congress authorized a new and innovative program which fundamentally changed the way we view foreign assistance. The MCA provides assistance to developing nations that are pursuing political and economic reforms. Their motto, "reducing poverty through growth" speaks to the validity of the program. The MCA specifically awards compacts to countries that have shown improvement in eliminating corruption and investing in people and ruling justly, and fostering enterprise and entrepreneurship.

Before entering into a compact, the MCA and the eligible country work together to draft the parameters of the compact. Each compact is different because the needs of individual countries are different. For instance, the MCA and Armenia signed a compact that focuses on rural development and Armenia's agricultural industry.

What this program also does is to ensure that U.S. taxpayer dollars are not wasted. Eligible countries are held accountable for how the money is spent as well as how their government is performing. I strongly believe that this program is the future of U.S. foreign assistance, where accountability and results are the top priorities.

This bill, however, underfunds the MCA by \$1.2 billion. While I understand the subcommittee made every effort to accommodate funding given its allocation, funding the MCA at only \$1.8 billion for fiscal year 2008 will stop the program in its tracks and slow the process of signing compacts with eligible countries.

Last year during the debate on the fiscal year 2007 Foreign Operations bill, the House approved \$2 billion for the MCA. Now, a year later, the new majority has cut the MCA below the President's request and below the House-passed level for fiscal year 2007. This is no way to grow a program.

Mr. Chairman, during the full committee markup of the bill, the chairwoman expressed her support for the MCA and her willingness to work with me to find more funding for the MCA through the process. I very much appreciate her support and look forward to continuing to work with her on what I believe is a very, very important issue.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, there are provisions within this bill that go against the fundamental value of life. The United States has a long history of supporting nongovernmental organizations and other groups that support abstinence and prevention but do not promote abortion. Current policy is fair and balanced and has worked for years. However, this bill, I believe, goes against the will of the U.S. citizens and allows NGOs that promote abortion to

receive U.S. Federal assistance. I understand there are going to be amendments to strike these provisions within this bill, and I intend to support these amendments. And although there are many things I support in this bill, if those amendments fail, I cannot support final passage.

I would hope the majority would work with the President and the minority to ensure that core American values are upheld as the bill moves forward.

Mrs. LOWEY. I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to a new member of the committee, a valuable addition, an expert on Africa and HIV/AIDS, Ms. LEE of California.

Ms. LEE. I thank the gentlelady for yielding. But also let me just commend you, Chairman LOWEY, for your brilliance, your leadership and your hard work in crafting this very good bipartisan bill. It is an honor to serve with you and our ranking member (Mr. WOLF) on the committee because I see how you two work together to make this a bill that we can all support.

Let me just highlight three provisions of this bill. First, I'm pleased that it includes \$949 million for humanitarian assistance in the Sudan. Of this, \$210 million is specifically designed to help the victims of the genocide in Darfur. Having traveled there three times, I have seen the plight of the Darfuran people firsthand. This bill will help the United Nations and the African Union to bring food, clean water, security, and other basic humanitarian assistance. It also urges our good friend and ally, Egypt, to do more to help the genocide.

Secondly, I am pleased that this bill includes nearly \$5.1 billion to fight the global AIDS pandemic, including \$550 million for the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, TB and Malaria.

In 25 years, HIV and AIDS has infected nearly 70 million people throughout the world and has killed more than 25 million. We have made significant steps in the last few years, and this increase reaffirms our commitment to stop the spread of this dreadful disease.

As the bill moves ahead, however, I hope we can go even further. As the New York Times pointed out in a recent editorial on Monday, we must try to provide \$1.3 billion to the global fund this year and help put the world on course to universal access to AIDS treatment by 2010.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to insert the New York Times editorial into the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, June 18, 2007]

TWO CHEERS ON GLOBAL AIDS

Now that the Group of 8 industrialized nations has pledged to commit \$60 billion to combat AIDS and other diseases around the world in coming years—a substantial sum by any reckoning—Congress and other national legislatures ought to look hard for additional funds to close a looming gap between the funds committed and the needs of desperate patients.

The advanced nations—both the G-8 countries and other donor nations—have greatly

increased their funding for AIDS programs in recent years in belated recognition that the epidemic threatens to destroy not just its victims, but also the social and economic fabric of many countries in sub-Saharan Africa. We are pleased that President Bush has proposed spending some \$30 billion to combat AIDS abroad over a five-year period, from 2009 to 2013, but in truth that represents only a modest increase from the spending trajectory we were already on. At its recent summit meeting, the Group of 8 pledged to commit \$60 billion to fight AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria "over the coming years," including the American contribution.

Yet even these pledges will not be enough to keep up with the devastating epidemics. Tens of billions of dollars more will be needed to provide treatment, care and preventive services for AIDS alone over the next five years.

Although the Group of 8 pledges are welcome, they actually represent a retreat from previous goals. In 2005, at its meeting in Gleneagles, Scotland, the group pledged to provide "as close as possible to universal access to treatment" for all people suffering from AIDS by 2010. That should mean at least 10 million people in treatment by then, judging from estimates by United Nations AIDS experts. Yet at the recent meeting, the G-8 said it was aiming to treat only some five million patients in Africa by an unspecified date. That sounds like consigning millions of untreated people to death and disability.

To its credit, the United States has been by far the largest AIDS donor in recent years, providing almost half of the funding commitments made by donor governments. But when measured against the size of the national economy, the American donations rank only fifth. There is room to do more.

As Congress wrestles with the fiscal 2008 appropriations bills this year, it ought to provide the full \$1.3 billion being sought by Congressional health advocates as the American contribution to a global fund to combat the three diseases—not just \$300 million as proposed by the administration or the \$850 million approved by the House Appropriations Committee. Congress should also set the nation—and by its example, the world—on course toward universal access to AIDS treatment by 2010.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, also takes steps to recognize the importance of our Caribbean neighbors by urging the State Department to promote professional and scholastic exchanges within the region. This is a significant way to welcome the heads of the Caribbean countries, CARICOM, as they convene in Washington, D.C. this week to consider our common future as neighbors. This is a region which has been, for the most part, neglected and ignored.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me just say that this bill provides the correct path to global peace and security, and does take care of and address the least of these. However, I only wish the amount in this bill was more than just the 1 percent of the Federal budget, which is what this is. This is a \$34 billion bill, but I wish, Mr. Chairman, that it was \$340 billion.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KIRK. I want to thank Mr. WOLF and our chairwoman for building a bipartisan bill that I think we all should support.

This legislation funds critical programs that advance our values overseas, it supports key allies of the United States, and it meets many of the humanitarian aspirations of the American people to do our part to relieve human suffering.

As a staffer, I helped found the global program on AIDS in 1985, and in this bill we have record funding to accomplish a great humanitarian mission of fighting the HIV/AIDS pandemic.

In this legislation, we support our best ally in the Middle East, Israel, now caught between two satellites of Iran: Hezbollah in Lebanon and Hamas in Gaza. In this bill, I helped sponsor language that increased the audit responsibilities over UNRWA programs in the West Bank and Gaza, a \$2 million audit especially to look at incidents in which an al Qaeda cell was allowed to form in a UNRWA camp now bedeviling the Government of Lebanon, and where we saw Gaza Islamic University, a U.S.-funded foreign assistance recipient who is running in its chemistry lab a cell of Iranian military officers training students in the chemistry of making suicide bombs.

In this bill, I also helped fund increasing assistance in the Frontier Autonomous Tribal area of Pakistan. This is a program of almost theologic importance to the people of the United States because it is in north and south Waziristan and surrounding areas, that we think the world's most wanted man, Osama bin Laden, is hiding. And with this \$20 million assistance package, we will bring new links and new friends in this region to help complete the arrest and bringing to justice of Ayman Al-Zawahiri and Osama bin Laden for the murder of 3,000 Americans.

In this bill we also preserved new funding in fiscal year 2007 to help Christian communities in Iraq. There are still 600,000 Christians in Iraq, now concentrating in the Nineveh plain.

□ 1900

The \$10 million designation we do there is a great help to these communities.

This bill makes a major forward step also in supporting a new democracy program for Syria, that one day that murderous and pernicious dictatorship may one day be replaced; and also backing women's rights programs in Iran, another country in need of a serious democracy make-over.

Lastly, this bill continues funding for Radio Free Asia and a voice supporting Western values, democracy, and human rights in a critical part of the world.

Before I was elected to Congress, I was a staff member with this subcommittee. I want to thank Christine Kojac and Rob Blair, Mike Ringler and Nisha Desai, Clelia Alvarado, Steve Marchese, Craig Higgins and Michele Sumilas, Mark Lopes, Lucy Heenan, Molly Miller, and my staff member, Richard Goldberg, for their work on this legislation.

In sum, this appropriations bill is bipartisan. It is supporting the interests

of the United States, and it is strongly backed by our allies. It makes peace more likely and achieves important humanitarian goals of the United States.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 3 minutes to my good friend and colleague from New York, another new member of the subcommittee, who has had a particular interest and has great knowledge in the environment and made a major contribution to this bill in encouraging Ex-Im to focus on supporting projects that will contribute to the environment.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished chairwoman and my wonderful partner in the New York delegation for her wonderful leadership. I want to thank the ranking member, Mr. WOLF, for producing a bill that says to adversaries and allies alike that politics can stop at the water's edge here in the United States Congress, that when it comes to foreign policy, Republicans and Democrats work together and strive to work together because we understand that a strong, muscular, fair foreign policy is in the best national security interests of our country, that where we can produce and facilitate stability and the conditions of peace, that we won't have to exert military force.

I want to thank the chairwoman and the ranking member for supporting three very specific provisions that I sought. One the chairwoman had mentioned, and that is asking the Export-Import Bank to dedicate part of their export authority to green exports, to renewable energy investments.

The Ex-Im Bank has supported \$400 billion of U.S. exports in the past 70 years. That is job creation here in the United States. It is the formation of capital that supports businesses right here. I support the Ex-Im Bank. But we are hoping that they will focus on new efforts to create green jobs, green manufacturing jobs to reduce global warming, which is a national security issue. And the provision that Congressman SCHIFF and I requested would require the Ex-Im Bank to dedicate some of its export authority to those green technologies and could result in an estimated \$1 billion in additional exports in 2008, encouraging the use of renewable energy worldwide.

The second provision that I am very proud of concerns Libya and the bombing of Pan Am Flight 103. It is a matter of fact that in 1988 Libyan-backed terrorists killed 270 people, including 189 Americans, by bombing Pan Am Flight 103. They made an agreement. They agreed to a settlement that would provide payment to those families. That settlement, those promises have not been kept. I am very proud of language that we added that says that the government of Libya, if it wants to be part of the international community, if Libya wants to be part of the community of nations, they need to keep their

promises, and funds for diplomatic relations to Libya will not be expended unless those promises are kept.

Kara Weipz, as the President of Victims of Pan Am Flight 103, said that they are deeply encouraged by this important step by Congress to hold Libya accountable before it is rewarded with diplomatic relations, and that this settlement represents a promise to the families, an acknowledgement of the victims, and some form of punishment to the perpetrators.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairwoman and ranking member for their steadfast support against the genocide in Darfur. As we debate this bill tonight and tomorrow, a genocide is being perpetrated in our midst. We have said to other genocides, never again. This bill turns that statement into action.

I want to thank the gentlewoman and the gentleman for their commitment to make sure that never again means never again.

Mr. WOLF. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend Chairwoman LOWEY for working diligently on this bill. She has produced a fairly good product here, and I want to commend her more for working with Mr. WOLF and myself to address many of our concerns.

She has produced a bill that is good in many respects. I appreciate the efforts as well of the staff that have worked very hard on this bill. A great example of working together is what my colleague from New York, Mr. ISRAEL, was talking about in dealing with Darfur. I want to commend Mr. WOLF for his passion on that issue and his passion for the issue of human rights throughout the globe. I also want to commend Ranking Member WOLF and Chairwoman LOWEY for their work on Colombia, and I am very pleased with the final product that they have there.

I am also very pleased that we have included language dealing with better accountability for the Global Fund to provide greater transparency. I commend Chairwoman LOWEY for including the language that I introduced, the amendment, to get a better understanding of why the participation of faith-based organizations in the Global Fund appears to be significantly under-represented. Numerous faith-based groups have been on the ground providing health care in many of those these countries for decades. In recent decades they have been on the frontlines in fighting against the spread of AIDS.

I saw the critical role that many of those faith-based groups provided firsthand when I visited Africa twice in recent years. I can tell you what part of the problem is, and it is really spelled out very nicely, and I will include for the RECORD this brief 3-page article

from Catholic News Services, "African Churches Find Global Fund Money Fairly Inaccessible."

Basically, what I feel is going on here with those faith-based groups is relatively simple. They are small. They are out there. They are going into these villages on foot and on mopeds. They don't have the ability to apply for grants with multi-billion dollar organizations in Geneva. It is going to require the Global Fund to reach into these countries, identify the groups, the church groups, the faith-based groups, that are doing the work. Frequently, they are on the pointy end of the spear. So I commend the gentlewoman for that language.

I know there are a few issues that we disagree on. The Mexico City policy language, we will have amendments to address that. Certainly, I understand that the gentleman has tried to reach out on this issue.

For me personally, the issue is an organization that is not only maybe providing abortion but as well is actually actively lobbying to overturn pro-life laws in many of those countries. We should not be supporting them even indirectly.

Finally, let me just close on the PEPFAR language. I played a role in getting the President's plan through the Congress, the authorizing language and the appropriations language. To me one of the most important things was the requirement that a portion, actually a small portion, I think it is 20, 25 percent of the preventive dollars go to abstinence education and abstinence training.

I want to make it very clear to my colleagues the reason why I felt so strongly about that and why I feel that we should continue the requirement that abstinence education be included in the preventive dollars is my experience in going into Uganda. Uganda lowered its AIDS incidence from 18 percent to 6 percent, a two-thirds reduction in AIDS.

The Global Fund didn't exist. PEPFAR did not exist when they did this. They did not do this through distributing condoms and comprehensive sex education. They did it through what they called ABC, abstinence before marriage, be faithful in marriage. We all know, you can't expect everybody to comply. But what is amazing to me is when you educate people on this thousands of people comply.

I just want to share with my colleagues that I had a meeting just 2 weeks ago with a Parliamentarian from Uganda who was an epidemiologist and a physician who was there from the ground up, and he verified just what I said, that people responded to the message.

Let me just finish up on that. Last July, southern African AIDS experts met and they officially listed "reducing multiple and concurrent partnerships" as their number one priority for the prevention of spreading HIV. It was not distributing condoms and com-

prehensive sex education, it was reducing concurrent and multiple partnerships. That is what this is really all about.

Let me just close and again commend the gentlewoman for a bill that has a lot of good in it. I am focusing on some of the things I disagree with. But for everything I disagree with, there are 10 to 20 different things that are good in it.

The spending level, I am very concerned that the President may veto this bill. I know there are a lot of worthwhile programs covered in the spending. I certainly would like to see us get a bill enacted into law. I think that would be to the credit of the chairwoman and the ranking member, the good gentleman from Virginia.

[From the Catholic News Service]

AFRICAN CHURCHES FIND GLOBAL FUND MONEY FAIRLY INACCESSIBLE

(By Michael Swan)

NAIROBI, KENYA (CNS)—In Kenya churches provide about 40 percent of all health care in remote and impoverished areas with no government services, but for their AIDS programs, churches receive no money from The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria.

"Since the inception of the Global Fund, the Kenyan bishops' conference has not accessed any direct funding from the Global Fund, even after applying to all the rounds," said Titus Munene, an HIV/AIDS program coordinator for the Kenyan bishops' conference.

"It isn't rocket science to say if 40 percent of the health care is in the church system in Kenya, you would think a good portion of (Global Fund money) is going to go to our operational system. But unfortunately, it isn't that way," said Maryknoll Father Ed Phillips, who runs seven community-based health care clinics.

The Geneva-based Global Fund, established in 2002, is a partnership among governments, civil society, the private sector and affected communities.

The Catholic Church alone provides more than 25 percent of all AIDS care in the world, according to Caritas Internationalis, the Catholic aid network. All faith-based organizations combined have received just 6 percent of the Global Fund's money since the first disbursements in 2002.

The Southern African Catholic Bishops' Conference, which represents South Africa, Botswana and Swaziland, has almost stopped applying for Global Fund money.

More than 18 percent of adult South Africans are HIV-positive, and the church is the largest health care provider after the government. But church bodies have been unable to access Global Fund money either directly or through the South African National AIDS Council, which coordinates South African applications to the Global Fund.

"I have sat on SANAC, the South African National AIDS Council, which is also the CCM (country coordinating mechanism) for the Global Fund. It has not been a helpful process," Dominican Sister Alison Munro said in an e-mail from Pretoria, South Africa.

"The Global Fund process is too large and too cumbersome for the churches," said Sister Alison. "If they (the churches) could apply directly to the Global Fund, some would. They can't because of the procedures. . . . The work involved is too much for any church group other than a national structure or a group with lots of capacity."

While many nongovernmental organizations employ grant application experts, church-based agencies have tended to regard such functions as wasteful of donor money.

Munene said when the churches do not get Global Fund money it weakens the fight against AIDS among some of the poorest Africans. A lack of international and Kenyan-government funding has forced mission hospitals, clinics and dispensaries to charge some of the poorest people in Kenya for AIDS treatment and services, while relatively well-off people in the cities are accessing free services.

Munene said when church agencies charge for health care it "means some of the poor cannot access services, since there are no government facilities in those rural areas."

The 6 percent of Global Fund money going to faith-based organizations translates into \$325 million spread over five years in dozens of countries. The Global Fund recognizes the number is too low, said spokesman Oliver Sabot.

"Given the essential role that they play in health care in many countries, particularly in Africa, we would like to see the amount of funding to FBOs (faith-based organizations) increase," Sabot said.

Part of the problem has been that churches have not done enough to fulfill conditions that might be expected from major international funders, such as making detailed applications for funding and monitoring expenditures to the satisfaction of donors, said Father Robert Vitillo of Caritas Internationalis, the Vatican's most prominent adviser on HIV/AIDS policy.

"Each of these funding mechanisms comes with its own set of challenges for (faith-based organizations), which are more expert in providing support, care, treatment and prevention education than in completing such complicated funding applications and then in monitoring and reporting on the funds received," said Father Vitillo.

Even if it is a lot of red tape, church organizations have to be willing to fight through it in order to continue delivering effective AIDS prevention and care, said Father Phillips. But the Global Fund also has a responsibility to help churches through the red tape, he said.

"The churches have to get more proactive," said Father Phillips. Sabot said the Global Fund has taken steps to ensure that faith-based organizations are able to apply for money. But by relying on countries' coordinating agencies or mechanisms, the Global Fund has become subject to the politics of Africa.

"This hands-off approach does mean that bias at the country level is sometimes reflected," said Sabot. He said sometimes faith-based groups are excluded from country proposals "either because of deliberate efforts by the government or other groups, or simply because they are less experienced with applying for international aid funding, and not enough outreach and support was provided to them" by country coordinating agencies.

"We have taken steps to help correct both these problems, but there is still more to be done," Sabot said.

Father Phillips said more than bureaucratic bias is involved in shutting churches out of national applications to the Global Fund.

"The church was considered in some of these countries to be the opposition to the government," he said. "Naturally, if they are considered to be opposition, well, they're (government mechanisms) going to make sure they're not going to target a lot of money" for the church.

Father Phillips said African bishops must get tough and vocal about demanding that

they be represented fairly in national applications to the Global Fund, but Munene said the churches may be talking to a brick wall when they demand fair representation.

"The Kenyan bishops have made frantic efforts to meet the minister of health on several occasions, and even his excellency, the president. And promises were given, but to date the pledges have not been fulfilled," Munene said.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), a valuable member of the full committee, an alumnus of the Peace Corps and an advocate for so many parts of this bill. He was a real partner in helping us craft this great bill.

Mr. FARR. Thank you, Madam Chairman, for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support and with a congratulatory note to Chairwoman NITA LOWEY for her bold leadership on this bill, and also to the ranking member, FRANK WOLF.

I am particularly proud of the fact that the committee, for the first time in many, many years, fully funded the Peace Corps. As a returned Peace Corps volunteer, a volunteer that served in Colombia, I am also a strong supporter of that country and the programs we are doing there. I want to thank the committee for rebalancing the United States-Colombia policy in the Andean Initiative.

I believe Colombia is a country of enormous potential. But Colombia's full potential as a democratic nation is not being realized because of its coca production. The Colombia that I know and loved as a Peace Corps volunteer is often not seen through the debate of the coca problems.

Eighty percent of the U.S. assistance has been allocated on military assistance and aerial fumigation, yet 80 percent of rural Colombians still live below the poverty line. Let me say that again. Eighty percent of the rural Colombians still live below the poverty line.

Tragically, after 7 years and \$4 billion-plus in U.S. assistance, it is overwhelmingly apparent that we must change our course in this country. Imagine if 80 percent of rural Americans lived below the poverty line. There would be riots in the streets, and every farmer would be growing coca in their backyards to feed their families.

Folks, we need to wake up and smell the coffee, preferably Colombian coffee. It is the poverty in Colombia that breeds the problems. Coca is a symptom.

The bill realigns Colombia-U.S. assistance so that 45 percent is allocated to economic and alternative development, which enables campesinos to grow crops like coffee, tropical fruits and chocolate that command better market prices so they can feed their families.

Why does this matter to you? Because stemming Colombia coca production stops the flow of drugs to Main Street USA.

Yesterday in El Tiempo, a Colombian newspaper equivalent to the New York Times, in an editorial stated "Alternative development should stop being a little sister charity case to the anti-drug strategy, and a substantial part of the assistance should go to rural development." This committee does that, and I commend them.

I hope soon that the State Department will comply with U.S. policy and force contractors to reach benchmarks when they must transfer their counter-narcotic programs to Colombians to run.

I must urge my colleagues to support the Foreign Operations bill. Help Colombia realize its potential to eliminate the root causes of the culture of poverty. Support these increased funds for economic and alternative development.

□ 1915

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Mr. WOLF, my ranking member, again. I do believe that we have created a good, strong bipartisan bill. I appreciated the comments on both sides of the aisle. Although there may be some differences, I know that when the amendments are presented, these differences will be apparent.

I do hope in the final analysis, as a result again of both Republican and Democratic members of the committee, this bill passes. This is a good, strong bill, and it is so needed by the people of this world. I know that both my ranking member and all the members of the committee and myself understand the important responsibility we have in this committee, and I look forward to passing this bill tomorrow with a good, strong vote.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. CLARKE) having assumed the chair, Mr. CAPUANO, 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. 2764) making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2771, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2007

Ms. SUTTON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-201) on the resolution (H. Res. 502) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2771) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the

fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

RENAMING THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

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. Madam Speaker, as of today, H.R. 346, my legislation to redesignate the Department of the Navy as the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps has 60 cosponsors. Although the language of this bill has already been passed by the full House last month as part of the Defense authorization bill, I want to encourage my colleagues on the floor of the House to join in cosponsoring this legislation. When the 2008 National Defense Authorization Act goes to conference in the fall, a large number of cosponsors of H.R. 346 will show the Senate the House strongly supports this change in name.

This is the sixth year in a row that the House has voted to support this change. This year, I hope the Senate will support the House position and join in bringing the proper respect to the fighting team of the Navy and Marine Corps. I am thankful to the Senate Armed Services Committee chairman, Carl Levin, who has said publicly that he will "keep an open mind" on this issue.

Changing the name of the Department of the Navy to the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps is a symbolic gesture, but it is important to the team. This change is about recognizing the true meaning of the department. The Marines do not serve beneath the Navy. They are co-equal partners.

Madam Speaker, there is no cost to this change. It is the right thing to do for the Marine Corps and the Navy. This legislation has received the support of numerous military leaders in both the Navy and the Marine Corps.

Madam Speaker, let me quote the Honorable Wade Sanders, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Reserve Affairs during the years of 1993 and 1998, who voiced his support for the change. I quote the Honorable Wade Sanders: "As a combat veteran and formal Naval officer, I understand the importance of the team dynamic and the importance of recognizing the contributions of team components. The Navy and Marine Corps team is just that, a dynamic partnership, and it is important to symbolically recognize the balance of that partnership."

I further would like to quote General Carl Mundy, the 30th Commandant of the Marine Corps. He stated, "I believe the changes you propose will do much to clarify the relationship, responsibility and functions of the appointed civilian authority over the United States naval services. I believe that any Secretary, present, past, or future, will be proud to bear the title 'Marine,' as well as 'Navy.'"

Madam Speaker, I have beside me, and I would read very carefully, "The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting this Silver Star posthumously to Sergeant Michael Bitz, United States Marine Corps."

Madam Speaker, the reason this is important, this Marine gave his life for his country. He left a wife and three children, twins that he never saw that were born after he was deployed to Iraq. And yet, as you can see in these orders for the Silver Star, there is the Secretary of the Navy, Washington, D.C., and the zip code and Navy flag. There is nothing in the heading that says "Marine."

Madam Speaker, what this bill will do, if the President should sign it, is to say that this Marine who died for this country, that the orders for the Silver Star clearly state the team's name. The name of the team is the Department of the Navy and Marine Corps.

But what the heading would say in this order for the Silver Star is the Secretary of the Navy and Marine Corps, Washington, D.C., with the flag of the Marine Corps and the flag of the Navy.

Madam Speaker, I hope that my colleagues in the House this year will join me, and let's get over 150, maybe 200 of my colleagues in both parties, to sign this legislation so we can say to the Senate in the fall of this year, it is time that the Marine Corps be recognized as an equal to the Navy. They both are equal in the services, and it is time that the Department of the Navy carry the name Marine Corps.

Madam Speaker, I ask God to please bless our men and women in uniform, and may God continue to bless America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WATERS addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

A TRIBUTE TO W. HORACE CARTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCINTYRE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCINTYRE. Madam Speaker, on April 15, 1947, Jackie Robinson took the field as a member of the Brooklyn Dodgers baseball team and broke the color barrier as the first African Amer-

ican to play in the major leagues. His courage, determination and integrity have served as an inspiration to generations, and opened the door to thousands to play our national pastime. Rightly, our Nation stopped recently to celebrate the 60th anniversary of this historic milestone.

However, as many of us know, the practice of discrimination and racism continued for many years, unfortunately, even after Mr. Robinson's historic first game. Indeed, there were other courageous individuals who joined in the fight for equality and justice for all.

One such man was W. Horace Carter of Tabor City, North Carolina. On a July night in 1950, thick with the heat and humidity of the deep south, Horace Carter watched as Ku Klux Klansmen made their violent way through his hometown of Tabor City, North Carolina. One hundred Klansmen in 29 cars robbed and terrorized this small community of farmers and merchants with threats and racism.

Although just 29 years old at the time and the new publisher, editor and newsman for the Tabor City Tribune, Mr. Carter knew this was his moment of decision. He wrote, "I searched my soul that evening and on into the next week. Was it worth sacrificing our happiness, shattering the tranquil life of running a little newspaper in a small town, taking part in Red Cross drives, church covered-dish suppers and annual yam festival promotion, just because I believed in a principle? Was it worth the risk that the print shop might be burned, our home dynamited? I could be dragged from our house with the frantic screams of my family ringing in my ears. I might suffer a brutal lashing by a band of masked hoodlums or even death if I dared to oppose them. Is it the time to stand up for principles, even before I am fully aware of what this Klan proposes," he wrote.

"I didn't want to sound pious or self-righteous," he said, "but I reasoned that if I were ever to campaign against this Klan reorganization, I should do it from its inception. That was now. I sat down at my used \$15 Royal typewriter with my experienced hunt-and-peck typing skill and I wrote an editorial."

Thus began a 3-year crusade Horace Carter took against the Klan in the editorial pages of this small, southeastern North Carolina newspaper. Mr. Carter's courage, determination and words helped in the convictions and prison time for Ku Klux Klansmen. From his doing the right thing, Mr. Carter catapulted the Tabor City Tribune into national prominence, which received the Pulitzer Prize for Meritorious Community Service, the most prestigious of the Pulitzers.

Madam Speaker, Jackie Robinson once said, "A life is not important except in the impact it has on others' lives."

Well, Mr. Carter's life has continued to be one of honor, leadership and service. And although Mr. Robinson didn't

know W. Horace Carter, there is no doubt that his words were about persons just like him.

Mr. Carter was elected mayor of Tabor City in 1954 and was a judge in the weekly city court. He served as president of the Tabor City Chamber of Commerce, the Tabor City Rotary Club, the Columbus County Economic Development Commission, the County Library Board, Tabor Industrial Development, Inc., Tabor City Recreation Commission and a Sunday school teacher in the Baptist Church.

A graduate of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and a World War II Navy veteran, Mr. Carter and his wife Lucille have three children: Rusty Carter, Linda Carter Metzger and Velda Carter Hughes.

May God's blessings continue to shine upon this most special man and his enduring legacy, a man who stood for equality, a man who stood for justice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1930

CONGRATULATING MARIA CONTRERAS ON BECOMING A UNITED STATES CITIZEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Madam Speaker, as we begin our debate here in this country on the issue of immigration, I think it is important that we remind ourselves of the literally hundreds and hundreds of thousands of immigrants who obeyed the law and who entered this country the right way.

I rise today to speak of one such individual who is illustrative of the many immigrants that we openly welcome into this country. I wish to speak about one of my newest constituents, one of the newest citizens in this country, Maria Contreras.

Maria was born in Michoacan, Mexico, and entered this country legally 14 years ago. Three years after that she met and married her husband, also a legal immigrant, and to this union has been blessed two beautiful daughters, one 11, one a year and a half. About 4 years into the marriage, Maria's husband became a citizen of the United States. It was he that insisted and encouraged Maria to go on that same path.

A couple of years ago this couple bought a home on a quiet street in a northern Utah city, Brigham City. They went to work on the yard, planting flowers, trimming the trees in the back. They worked on the home doing

some painting, repairing the roof. Both of them did this work after putting in a full day at their regular occupation. They even brought back souvenirs for their neighbors from their family trips. I know their neighbors in Brigham City found this family to be a pleasure and a welcomed addition to the neighborhood, and I can say this because the Contreras family is my next door neighbors. We share the same driveway.

It was a thrill for me one day while working in the yard to have Maria and her daughter come over and ask me some questions about government as she was now studying for her citizenship test.

On January 27 of this year, this test was administered to her in her second language of English. I am proud to say she passed it perfectly, getting 100 percent correct on this particular test. Many of my students I taught in high school, taking that same test in their native language, would be hard-pressed to have that same kind of score. In fact, it is probably wise that Members of Congress are not administered that same particular test as well.

On March 21, 2007, a great day for the Contreras family, Maria was sworn in as a new citizen of the United States. Maria did it the legal way, and as we talk about ways of limiting illegal entrance into this country, it is important also to remember that we should be mindful of ways of making it easier for people to legally enter into this country as well.

The Contreras people have the kind of entrepreneurial spirit that we want to welcome into this country, that builds this country and makes it better for all of us. As Maria said, It is great to be here. I love it here. It is a better life with more opportunities.

So I am very pleased today, Madam Speaker, to welcome a great neighbor, a new American, hopefully I can convince her to be a voter, because I am very proud of the price she paid to do things the right way, to become a new citizen in this new land. I congratulate Maria Contreras and the entire family as they enter into this new situation and for what they have done and the commitments that they have made. I am very proud of them all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

CONGRATULATING TOM AND LOIS MILLER

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. Madam Speaker, I rise to extend congratulations to

two of the citizens of my community, two of my constituents who have made invaluable contributions to the lives of people in the neighborhoods where they live, as well as people throughout America.

Madam Speaker, Tom and Lois Miller became and still are pillars of their community. They raised four daughters, have four grandchildren and two great-grandchildren. Ever since their marriage, they have been rocks of the Greater Zion Missionary Baptist Church. They are founding members of the 4500 West Congress Block Club in Chicago, and have been active in many other civic and social endeavors. For the past 10 years, they have lived in the village of West Chester, Illinois, where they have immersed themselves in community life.

Madam Speaker, 50 years is a long time and when you can spend those 50 years in a state of peace, happiness and productive engagement, you have been truly blessed, just as you have been able to bless others. I have been told that "to those to whom much is given, much is expected in return."

The Millers have been fortunate to have a great family, great children, grandchildren, friends and relatives. They have given much to those who have known them, and have received much in return.

Mr. Miller has retired after having worked at Alcola Company for more than 30 years, a productive career. Mrs. Miller established her own business, a beauty shop, that has been in operation now for more than 47 years. And so I simply pause, take this opportunity to commend them for their tremendous civic and religious involvement, wish them well as they celebrate their 50 years of marriage, and trust that they will have many more productive, happy and beneficial years.

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.)

U.S. ATTORNEY GONE WILD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE. Madam Speaker, before I came to Congress, I had a career in public service in Texas, first as a prosecutor for 8 years. I was a chief felony prosecutor and tried felony cases in Houston, Texas. And then I assumed the bench for 22 years and tried felony criminal cases and heard over 25,000 felony cases.

And I say that to say during that time, both as a prosecutor and as a judge, I heard cases where peace officers were the victims of crime and I

heard cases where peace officers were accused of criminal conduct against other individuals, people they had arrested. And I want to talk about a situation that has occurred down to the Texas-Mexico border involving a Border Patrol agent by the name of David Sipes. David Sipes was a Border Patrol agent patrolling the south Texas area, and he came in contact with a coyote. A coyote is a phrase we use in the vernacular for a person who is a smuggler of human beings into the United States. He makes money off of the plight of people who want to be in the United States for economic reasons.

David Sipes arrested a coyote by the name of Jose Guevara, who resisted arrest. There was a fight that ensued and David Sipes hit Jose Guevara in the back of the head when he resisted arrest and he was charged with smuggling people into the United States.

But what happened was, the U.S. Attorney's Office, rather than prosecute the human smuggler, they decided to prosecute the Border Patrol agent for using too much force in arresting the coyote and charged him with civil rights violations against the illegal in this country smuggling other human beings.

David Sipes was tried for that offense. This all occurred back in April 2000. He was tried for that offense, civil rights violations, and the U.S. Attorney's Office vigorously and relentlessly prosecuted him for this so-called offense. But after the trial it turned out, after he was convicted of the civil rights violation, that the U.S. Attorney's Office hid evidence from David Sipes and his lawyer.

So the district judge ordered a new trial because the U.S. Attorney's Office cannot hide evidence in a criminal case, but they did so against this Border Patrol agent. Why? We don't know, but they did. So the district judge ordered the case to be retried. But before it could be retried, the U.S. Attorney's Office appealed the judge's decision, and the Fifth Circuit agreed with the trial judge that David Sipes was entitled to a new trial and the Federal Government's appeal was thrown out and this year David Sipes was retried.

The jury heard all of the evidence, evidence that the U.S. Attorney's Office hid from the jury when it was first tried, and in less than an hour David Sipes was found not guilty, and properly so.

The evidence that the U.S. Attorney's Office hid from the jury, well, first of all they never told the jury that the U.S. Attorney's Office gave this drug smuggler travel expenses so he could go back and forth to Mexico, that they gave him witness fees, that they gave him free telephone access, that they gave him a border crossing permit, that they gave him a U.S. Social Security card, and they even gave him a Texas driver's license. But the biggest thing that the jury never heard about, besides all these benefits, back room deals he was given, it turns out

that this human smuggler brought in another load of humans into the United States and the jury never heard about the second situation.

Why does our U.S. Attorney's Office hide this type of evidence from a jury? We are going to find out why, Madam Speaker. Not only that, but Guevara was given \$80,000 by our United States Government when he threatened to sue our government for his so-called illegal arrest, and reports are that he has gone back to Mexico and bought himself a ranch down there with American taxpayer money.

Madam Speaker, just last week David Sipes asked to receive back pay. Of course, our Federal Government fought that, too, but he received back pay for the 6 or 7 years that he was out of service with the Border Patrol. But his life was destroyed. His wife divorced him because of this. He went bankrupt. He is destitute and he lives with his original trial lawyer. All of this because our Federal Government fought every inch of the way to prosecute a Border Patrol agent for arresting a criminal on our border smuggling human beings instead of prosecuting a human smuggler, a coyote.

Our government had the choice, prosecute border agent or prosecute human smuggler, and our government chose poorly, and they prosecuted a Border Patrol agent.

Of course we all know this isn't the end of the story because with agents Ramos and Compean the same situation has occurred. But, Madam Speaker, justice is the one thing we should always find. And finally, after 7 years, a jury heard all of the evidence in this particular case and David Sipes was vindicated and our government chose the wrong side. We are going to follow this case and other cases and see why the government has gone wild about prosecuting Border Patrol agents.

And that's just the way it is.

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.)

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 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 gen-

tleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SESTAK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SESTAK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1945

THE OFFICIAL TRUTH SQUAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the leadership for allowing me to come to the floor this evening and spend a few moments and talk about some of the activity that has gone on here in the House over the past couple of weeks. This is an edition of the Truth Squad that I am pleased to be able to host.

The Truth Squad is a group of individuals who endeavor to come to the floor of the House and try to shed a little light, a little truth, a little honesty on the matters that are discussed here on the House floor. It is my privilege to come to the floor of the House tonight and talk about the work that is being done here in the House right now and in Congress.

On the House side, we are in the appropriations process, the time when we determine as a Congress, as a House of Representatives, how to prioritize, how to spend hard earned American taxpayer money. It has been an interesting process, Madam Speaker, as you well know.

Last week we had a fascinating time that really brought light to one of our favorite quotes and that is this quote here from Senator Patrick Moynihan.

Senator Moynihan said that everyone's entitled to their own opinion but no one's entitled to their own facts.

And so last week we had one of the appropriations bills come to the floor of the House and the majority party had determined that they were intent upon making certain that earmarks, or special projects, were never seen by not just the American people during the process of the debate but by Members of Congress. The appropriations process was such that the majority party had determined that these special programs or special projects in individuals' districts, what have come to be known as earmarks, some people know them as pork, that these special projects would not be seen by Members of Congress until the very end of the process, until the conference committee occurred, and then they would be put into the bill. The reason that that is important is that there would be no way from a procedural standpoint or parliamentary standpoint, no way to be able to have a Member of this House of Representatives stand up and say, I think that we ought to have a separate vote on spending X amount of dollars for this project. And that's just wrong, Madam Speaker.

And so what we did on our side was to say, that's not what the American people want. That's not democracy. That's not what we're here for. That's not a process that gives honor to the House of Representatives. That's not a process that says that, yes, we are interested in being responsible with hard-earned American taxpayer money. So we spent a lot of time last week trying to make certain that that point was brought to the floor, that that point was brought to the American people. In so doing, we got some attention. We got some attention, because I think for a small moment that many people across this Nation appreciated that there were people fighting as hard as they could here in this Congress to make certain that there was some fiscal responsibility, that there were individuals who were doing their dead level best to make certain that if this Congress was going to spend as much money as the majority appears to desire to spend, if we were going to do that, that we were going to make certain that every dollar was held accountable.

We got a lot of individuals, a lot of newspapers, a lot of press across this Nation who agreed with us, who said, that's absolutely right. How on earth can you have a process that hides money, that hides money until the very last moment? That's not the way it ought to be done. I have here a number of pages, a number of editorials that were written all across this Nation agreeing with our perspective: Roll call, the Wall Street Journal, The Washington Post, the Hill, the Washington Times, on and on and on, around the Nation far and wide, really remarkable, Chicago Tribune, papers all across this Nation agreed.

What they said was that they were proud of Republicans, proud of conservative Members finally standing up and saying, no, we're not going to have that kind of process here.

And so the majority party relented. They said, okay, we agree. We ought not do what we said we were going to do, we're going to work to make certain that those projects are transparent, that there is accountability, that individuals when they present and desire to have special projects in their district that they have their name attached to it, something we've been fighting for for a long time. It was proof that democracy works. It was proof that hard work and diligence and that when you fight in that way for the American people, for the American taxpayer, that yes, there are times when you can be victorious. I was proud to work with my colleagues in the Republican Conference and on the Republican side of the aisle and some of our friends on the other side who joined us and said that you've just got to change that.

It has been a curious situation here these past couple of weeks as the majority party has brought appropriations bills to the floor. I am reminded

in this process as we bring up some of the remarkable irresponsible spending that continues to go on here in Washington, Madam Speaker, of some experience that I had back at the State level. I represent a district in Georgia on the northern side of Atlanta, the northern suburban Atlanta area. I served four terms in the State senate before coming to the House of Representatives. In that process, there were also individuals there who were interested in spending what many of us believed was too much of hardworking American taxpayer money, and so we came up with an award that we entitled the "stuck pig award." I was reminded of it this week, because when we have pointed out the amount of spending, increased spending, irresponsible in many instances spending, on the part of the majority party, you hear them squawk and squeal. And so we came up with, at the State level, what we called the stuck pig award and we would award it to somebody who defended the most ridiculous kind of spending. It may be, Madam Speaker, that we need to come up with the same kind of award here in Washington, because there would certainly be a number of candidates for the stuck pig award. But maybe we'll leave that for another day.

I want to highlight a number of things that happened on the floor just today. Today we had, Madam Speaker, as you remember, the Energy and Water appropriations bill, a bill that is very important for our Nation, an area that sets priorities in terms of spending for our Nation and the amount of money that ought to be spent on projects all across this Nation that in many areas are needed desperately. Last year, Madam Speaker, in that area of appropriations, we spent, this Nation spent, \$30.2 billion. The administration's request in the areas where they felt appropriate to fund for this year, for fiscal year 2008, was \$30.4 billion, an increase of about 0.6 percent, under 1 percent and certainly under the rate of inflation, which is what we attempted to do when we were in the majority, was to keep these levels increasing at a rate less than inflation. Many of us believe that we ought to have actual decreases, but keeping it less than inflation is certainly a step in the right direction.

But what happened this year is that the majority party brought this bill to the floor, the appropriations bill for Energy and Water, at a rate of spending of \$31.6 billion. That's a 4.3 percent increase, which is about three times the rate of increase that we had when we brought the bill to the floor last year.

Now, many of us believe that that's simply too much money, that that doesn't prioritize the Federal budget in the way that Americans across this Nation have to prioritize their family budget. And so we offered a number of amendments, which is really the only way that you can kind of get to who is

interested in being fiscally responsible and who isn't. Because, Madam Speaker, as you know, people can stand up and give speeches about anything they want and they can say anything they want, but as Senator Moynihan said, everyone's entitled to their own opinion but not their own facts.

We learned some facts today on the floor of the House, Madam Speaker, about who is interested truly in fiscal responsibility. A number of us offered amendments that would have resulted in some decrease in the amount of spending. These amendments covered various levels. One of the amendments offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) said that we ought to keep the spending in this area of the appropriations, in this area of our budgetary process, to exactly what it was last year, to have no actual percentage increase, which results in a functional decrease because of the rate of inflation, something that many people believe to be responsible at a time when the Federal Government spends more than it takes in, which the Federal Government currently does. So Mr. CAMPBELL offered an amendment that said you ought to keep it at last year's level, which is about a \$1.3 billion savings.

Mr. JORDAN, the gentleman from Ohio, said that may be appropriate, but if our friends on the other side of the aisle or in this Chamber don't think that that's a little too much to save, then I'll offer an amendment that says we ought to keep it at the President's level, the 0.6 percent increase. What that would do would save about \$1.1 billion.

I offered an amendment that said, well, there may be some people who believe that keeping it at last year's level is not an appropriate level, that keeping it at the level that the President and the administration requested is not an appropriate level, that, well, then maybe we just ought to decrease it or reduce it by 1 percent. Now, Madam Speaker, this isn't a 1 percent cut. This would be a 1 percent reduction in the increase. The increase is about 4.3 percent. This would be a 1 percent reduction, increasing it about 3.3 percent. So if you didn't believe that we ought to keep it at last year's number, if you didn't believe that we ought to put it at the number that the President requested, then you might believe that we ought to just reduce spending by 1 percent, decrease it by 1 percent in the reduction of the increase. And so we offered that amendment.

And then a final amendment, overall amendment, was offered by Mrs. MUSGRAVE, the gentlelady from Colorado. She said, in essence, well, you may not believe that we ought to keep it at last year's amount, you may not believe that we ought to go to the President's amount, you may not believe that you ought to cut 1 percent, that may seem to be too much, but you ought to believe that you could cut a

half a percent. You ought to believe that you could cut a half a percent, so 50 cents out of every \$100, that you ought to be able to cut that amount.

Those four amendments were offered on the floor of the House today. The fact is, Madam Speaker, that each and every one of those amendments failed, that the vast majority of the Members of the majority party, the Democrat Party, voted against those to carry the day. So that they believe that, no, you ought not keep the spending level, as a matter of fact, you ought not keep the spending level in this area of the budget to last year. You ought not save \$1.3 billion.

And they voted that you ought not have the amount of spending be at the level that the administration, that the President requested. This is the executive branch, the branch that is responsible for carrying out the laws and the bills and the priorities that we pass here in Congress, you ought not keep it at that level. You aren't interested in saving \$1.1 billion. Again, a fact.

They also said, as a matter of fact, Madam Speaker, that you don't want to cut it 1 percent. You don't want to have a reduction of 1 percent. Remember, a reduction in the increase. Not a reduction in real numbers but a reduction in the increase. None of these amendments would have reduced in real dollars. All of them were a percentage reduction in the increase.

The majority party, in fact as a majority said, no, we don't as a matter of fact want to reduce the increase by 1 percent. Also, as a matter of fact, Madam Speaker, they said that they didn't want to reduce it by one-half of 1 percent. They didn't want to realize savings that would result in a 50 cent savings out of every \$100 spent by the Federal Government in the area of Energy and Water appropriations.

Now, Madam Speaker, I don't know about you, but when times are tight in our household, when times are tight in the household of my constituents, when times are tight in households all across this Nation, when American families have times when they are spending more or budgeting more than is coming in, what they do is they look at their budget, they look at their family budget and say, Where can we save some money? Sometimes they say, Well, we'll just cut everything a little bit. We'll spend a little less on everything. That's the similar story. That's the analogy to the family budget.

But what this Congress said, what this majority party said is that, no, we don't believe that we're not spending enough. In fact, we believe that we ought to spend more. We ought to spend more than the increase last year, we ought to spend more than was requested by the administration, we just ought to spend more. And so it rings on deaf ears, Madam Speaker, when the majority party says, and had said before the election in November, we will rein in Federal spending.

Well, this is a clear example, once again, of what I have dubbed Orwellian

democracy, after George Orwell, the famous author, who famously in his books demonstrated that policies of governments oftentimes say one thing and do exactly the opposite.

□ 2000

That's what we find now in, I believe, this majority party, is that they say one thing and do exactly the opposite. So they say, with a straight face, that we are reining in government spending, that we are reining in Federal spending.

But, in fact, what's happening is a significant increase in Federal spending and an increase of greater than the amount that they railed against last year, which strikes me as being somewhat disingenuous and also misleading to the American people. The American people go to the polls every 2 years, and they vote based upon what people are going to tell them what they are going to do. I believe before that our side of the aisle had gotten a little wayward in terms of spending. So the message of reining in Federal spending fell on receptive ears.

The problem is that it hasn't been followed up by action. So it's a leadership that continues to say one thing and to do another, truly, truly remarkable.

Now, I want to talk a little bit about the issue of taxes and the tax increases that will be required to cover the amount of spending that the new majority has begun to march down a path to spend. The appropriations bill last week was an example of that, the appropriations bill today was an example of that, and most of them, as they come up through the 12 bills of the appropriations process will, indeed, demonstrate the lack of fiscal responsibility.

So what the other side is going to have to do is to find revenue. Instead of doing what our party did, and this President did, and President Reagan did, and, in fact, President Kennedy did in order to gain increased economic activity and in order to increase revenue to the Federal Government, those three individuals, President Bush, President Reagan and President Kennedy, all decreased taxes in a somewhat nonintuitive kind of activity, increased revenue to the Federal Government.

Because when you decrease taxes, what you do is you allow people to keep more of their money, you allow them to keep more of their money in their back pocket and in their pocketbook. Hence, they are able to decide for themselves when to save or when to spend or when to invest. When they spend, because they have more money, what results is increased economic activity.

Well, the current majority party demonstrates clear differences between a conservative Republican philosophy and a liberal Democrat philosophy. The difference is that we believe taxes ought to be reduced in order to in-

crease economic activity. The other side clearly believes that the taxes ought to be increased, with the peculiar notion that if you just increase taxes enough, you will gain enough revenue to the Federal Government to equal the appetite for spending.

So they passed a budget, and their budget would increase taxes for every single American that pays taxes, every single American that pays taxes. The largest tax increase in the history of our Nation was passed by this majority just a few short months ago.

When you ask, well, what would that cover, what happens is that all of the tax, the appropriate tax reductions of earlier in this decade, 2001 and 2003, if the budget that was adopted by this majority is allowed to proceed over the next number of years, all of those tax reductions go away. All of the tax increases come back.

What happens on December 31, 2010, which isn't too far away, what happens is that the tax rates on ordinary income go from 35 percent overnight to 39.6 percent. The capital gains tax goes from 15 percent to 20 percent overnight. Dividends tax goes from 15 percent to 39.6, overnight. Estate tax, this is the death tax, this is what individuals, individuals' families, their estate has to pay when they die. It would be 0 percent on December 31, 2010, under the majority party's budget, and under the budget that they adopted. Again, this is the largest tax increase in the history of our Nation. It will jump to 55 percent overnight in 1 second.

Child tax credit, which would rest at \$1,000 in 2010, would decrease in half. It would be cut in half, decrease child tax credits by 50 percent down to \$500. The lowest tax bracket, those at the lower end of the economic spectrum who currently pay 10 percent would pay 15 percent, a significant increase in their taxes, nearly about half of what they would currently pay.

Now, it just doesn't make any sense to have that kind of tax policy in place when, in fact, what they have said before is that they would responsibly spend American hard-earned taxpayer money and be fiscally responsible. Instead, what they have done is gone back to a tried and true method of tax and spend. So everybody's taxes, nearly \$400 billion, will shoot up virtually overnight.

Now, in their budgetary process, and that might be all right for some people, that whole tax increase and gaining, supposedly gaining new revenue for the Federal Government. Some people will say that's fine, if you are really solving problems, if you are truly solving problems, then it may be appropriate for us to do that.

As you well know, the largest problem that we have in our Nation from a fiscal standpoint is the issue of entitlement spending, automatic spending that occurs in our Federal Government programs, primarily three programs, Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid.

This chart here outlines the percentage of the Federal budget that goes for those programs. These are the programs that are on automatic pilot. They just kind of continued to increase because of the demographics of our society, aging population. The monies for these programs continue to increase year after year unless there is particular reform.

So, in 1995, those three programs that are in this yellow portion of this pie chart here were about 48.7 percent of the Federal budget. In 2005, they measured 53 percent. They are a little over 54 percent now. In 2017, they will be 62.2 percent with no changes, and within another, oh, 10 to 15 years beyond that, they will consume the entire Federal budget, if the budget remains at its current level, which is its historic rate.

Now, many of my constituents might say if you are going to increase taxes like the majority party has done by adopting the largest tax increase in the history of our Nation, nearly a \$400 billion tax increase, if you are going to do that, that might be okay if you are going to solve real problems, if you are going to solve real problems. But the fact of the matter is that the budget didn't solve any of the problems, none, zero.

When we look at this graph, this graph is evidence of the absolute emptiness of the promise that the majority party had to reform entitlement spending, to reform automatic spending, mandatory spending. In our budget, in 1997, we had 125, \$130 billion in appropriate reform and reductions. The Deficit Reduction Act, in 2005, had about \$43 billion in appropriate reductions.

The budget just adopted for the coming years, by the new majority party, had zero, zero, no money at all for appropriate fiscal reform, responsible reform in the area of Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security.

Those programs are social compacts with the American people, but they are programs that left on their current course will not be able to survive. They will not be able to survive. So every day that we wait, the problems get greater, the solution gets more elusive for each of those programs. So it is imperative, it is imperative that we move forward.

I would challenge my friends on the other side of the aisle to join together with those of us who are interested in true fiscal responsibility and true entitlement reform, and let's get it done. Let's get it done on behalf of the American people, because, frankly, that's what they sent us here to Washington to do, to solve big problems.

This graph demonstrates that we are not solving big problems here. As I say, if you were going to increase significantly the amount of taxes that the American people are paying, then many of them may say, I think there is a better way to do it, as I mentioned. Because I think tax reductions increase revenue to a greater degree to the Federal Government.

But many people across this Nation might say, well, I am all right paying a little more taxes if we are solving real problems, but not if we're on a spending spree that appears to be what is occurring with this new majority. This graph demonstrates the commitment to entitlement reform, which apparently in this new majority is zero. So I urge my colleagues to rethink the process and the policies that they put in place that will result in no significant entitlement reform.

As they are looking, once again, at their budget and at their policies, I would urge them also to look back into history. The next graph demonstrates clearly what kind of economic policy does work. This graph could be a number of things that show, that demonstrate negative growth or negative activity in the economy to positive activity in the economy over the years of this decade.

This graph, as a matter of fact, is the graph about job creation. How many new jobs have been created in our Nation since the beginning of 2001? As you can see, what we have here for month after month after month after month, between 2001 and 2003, virtually negative job growth during that period of time, no new jobs, in fact, losing jobs in the economy. For every single quarter, with the exception of four during that 4-year period.

Something happened, miraculously, in the beginning of 2003, the early months of 2003, in this vertical line here that marks the beginning of moving toward quarter after quarter after quarter after quarter of increased job growth, over 7 million new jobs since the summer of 2003.

What happened at that time is, as you know, this is when the final appropriate tax reductions were adopted by the Republican majority with this administration and this Congress. What that has resulted in is remarkable increase in job growth across our Nation. Virtually every single State, virtually every single State has seen increase in job growth over that period of time, average job gain of 168,000 new jobs per month on average.

So one would think that if you were charged with coming up with economic policy for our Nation that you would look back and say, well, this looks to be a pretty good program here that has resulted in significant job growth.

As I said before, this could be economic development, you could see a significant decrease in unemployment. All sorts of things could go on these axes, and you would see positive activity during this same period of time.

So if you were charged with coming up with economic policy for our Nation, one would think that you would look at this and say what happened, what happened at that point that made the resulting number of quarters to the current time, made it so productive? How did we become so productive as a Nation compared to where we were earlier in this decade?

Well, as I said, what happened during that time was appropriate tax reductions, making it so that individuals paid less of their hard-earned taxpayer money, that they are allowed to keep more of their money so that they decide when they spend, or they save or they invest. It's those kinds of policies that have resulted in can significant economic growth and economic activity.

I would urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, as they are working through their process, as they are trying to figure out how to make certain that we stay a global, world competitive economic engine, that what they ought to do is look into history. Just a few short years ago there was a policy that was adopted by this Congress that resulted in remarkable, remarkable economic activity. So that we have the most economically productive Nation in the world, the industrialized world.

We continue to perform month after month after month. One of the main reasons for that is, indeed, the decrease, the appropriate reductions in taxes all across the Nation so that anybody who has paid taxes pays fewer taxes, less taxes today from a percentage standpoint than they did prior to that early point in 2003.

That's what results in increasing economic activity. It's not something that is unique to these tax reductions in 2003. In fact, that's what we saw when President Reagan decreased taxes in the 1980s, decreased taxes for the American people. Many folks said, oh, you can't do that, you won't be able to fund the programs in the Federal Government.

But what happened is that, as happened here, it increased revenue to the Federal Government because you decreased taxes because you cut taxes and because you allow the American people to keep more of their hard-earned money.

□ 2015

And that's what results in increasing economic activity. And it hasn't only been on the Republican side of the aisle. Democrats, indeed, have shown this same kind of discipline in the past. When President Kennedy, in the early 1960s, in fact, cut taxes, decreased taxes, appropriate tax reductions for the American people, because he knew that if you decrease taxes to the American people, what happens is that they will determine for themselves responsibly when to save or to spend or invest and, in fact, that increases economic activity for our Nation.

It points out, Mr. Speaker, one of the fundamental differences that I talked about between a conservative Republican philosophy and a liberal Democrat philosophy, and that is that we believe that the American people know best how to spend their money, not Washington. There are very few times when Washington knows better how to spend someone's money than themselves. And it just makes common

sense, because only an individual, only people know their priorities.

Now, there are certain things that we have to spend common money on, without a doubt, and we talked about one of those that we dealt with earlier today. But there's a responsible way to do it, and that responsible way to do it, Mr. Speaker, is to identify, clearly identify those programs that ought to be absolute priorities.

And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that is so many fewer programs than this Federal Government is currently undertaking. But the Democrat liberal majority has a mentality that tends to come from San Francisco, I guess, which means that you just ought to spend just as much as you can get. You just ought to spend as much as you can get.

And so I'm pleased to join with my colleagues and point out that the economic policies that have been successful in the past and will continue to be successful if they're adopted, are those policies that will result in more hard-earned taxpayer money being able to be kept by hard-earned American taxpayers.

I just want to highlight once more a chart that demonstrates exactly that. And that is that when you reduce taxes to the American people, when you reduce, appropriately, taxes so that the American people can keep more of their hard-earned money, which is what occurred here in the early part of 2003, tax revenues were going down and down and down, 3 straight years of decreases between 2000 and 2003, tax reductions occurred with the Tax Relief Act being passed, and then the revenues increased significantly so that greater revenues than ever seen by the Federal Government because of tax reductions. And that's the kind of responsible economic policy that we believe, that I believe, ought to be put in place and kept in place, so that you decrease the tax burden on the American people, you allow them to determine when they save or they spend or they invest their own money. And then what happens is that the economy flourishes because there's more money available to drive the economy, more jobs created, more economic activity, more independence, and more liberty, more liberty and more freedom, because when people are able to keep their own money, they're freer, they're freer to make decisions about how they indeed spend or save or invest their own money.

So we're talking some economic policy tonight, Mr. Speaker, and hopefully, we'll be able to encourage our friends on the other side of the aisle to adopt some of these commonsense reforms.

I'm pleased to be joined by my good friend from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) who's going to talk a little bit also about some economic activity that's been going on here in Washington, and I'm pleased to yield to my friend.

Mr. GOHMERT. And I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia yielding, and

appreciate the work he's been doing and pointing out some real economic truths. Some of these things are just so basic. As we've talked about before, you mentioned before, Ronald Reagan said we don't have a taxing problem, we've got a spending problem. And he was so right.

But over the last 2½ years, Mr. Speaker, that my friend from Georgia and I have been here together, we've seen lots of indications, lots of signs out in front of offices talking about the national debt, and your share is so much. And I just think those are so good and so helpful.

As we see here, Blue Dog Coalition, today the U.S. national debt is \$8,809,000,000, and your share is \$29,000. I mean, that's staggering. And frankly, you know, I've begun to think I want one of those signs, because we know who's in control. And there are those of us for the last 2½ years, or the last 2 years that we've actually been here, that have been trying to push this body into having more economic responsibility. And we did see, last year, great strides made in the first time that discretionary spending wasn't just held even, it actually was cut. So we were making some real progress.

We saw the Federal revenues come streaming up, as the gentleman from Georgia points out, that real progress is being made. And so I just want to applaud what has been done because really it's consistent with the efforts that so many of us have made, like earmark reform. We were trying to get earmark reform. And it only took a few dozen conservative Republicans to band together and not vote for key legislation unless we got some earmark reform.

□ 2030

And that is when we finally got some earmark reform. Of course, you wouldn't know it to listen to me. They never talked about what we got accomplished, but being able to object, make a point of order on earmark reform. But I think this is a good idea to keep reminding everybody of how high the debt is, how much everybody's responsibility is. And, frankly, I want one of these signs. I may have to change the name to the "Blue Hound Dog Coalition" or something, but I would like to see everybody encouraging this Congress to move as we were able to push the Congress in doing in the last year or so, and hopefully there are people on the other side of the aisle that will be able to push the Democratic majority away from this just uncontrolled spending. Not only is the President's request up in most every area, but the proposals for appropriations from the Democratic majority just skyrocket above that in so many areas.

So I don't know what the gentleman from Georgia intends to do. But I tell you, I like reminding the majority it is time to do something. We made some real progress the last 2 years, and I am hoping that folks are not going to let

that die. Even though there is a major effort to try to get that killed, I think we should keep pushing, keep pushing. I just encourage all Republicans get a sign outside your door. Let's remind folks, not just the 36 that pushed for earmark reform. Let's get everybody out there reminding the majority.

I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia's yielding, and I would just encourage you in all your efforts, let's get this done.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, and I appreciate his bringing that sign because it highlights the Orwellian nature of this majority. You say you have got folks who are members of the Blue Dog coalition and what they say is that they are opposed to increasing that number. But, Mr. Speaker, what happened earlier this year is that the 8 trillion plus dollars of debt that have increased over multiple administrations have been increased to over \$9 trillion now. The debt ceiling was increased by the Democrat majority, along with the Blue Dogs, to over \$9 trillion. By this majority. By this majority, Mr. Speaker. Something they said they would never do. But, in fact, that is exactly what they did do. And in so doing, they adopted the second largest debt increase in our history.

So it is important for the American people to be listening and watching. It is important for them to appreciate what happens when you decrease taxes, that Federal revenues increase. It is important for them to appreciate, as this chart demonstrates, what track we are on for spending with this new majority.

This green line here, Mr. Speaker, that is moving along demonstrates the significant increase in spending. And much of that is driven by the entitlements that we talked about earlier, the mandatory spending, Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and demands reform. Demands reform. But that is not what has been enacted by this majority. The problem is that this majority is adopting policies in their current appropriations bills that will not decrease that line; it will increase. It will further increase that slope. And that is not the kind of leadership that America needs or deserves or desires or, Mr. Speaker, I believe, not the kind of leadership that they voted for in November.

One of the things that they did do in November was send us a good new Member on our side of the aisle, Mr. LAMBORN, and I am pleased to see him join us this evening and I look forward to his comments on economic policy.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Georgia yield for purposes of a colloquy?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I would be happy to yield to you.

Mr. LAMBORN. To the gentleman from Georgia, you have been in Congress for about 3 years now, I believe, if I am not mistaken, and you came from the Georgia legislature. Like you, I

came from the Colorado legislature. And one thing that the great State of Georgia and the great State of Colorado share, as do all 48 other States, is that they have a balanced budget amendment. It is written into the State Constitution of both Georgia and Colorado that every year we have to balance the budget.

Now, unfortunately, I think the biggest glaring problem with our national budget is we don't have such a balanced budget requirement every year, and it is so easy to go into debt. If we had strong willpower, we could hold the line, and that is what we are going to talk about here, and I have some questions for you. But in the absence of that strong fiscal strength of character, moral fiber, whatever you want to call it, it is so easy to want to please everybody, spend for the projects, not prioritize, and we run up massive deficits. And I know that in the past deficits have been run up under all kinds of administrations of both parties.

But to the gentleman from Georgia, what would be the difference here if we had some kind of balanced budget amendment? I mean until we have that and if it takes a constitutional amendment, which I would favor but that is going to take two-thirds of the House and Senate and three-quarters, or 38 of the 50 States, to ratify that, and until that day comes, we just have to have the strength of will and the commitment to the American people and the taxpayer that we will balance the budget.

Could you respond to that?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman's comments, Mr. Speaker. And I am so pleased that he brought that up because oftentimes when we have these discussions, you hear people never provide any solutions, and you have put a solution on the table that I think is very important.

As you mentioned, I have been here just 3 years. This is my third year in Congress. And I came from the State level, where you have to balance the budget, and the reason you have to balance the budget is because you can't print money. States can't print money and Washington can, and that may be the crux of the problem right there. But I recognized early on that all of the inertia, and we see it during this appropriations season, all of the inertia here in Washington is to spend money, to spend more money. There are very few institutional, if any institutional, parameters in place that force you to hold the line on spending, which is why a balanced budget amendment is so incredibly important. And it is one of the reasons that many of us have supported a taxpayer bill of rights at the Federal level. We certainly did at the State level. I know I did. I suspect you did as well at the State level.

But we believe and we have introduced legislation for a Federal taxpayer bill of rights because we believe taxpayers have a right to know that the Federal Government doesn't grow

beyond their means; that they have a right to receive back every single dollar that they put into their retirement program, into the Social Security program. We believe that taxpayers have a right to a balanced budget amendment without raising taxes, which is one of the issues that you stated. And it is so important, and the reason it is important is because of the programs and the policies and the traditions, if you will, of Washington. And the American people understand this clearly. The traditions are to continue programs that are already in place and then add some more on. It is just the natural tendency, and that is simply not what the American people want or desire, I believe.

I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. LAMBORN. Thank you. And it is probably a concern to you, as it is to me, that the current appropriations bills, about 12 of them, that are going through the House have an excess of \$23 billion over what the President has requested. And if it was me in the President's place, I might have even had that lower. But let's go with that as a base amount to start with. We are going \$23 billion over that. And he has said that, with the exception of the military construction bill, he is ready to veto bills that go over his spending requests. So let's say eight or nine of those get vetoed. Doesn't that mean we are going to have to come back? You have been through this process a full cycle, and I have not. Doesn't that mean we are going to have to come back later this summer, go through these bills all over again, and start from scratch?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank my friend for his comment.

I am hopeful that the President will follow through on his admonition to Congress to toe the line on spending, and I am hopeful that he will indeed veto a bill that gets to his desk that has an increase in spending.

Remember, the amount that the administration requested is the amount that the departments believe is the appropriate level of spending to carry out the needs of the American people.

Now, it is perfectly appropriate I believe for Congress to reprioritize within that basket, to say we think we ought to be spending, as a Nation, more here as opposed to here. I am one of those who believe we ought to be spending less as a Nation; so I would hope we would reprioritize and say this program is a priority of the Federal Government and, in fact, this one is best done elsewhere, maybe even the private sector and consequently doesn't need to be funded.

But what will happen, I trust, is that the President will be good to his word and veto legislation that spends more than the departments asked for and then it comes back to the Congress in order to rewrite a bill that will provide and allow for the President to sign. And as I say, I am hopeful that that kind of fiscally responsible activity occurs as we move through this process.

And I am pleased to yield again to my friend.

Mr. LAMBORN. Thank you for that answer.

And as a follow-up to that, I would have to say that in the absence of a balanced budget amendment, at least we have the possibility of sticking to the numbers that the President has given us. Those numbers are still in excess of the rate of inflation. He is asking some departments for a 6 or 8, 9 percent increase as opposed to 2 or 3 percent, which would be the inflationary rate. So his numbers are very generous just right there. But when our colleagues across the aisle are going \$23 billion on top of that, I just see a chance for a little bit of fiscal restraint if they would back off \$23 billion and say let's stick within what the President has recommended. There are still many things that can be done that are worthy projects within that amount. And I just see that we are missing a golden opportunity here, and I just think that until we have a balanced budget amendment, we have to do it by our own sense of fiscal discipline.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend's comments. And I will point out that our side of the aisle, when we had responsibility for these budgets over the past at least 2 years that I have been here, we kept the rate of increase in the discretionary programs to less than the rate of inflation. And that was something that I and many others here thought was important.

I think it is important to put on the table solutions because the American people want solutions. They want us to work together in a positive way and provide solutions. And the Taxpayer Bill of Rights is indeed a program of solutions, making certain that we don't grow beyond our means, that the Federal Government budget doesn't grow faster than the rate of inflation and the increase in population. Perfectly appropriate. Making certain that the Social Security Trust Fund money is spent on Social Security.

We heard a lot about that from our friends before the election, that that is exactly what they would do. In fact, they have had an opportunity to put that in place and have not done so.

A balanced budget amendment without raising taxes, it is clearly possible from historical precedent and from economic policy that has been written before that it is easily done to balance this budget without raising taxes. You will hear our friends on the other side say, no, you have got to raise taxes in order to balance the budget.

I am happy to yield to my friend.

Mr. LAMBORN. Thank you. And I have another question from the gentleman from Georgia.

You were here over the last 2 years before January, when I was sworn in and I came on, although I am new since then. Isn't it true that we had a rule that the Republicans initiated that said it took 60 percent to raise taxes,

not in statute but in rules, and that that was one of the first things that went out the window when we turned control over to the Democrats?

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank my friend for asking it because it is one of the things that resulted in a 12-year history in this Congress of no increase in taxes. And one of the reasons for that was we required in our rules a super majority to raise taxes. And you are absolutely correct. On that first day there were a lot of rules that changed that determined how the House works. One of the rules that was changed said, no, you don't need a super majority; all you need is a simple majority, which, as you know and as the American people know, means that the majority party can do anything they want in terms of taxes, which was how they were able to pass a budget that includes the largest tax increase in the history of our Nation, nearly \$400 billion in the future.

So I appreciate my good friend's comments and would yield to him if he has another question or comment.

Mr. LAMBORN. Yes. And then I will turn it back over to you.

But you remember the year 2001 in the Georgia legislature. I remember that very well in Colorado. When 9/11 happened, the tragedy involved with that, and then on top of that the subsequent horrendous economic problems that our country had, and each State suffered losses of revenues. We had to look at cutting programs or doing with less. But at the same time, the American public and families had to do with less also.

□ 2045

But then when times were better, we had more, and we can spend more, if necessary.

So I just think that it's unfortunate that we don't have such a balanced budget amendment. But it's good that we had rules, at least up until January, where we took a supermajority before we had a tax increase, and even now we have an opportunity, if we will all only seize upon it, to say, okay, we'll stick with the President's numbers. I think we can do even better than that in terms of saving money for the taxpayers. But let's say we stick with the President's numbers, that would still be a \$23 billion savings over what our friends across the aisle are proposing in these various appropriations bills. And that we would, by going to the President's numbers, we would still be over the rate of inflation in most of the different agencies.

So, I just think it's a tragedy that we're not seizing upon this opportunity. I just expected better when I got sworn into Congress because I had heard talk during the campaign that if the majority party would take power, that they would be more fiscally responsible in different ways. And unfortunately, I haven't seen that fully carried out, and I've been very disappointed.

At this point, I'm going to yield back to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I thank my friend from Colorado for coming down this evening and sharing his comments and his perspective. It's similar to mine. And the disappointment is shared as well because the American people did expect more. And I think that the numbers that we've seen, Mr. Speaker, and the polls that are out now that demonstrate the impression of the American people of Congress is at its lowest point in decades, that that's reflective of the disappointment that they have in this new majority. So I appreciate your comments.

I do just want to end, Mr. Speaker, by highlighting once again what we believe the solutions are. And there are solutions, and they're positive solutions. And they are solutions that we can embrace together, Republicans and Democrats, who truly desire to be fiscally responsible. And they are incorporated in the Taxpayer Bill of Rights at the Federal level. Again, it means that the Federal Government ought not grow faster than the rate of inflation and the increase in population; that every single dollar that goes into the Social Security trust fund ought to be spent on Social Security; that that money ought to be preserved for individuals who send that money to the Federal Government; that a balanced budget occurs without raising taxes. It's very doable. We have demonstrated it time and time again, that you increase revenue to the Federal Government when you decrease taxes. So, a balanced budget amendment without raising taxes.

And fundamental and fair tax reform. Our tax system is woefully flawed, and it is a system that is crying out for reform, crying out for repair. It's unfair for people all across the spectrum, and demands, indeed demands, fundamental reform.

And finally, a supermajority required for any tax increase, as my friend from Colorado highlighted. We had no tax increase over the 12 years when my party was in charge. And one of the reasons for that was that it required a supermajority to pass a tax increase. And that just makes common sense. If you are going to take more of the hard-earned American taxpayer money, then you ought to do it with significant majorities. Thomas Jefferson, I believe, said that "You ought not make major changes with minor majorities." It's something that I think this majority ought to adhere to.

Mr. Speaker, let me just close by saying that we live in a wonderful and glorious Nation, a Nation that allows us to be elected and to come and represent the finest people on the face of the Earth. I challenge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to endeavor to do that in a way that's responsible, that respects the hard work that they do day in and day out, that respects the importance in the correlation between liberty and freedom, and allow-

ing the American people to keep more of their money. When they're able to keep more money, they're more free, they have greater independence and greater liberty. And by so doing, we adhere to fundamental principles that are uniquely American.

I yield back the balance of my time.

PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2764, THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, FOREIGN OPERATIONS AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2008

Mrs. LOWEY (during Special Order of Mr. PRICE of Georgia). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, during further consideration of H.R. 2764 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 498, notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the bill may be offered except:

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

An amendment by Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida or Mr. SIRES regarding funding for Cuba Democracy assistance programs, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. WOLF regarding funding for certain assistance programs for Iraq, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. SHAYS regarding funding for Iraq Study Group;

An amendment by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey regarding funding for anti-terrorism programs;

An amendment by Mr. MCCAUL of Texas regarding funding for international narcotics control and law enforcement programs;

An amendment by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey regarding certain reporting requirements related to U.N. employees participating in U.N. peacekeeping missions;

An amendment by Mr. MACK regarding funding for broadcasting to Venezuela;

An amendment by Mr. SHADEGG to strike language designating funds for renewable energy;

An amendment by Mr. SHERMAN regarding funding for the International Development Association;

An amendment by Mr. PAYNE regarding funding for tuberculosis through Child Survival and Health;

An amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding funding for Liberia;

An amendment by Mr. BLUMENAUER regarding funding for Pakistan;

An amendment by Mr. CULBERSON regarding funding for rural water and sanitation projects in East Africa;

An amendment by Mr. SHAYS regarding funding for community assistance programs in Iraq;

An amendment by Mr. FORBES regarding ESF funding for Ethiopia;

An amendment by Mr. KNOLLENBERG regarding funding for the Millennium Challenge Corporation;

An amendment by Mr. PITTS regarding funding for HIV/AIDS abstinence prevention programs, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. PRICE of Georgia regarding funding for Israel;

An amendment by Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN regarding funding for the U.N. Development Program;

An amendment by Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin regarding notification requirements on Liberia;

An amendment by Mr. SKELTON regarding oversight of Iraq reconstruction;

An amendment by Mr. WEINER regarding military assistance for Egypt;

An amendment by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey or Mr. STUPAK regarding the Mexico City policy on family planning assistance, which shall be debatable for 45 minutes and shall remain in order even if proposing to strike language inserted by amendment;

An amendment by Mrs. LOWEY making changes to section 622, which shall be debatable for 45 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. LAMBORN regarding a prohibition on funds for certain individuals and entities for West Bank and Gaza programs;

An amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa regarding basing rights in Iraq;

An amendment by Mr. BOUSTANY to strike section 699;

An amendment by Mr. FORTENBERRY regarding foreign military financing funds for Egypt for certain border security efforts;

An amendment by Mr. MCGOVERN limiting assistance for Western Hemisphere Institute for Security Cooperation, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. WEINER limiting funding for Saudi Arabia;

An amendment by Mr. UPTON or Ms. HARMAN regarding use of Energy Star certified light bulbs;

An amendment by Mr. TIERNEY regarding funding for Pakistan;

An amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding health infrastructure in Africa;

An amendment by Mr. GINGREY regarding a prohibition on funds for negotiations related to the visa waiver program;

An amendment by Mr. PENCE regarding a limitation on the use of liquidated assets from an enterprise fund to establish a new foundation or entity;

An amendment by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey limiting the use of funds for international conferences;

An amendment by Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN regarding a prohibition on the use of funds for contributions to the U.N. for the United Nations Human Rights Council;

An amendment by Mr. PRICE of Georgia regarding an across-the-board reduction in funding, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. POE regarding a prohibition on funds to issue visas to citizens of certain countries based on certain extradition policies;

An amendment by Mr. POE or Mr. TANCREDO regarding a prohibition on the use of funds in contravention of 8 U.S.C. 1253;

An amendment by Mr. FLAKE limiting the use of funds to certain non-governmental organizations other than through the competitive bidding process;

An amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa limiting the use of funds for travel by certain House officials to certain countries;

An amendment by Mr. GOODLATTE or Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN regarding a prohibition on the use of funds for the diversity visa program;

An amendment by Mr. PENCE limiting the use of funds for the Palestinian Authority;

An amendment by Mr. PENCE regarding a prohibition on funds for U.S. contributions to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Gaza;

An amendment by Mrs. MUSGRAVE regarding an across-the-board reduction in funding, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. JORDAN of Ohio reducing funds in the bill, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

An amendment by Mr. CONAWAY regarding use of reductions made through amendments for deficit reduction;

An amendment by Mr. HENSARLING reducing funds in the bill;

An amendment by Mr. TANCREDO prohibiting funds to enforce certain guidelines regarding relations with Taiwan;

An amendment by Mr. BLUNT prohibiting funds for the International Seabed Authority;

An amendment by Mr. SHADEGG prohibiting funds for countries providing assistance to Iran related to nuclear and missile programs;

An amendment by Mr. SHADEGG prohibiting funds for countries providing refined petroleum to Iran;

An amendment by Mr. OBEY regarding earmarks; and

An amendment or amendments by Mrs. LOWEY regarding funding levels.

Each such amendment may be offered only by the Member named in this request or a designee, or by the Member who caused it to be printed in the RECORD or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment except that the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and the Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs each may offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of debate; and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

Except as otherwise specified, each amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an oppo-

nent. An amendment shall be considered to fit the description stated in this request if it addresses in whole or in part the object described.

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

There was no objection.

HIGHEST DEBT IN HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it's an honor to be on the House floor. And I must say that free speech is a beautiful thing in the United States of America. Our friends on the other side can pretty much say anything they want in this wonderful Chamber in this country, with absolutely no ramifications or connection to the truth at all. And I want to just share with the American people and I want to share with other Members of Congress, Mr. Speaker, and my good friend here from Connecticut, some facts that have been absent over the last hour and really over the last couple of days.

I think it is important to just go back and piece the history together. Over the past 6 years there has been a Republican House, a Republican Senate, and a Republican White House. The gentlemen on the other side, fine men from fine families who have been speaking here, have completely forgotten about the last 6 years. They think that they ran up a high bar tab and that it can be fixed rather easily. The fact of the matter is they ran up, the Republican House, Republican Senate, Republican White House, \$3 trillion in debt, \$3 trillion over the last 6 years.

They just got out of office in January, and here it is June, and they're acting like this is ancient history. Three trillion dollars. They had the debt limit raised five or six times, which means they had to pass legislation out of here that would allow the Department of Treasury to borrow more money. And then 5 months after they're out of office, they come here, Mr. Speaker, and they talk like they've had nothing to do with this.

Now, we saw our friend from Texas earlier hold up the Blue Dog Coalition debt limit sign, over \$8 trillion, almost to \$9 trillion in debt and act like they had nothing to do with it. But the American people recognized in November and asked for a change in government, and they got it.

Let me clear up another fact that has been misrepresented here today and yesterday and over the past couple of weeks. This is their quote, "The Democrats are somehow going to raise taxes. It is the largest tax increase in the history of the United States of America." Not accurate. Not true. I ask the American people, and as I speak and it is written into the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD, we need to ask all Americans to keep their tax forms from this year and hold on to them and match them to next year's tax forms. There will be no increase in taxes from the Democrats. None. And take the statements that have been said here, take your tax forms. Don't believe me. Don't believe Mr. MURPHY or Mr. MEEK or any of our other 30-something friends who are going to come here, keep your own forms.

Now the bottom line is this; we know how to govern. Our friends on the other side have had their chance. They got the keys to the car in 2000 when President Bush won and they controlled all levers of government and failed miserably; \$3 trillion in debt, a foreign policy that's a complete disaster, a FEMA organization agency that can't even respond to natural disasters in the United States of America. They can't even get the American citizens their passports. So save the lectures for somebody who wants to listen to them, because quite frankly, we don't, and the American people do not want to listen to them. That's the bottom line. When you can get the American people their passports on time, then come talk to us about worrying about environment and creating jobs and the economy and foreign policy. Enough is enough.

My friends, Mr. Speaker, on the other side are putting all of their trust in Mr. Bush, our President, because he says he's going to veto all our bills. Well, let's just look at what the Republican Congress did. President Bush, Mr. Speaker, said that he's going to veto all our bills if they come in one dollar above what his submission was to the Congress. Let's look at what happened in 2005.

This is the defense bill in 2005. The Congress spent, Republican Congress, \$45 billion more than President Bush requested. President Bush signed the bill on December 30, 2005. Transportation appropriations bill, Republican Congress spent \$7.2 billion more than President Bush requested. President Bush signed the bill on November 30, 2005. Labor, Health and Education. Republican Congress spent \$5 billion more than President Bush. President Bush signed that bill into law on December 30th. On and on and on. And I can go through agriculture, military, I will submit this for the record so that all of America can go and check this out. Three trillion dollars in debt. Some of the highest deficits in the history of our country were run up by the Republican House, Republican Senate, Republican White House.

Here we go. Exploding national debt under the Bush, now Mr. Nussle, who is joining the team, projected 10-year budget surplus of \$5.6 trillion turned into a projected 10-year deficit of \$3 trillion. The surpluses were gone. In the largest budget deficits in American history, Mr. Speaker, \$378 billion in 2003, \$412 billion in 2004, \$318 billion in 2005.

Now, you look at the Democratic budget, Mr. MURPHY, and you will see that we balance the budget. Keep your 2008 forms. We do not raise your taxes. Just to prove what the other side is saying to us, keep them. We don't raise your taxes and we balance the budget. And I can't even wait until all of these pass and we can go all around the country, Mr. MURPHY, and talk about what we have done. The largest increase, and I will be happy to yield to you in a second, my friend, the largest increase in veterans spending in the history of the VA. So all of the problems that our veterans have been having, backlogs, they don't have enough workers in the VA system to process the claims, all of that is going to be taken care of. All of our kids that are coming back and our adults and our soldiers coming back, there is \$500 million in this bill for post-traumatic stress. There is money in here for amputees. There is money in here for prosthetics. There is money in here for brain injuries. There is money in here to make sure the veterans don't have a huge increase in their copay and user fees, as the Republican Congress and President Bush nicked and dined their veterans to death. And this budget that we prepared for the veterans was approved by Disabled Vets, Paralyzed Vets. Everyone has approved and said this is a monumental step.

So we can get into energy, and I'm sure we will tonight; we can get into Homeland Security, which I'm sure we will tonight; we can get into Labor, Health and Education, which I'm sure we will tonight, and basically say, Mr. Speaker, that we have delivered for the American people exactly what they want.

I understand what the polls say right now, but our budget has not been implemented yet. And when people go next year and they apply for a Pell Grant and they're allowed to get \$700 more so they can send their kid to college, and their student loans rates are cut in half and they get the minimum wage in July, and there are community health centers being built all over our country so that middle-class families who can't afford health care can go to a clinic at least and get their kids care. When you have a million more kids on SCHIP. Next year this is all going to happen, and some will happen before that, the American people will recognize that it was the Democratic Congress that pushed this agenda. And let the President veto it, let him.

I yield to my friend from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Thank you very much, Mr. RYAN.

I think what happened here over the last 12 years, and I was watching it all from the outside, is that the Republicans, for a very long time, vastly overestimated the gullibility of the American people. They thought they could stand up here and say over and over again that the Republicans are being fiscally responsible, and that the

American people wouldn't notice that they were racking up record amounts of debt, \$3 trillion, up to \$9 trillion now is the amount of Federal debt that this government has racked up. The fact that they wouldn't notice that every single dime for this war in Iraq and Afghanistan has been borrowed money. I think you give them too much credit, Mr. RYAN. You said they were spending like a bunch of drunken sailors. Well, drunken sailors spend their own money at least, they probably don't spend it very wisely, but their own money. These are like a bunch of thieving drunken sailors. They were spending other people's money, my money, my parents' money, my neighbor's money, all the while kind of pretending that we weren't ever going to have to pay it back.

So what we've seen here tonight and what we've seen over the last few days is a Republican minority now that continues to vastly overestimate the gullibility of the American people. They think they can stand here, try to make disappear everything that happened over the last 12 years, and that once again they can stand here and talk about being fiscally responsible, while the very mess that we're here cleaning up is all theirs in the making.

□ 2100

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Now, Mr. Speaker, here is what we are doing. You mentioned that we have a balanced budget, in 5 years we are going to balance this budget. But on top of that, we are starting to fix some of the biggest messes they left this Democratic Congress.

Take for example the Alternative Minimum Tax. Now, not a lot of people know what this thing is. You know it if you are paying it, and you are going to start paying it year after year. More people will start paying more and more. This is the biggest middle-class tax increase potentially in the history of this country, imposed by a Republican Congress. And, guess what? We are going to fix it. We are going to take it on.

For the first time, legislation that comes before this House actually has to be paid for as we go along; the pay-as-you-go rule. Every spending increase that this Congress proposed has to be accompanied by either a revenue offset or a spending offset. That's real fiscal responsibility; rules passed by the Democratic majority here that are going to finally impose some fiscal discipline on this place.

So the Republicans and the minority can say over and over again whatever they want. They can hope that if they say it often enough that they will believe it and maybe a few people out there will believe it.

But what is going to happen here over the next few months is results, Mr. RYAN. It is going to be rhetoric matched with results: Fixing the AMT, balancing the Federal budget over 5 years, making sure that every bill that

comes before this House is paid for as we go along, record increases for veterans programs, for education programs, for the things that people want to have funded in their communities.

There are finally going to be some words that are matched with actions here. As much as the other side of the aisle may try to make this disappear, they are going to find an American people that isn't as gullible as they used to think they were.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I would be happy to yield to my good friend, the Cardinal from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Mr. RYAN and Mr. MURPHY.

Mr. Speaker, I am really pleased to be here with my colleagues from the 30-Something Working Group once again.

Just to jump off what our good friend Mr. MURPHY was talking about, we are in the midst of the "New Direction Congress." Mr. RYAN, Mr. MEEK and I spent the last several years on this floor railing about the "culture of corruption," railing against our good friends on the other side of the aisle, whose only interest when they spoke about tax cuts was providing those tax cuts to the wealthiest few in this country.

Now, what is amazing about our ability to move this country in a new direction is that we can really focus on those targeted tax cuts that will help the average working family, the regular folks, the people who don't have the ability to just kick back, put their feet up on the desk and live on Easy Street day in and day out.

We are talking about people who live paycheck to paycheck. Not poor people who live paycheck to paycheck, but people in middle America, who make sure that all their bills are paid, just like we are trying to do here with our PAYGO provision, but make sure all their bills are paid. But it takes every dollar they have to do it.

Then you add to their budget the increased price of gas, which increases the price of food, which impacts everything that regular, everyday working families have to deal with. And we hit them under the Republican-led Congress with an Alternative Minimum Tax, that was never supposed to be directed at them, but ultimately scooped up so many of those hardworking taxpayers. And you know we listened to the garbage rhetoric that is so tired on the other side.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is like the 1992-1993 talking points have been taken off the shelf somewhere in the cloakroom and dusted off.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I am glad the gentleman jumped in. It is like either they have a tape recorder that is stuck on rewind, or maybe we are trapped in "Groundhog Day" and we don't know it, or maybe they are just tired.

We used to be in meetings, and I have sat in many meetings where I have had

colleagues and supporters express frustration because they marvel at our Republican friends' ability to come up with these pithy, cute, packaged messages and that ours aren't as cute and pithy and succinct.

Well, do you know what? That is because we don't have purely simplistic solutions to complex problems. The American people saw right through the pithy, cute, succinct, tired slogans that the Republicans have been throwing at them year after year and don't believe them anymore. They reached the point where they won't just take what they say when they repeat it over and over again at face value.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, let's look at what happened here in the last couple of days. Right here, about 20 minutes ago, we heard two of our friends on the other side, Mr. Speaker, talk about a balanced budget amendment. They just ran up \$3 trillion in debt, raised the debt limit five times, and it is like it never happened. Let's put on a balanced budget amendment, the constitutional amendment.

It is unbelievable.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, they also talked about earmark reform. They were railing on and on about earmark reform.

Who brought earmark reform to Congress? We did. Who brought about the beginning of the end of the war in Iraq, hopelessly mired in a chaotic conflict in another country? If you rewind back to pre-November 7, what was their cute, pithy, succinct little saying? Stay the course. We can't pull out. We can't cut and run.

Who is scrambling to make sure they can protect their own political hides now and be supportive of making sure that we can withdraw, but in a responsible fashion? Well, it is they that spend plenty of time talking about that. We are the ones that are bringing about the beginning of the end of this war by putting those votes up on that board and bringing those bills to this floor that they refused to yield on.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the beautiful thing about this is that for how many years they talked about the protecting the homeland, about homeland security, that it make us safer fighting there so we don't have to fight here, all their rhetoric hasn't delivered.

So here we come, right? We come with an increase in funding so we can fund the "loose nukes" program, the Nunn-Lugar program, so we have more people out with more money buying more loose nuclear weapons that are getting spread around the world, we put hundreds of millions of dollars more into this program, which is going to keep us safe.

Mr. Speaker, last week, the mother of all rhetorical contortions, we are passing a Homeland Security bill here, or trying to pass, where 3,000 Border Patrol agents will be funded; technology for all our ports to monitor chemical and biological weapons com-

ing in; grants for first responders, police, fire. We also passed 50,000 new cops for the country for communities who can't afford them, a lot like mine. And they held up the bill. They held up the bill.

Mr. Speaker, we are trying to pass funding for 3,000 Border Patrol agents, and they are trying to hold up the bill. Now, who is for homeland security now? And on and on and on.

But what we have shown, and this is what I love about it, is that when these bills pass, those men and women who get hired to be Border Patrol agents will know it was the Democrats. When the minimum wage goes in this summer, they will know it was the Democrats. When you go to get a Pell grant, they will know it was the Democrats.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, when we bring an energy package the week before we leave for the July 4 recess that really begins to make sure that we end our addiction to foreign oil, they will know it was the Democrats. When we make sure we bring about an end to this war in Iraq, they will know it was the Democrats. And they will say repeatedly, "they" being the smart American citizens, American voters, they will say to our good friends on the other side of the aisle exactly what they said to them on November 7, after listening over and over to the same tired slogans, "Talk to the hand. We don't want to hear it anymore. We see through your garbage. And we are voting to make sure we can move this country in a new direction."

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, let me tell you what happened in my district, because it happened in 40 other districts around the country last fall.

All the people who are fiscal conservatives, people who were concerned about fiscal responsibility frankly probably voted Republican for a long time because they did believe that the words were backed up by the actions, finally saw through all that rhetoric. And all those true fiscal conservatives came out and voted Democrat.

My district hadn't been Democrat for 24 years. And, guess what? It wasn't just the social progressives and the anti-war activists who came out and said we want change. It was the fiscal conservatives, the people who were concerned about the absolute and utter incompetency in this Government that came out and decided to change this place.

And, guess what? They are seeing results here. They are seeing results because what they did was they saw a party that over the years started out as a collection of ideas that ended up just being a collection of special interests.

Mr. Speaker, the words they used were still the same. Their allegiances changed over time. Their allegiances didn't happen to sit with the ideas that they held. Their allegiances sat with the lobbyists and the special interests and the folks that they were protecting

every single day on this House floor. Those voters who came out and voted Democrat based on fiscally sound and fiscally responsible principles last year are going to do the same thing 2 years from now because they are going to see that balanced budget. They are going to see the Alternative Minimum Tax. They are going to see the pay-as-you-go rules. Those are all results. Those are going to be voters that will be sticking with the Democratic Party.

□ 2115

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. They are not going to see a tax increase. Again, keep your tax forms from this year, compare them to what you fill out next year. There will be no tax increase. Period, dot, Mr. Speaker. When you wonder why the fiscal conservatives gave the Democrats a chance and why we are passing balanced budgets, why we passed a rule in the House called PAYGO which says if you spend money, you got to pay for it. You got to find a cut somewhere to cut it out.

Here is why they voted for us: This President and the Republican Congress, as we have stated ad nauseam on this floor, have borrowed more money from foreign interests in the last 6 years than any other President and Congress before them combined. Combined. From foreign interests.

Now, look here: Japan; China; UK; Caribbean; OPEC countries, \$67 billion of our debt; Japan; China, \$349 billion.

Now, we are trying to compete with China. And one of our friends was up here earlier today with an amendment. We have to compete against China. No kidding. Well, then why did you, he wasn't here, but why did his predecessors before him borrow over \$600 billion from China, and then turn around and say, hey, aren't we competing with the bank we are borrowing from? How are we going to work this out?

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. RYAN, one of the most perplexing bars on that graph is the amount of money that we have borrowed from OPEC nations. You want to talk about why we can't stand across the table from the countries that are pillaging American consumers with these ridiculously, monstrously high gas prices?

Guess what? We can't sit across and be an honest broker from them because they hold the mortgage to this country. The same can be said of the Chinese and the same can be said of European nations. We have lost so much of our ability to sit and be an honest broker in negotiations over energy policy and foreign policy, because they own our currency. They hold all of our debt.

So beyond how terrible this is for the American taxpayers, it is also terrible for the American foreign relations. It has to stop.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. You stand here and scratch your head and wonder how it is they could allow it to get to this point. There is no logical, rational explanation. The only thing I

could come up with is, A, they think we are dealing with Monopoly money here and it is not real money and it is not real debt; or, B, it is not really my personal debt, so it doesn't affect my personal bottom line, so it doesn't matter; or, C, which is the worst, they just didn't care.

It just didn't matter. Their rhetoric was of the utmost importance to them. Making sure they could continue to pass tax cuts that benefited the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans, the debt be damned, the deficit be damned, none of that mattered to them, as long as they could keep their contributors happy.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Even when they did spend money, they spent it in such a ludicrous way as to waste the taxpayers' money on essential programs like the prescription drug benefit. Even when they chose to roll out a brand new and expensive new domestic program, they overspent to the tune of potentially \$50 billion a year by cutting a deal with the drug companies so as to prohibit the Federal Government from using its bulk purchasing power.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. MURPHY, to add insult to injury, the administration, now that they are not in power here, the administration is using its ability through their agencies to try to cram new formulas down the throats of our hospitals so their reimbursement rate is dramatically impacted, dramatically cut, so that they aren't able to serve the people who need the most help.

So not only are our seniors getting nailed by not being able to make sure that they have truly the lowest possible prices that they can pay, that we could negotiate on their behalf for prescription drugs, but our hospitals are facing major cuts at the hands of the administration without any input from elected officials, just bureaucrats in the Bush White House's administration.

They actually have one proposed formula change that would presume that hospitals are just going to game the system, so they are cutting money out of their budgets, just because. Pretty much just because they think they are going to play with their numbers. Because they are going to make that assumption, they are going to take the money away, rather than prove that they do that and then take the money away.

That is accountability? That is like what is that game that you play on the street, Three Card Monte. They are playing Three Card Monte with people's health care. I don't know. Maybe it is because most of the people who run this country in the Bush administration can afford to pay their own medical bills, so maybe it is just they have hired too many people who don't understand what it is like to try to pay the bills every month. Really, it is just beyond baffling.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I think it was a pretty simple formula. It was

that we were going to squeeze and squeeze the people who have the least in this society, and that is the hospitals that care for the sick and the uninsured, it is the families that have the courage to send their loved ones off to war, it is middle-class families who can't afford to pay another dime. Those are the people that are going to get soaked in order to fund these giant tax cuts for the people.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. It is people who need to be able tomorrow pay for their gas in their car and who are running businesses who need to pay for the vehicles their employees are operating so they can make sure they can serve their customers so they can stay in business and pay their employees. Those are the people they are not thinking about.

I had a press conference a couple of weeks ago with Congressman KLEIN who also replaced a Member in a district that had not been represented by a Democrat for 26 years. We were out there with some of our small business owners who talked about the impact of gas prices on their bottom line.

I have a constituent in Southwest Ranches who runs a repair business. He literally last year employed 24 people, Mr. RYAN, and now employs 14. He directly attributes this to the fact that he can't afford the gas that he needs to be able to run his trucks around to the businesses that want to hire him to do the repair work. That is just unbelievable.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think it is important for us to say, we know that the government can't do everything. We know that we can't solve every problem. We have got some basic responsibilities though, defense and what not.

One of the things we are doing here when it comes to gas and oil in the bill that we were on the floor today with, the Energy appropriations bill, is to invest into alternative energy sources. It is very important for us to recognize and for the American people to recognize what we are doing with our budget, because we had a lot of amendments and "cut this" and "cut that."

This bill passed out as a bipartisan bill on the House Energy and Water Subcommittee, led by Mr. HOBSON from Ohio, who is a great ranking member and was a great chair of this committee. But, finally, over the hurdles of many Republicans, over the hurdles of the President, we are now investing into renewable energy and energy efficiency procedures here \$1.9 billion, a 50 percent increase in energy efficiency and renewable energy technology. An additional \$300 million was added from the joint resolution 2007 resolution we passed.

We are investing in biofuels. Solar energy, hydropower, geothermal, new vehicle technology, new materials technology so we can have lighter vehicles that don't use as much fossil fuel, weatherization grants, carbon capture and sequestration, climate change science research.

You want to talk about moving the country forward? This bill funds 3,500 scientists.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Could I ask you a question, Mr. RYAN? We are both on the Appropriations Committee and the committee is working very hard in a bipartisan way, I might add, to produce a product that we can really have the American people be proud of.

Is the President talking about signing this bill into law?

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. The President is talking about vetoing this bill, my good friend.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Vetoing this bill. Isn't this the same President that talked, again more words, no action, talked about the need for America to end our addiction to foreign oil in his State of the Union that we sat right in this Chamber and heard him say?

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, I think in four or five or six State of the Union speeches in a row. Not just the last one.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Here we have a budget that actually funds scientists, funds research. There is a great report that has come out called *Rising Above the Coming Storm*, something along those lines, a beautiful panel of experts led by the former CEO of Lockheed Martin, probably not a Democrat, if I had to guess, but a very detailed report on what we need to do.

One of the key components was focus on basic research in the physical sciences. That is what this bill does. Our friend, when I mentioned this the other day, I said, this is a jobs bill. This is the next generation of people that are going to benefit from the research money. They are going to get into research. They are going to partner with businesses and spring out in more research and development and manufacturing and everything else.

He said, well, this is not a jobs bill. I take issue with what the Member from Ohio is saying.

Well, I am sorry. If we figured out a way to do research and create jobs from it and create new industries, isn't that a good thing? That we were able to get a real good bang for our buck in the investments that we have made?

I just think, Mr. Speaker, that illustrates the difference in philosophy. We have one party in this country who comes to the floor and says they can solve every complex issue with two words: Smaller government, lesser taxes, this and that.

We have a bill that doesn't raise taxes and we are able, because we peeled off \$14 billion in corporate welfare that we were giving to the oil companies last year and we put it in alternative energy research, we were able to make that investment without raising taxes. Don't be mad at us. Don't be a hater.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I am not a hater. As a new Member, I am loving every minute of this, Mr. RYAN.

Listen to me: From every standpoint it makes sense. You talk about the jobs

that an investment in alternative energy is going to bring. Undoubtedly it is going to make our air cleaner. It is going to reduce our contribution to global warming. We know in the long run it is going to bring prices down. It is going to be the thing that finally breaks our dependence on the high prices of foreign oil.

Also it is about national security. It is about finally breaking us free of dependency on the countries that produce that oil, that compromise a lot of our conversations in places in the world like the Middle East, compromised additionally by the amount of debt those OPEC nations hold. So, it is kind of a win-win-win-win-win scenario.

So the question is why didn't it happen? Well, it didn't happen because the agenda here wasn't about the economy. The agenda wasn't about cleaning up the air. The agenda wasn't about lowering gas prices. The agenda was about helping a bunch of people in the oil industry.

This is what happens when you break this place free of special interests. Good policy starts to happen. You get wins for everybody when you start making this about Main Street, right, instead of about the few people that get in the room and write the legislation based on how much money they have given to campaigns and how much influence they have inside the Beltway.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. You know, Mr. MURPHY, what you and Mr. RYAN just outlined is what Speaker PELOSI always talks about when we are in our Caucus meetings and when I have heard her talk about the direction that she is helping us lead this country, and that is the budget, and by extension the appropriations bills, are an expression of our values.

Mr. RYAN, you talked about our colleague on the other side, and I was in the Chamber when you stood up and talked about that. It really is an expression of our values and a stark contrast in the difference between ours and theirs. Their values were expressed in the energy bills that they passed in the 109th Congress, which gave away \$14 billion in subsidies to the oil industry, which when we came into the majority we included in our first 100-hour agenda. The first six bills we passed, one of those was repealing those \$14 billion in subsidies so we could responsibly use that money to expand alternative energy research. We earmarked that money appropriately and are holding it so that we can make sure we spend it on really ending our addiction to foreign oil.

So if you look at the Homeland Security bill, the Military Construction bill, the Energy and Water bill, all of the appropriations bills that we are going through right now, they are an expression of our values. They show these stark and clear differences between the way we choose to take this country, in the direction we choose to take this country, versus the direction that they had us on, which was careening into oblivion.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I think I work pretty hard. I get back to the district every minute I can. I see as many people as I am able to. But you don't have to work that hard to hear what the values of the American people are. I mean, you don't have to be everywhere at all times in your district to understand that when people were crying out for energy reform, energy reform wasn't giving more tax giveaways to big oil.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. No, but you do have to be listening. It is very easy to stand as a Member of Congress in front of a group of people, have a town hall meeting, be in a room sitting on your couch in your office, and you are there but you are not listening.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. All I mean by that is it makes it even more inexcusable that all you had to do was go out and listen a little bit to hear the cries from people.

There are these sort of "are you kidding me" moments that happen out there. They happened in my district, when people are asking, listen, do something about energy policy. And the "do something" was let's just empower the oil companies even more.

People are crying out for change in our policy towards Iraq, and the answer was we are going to commit ourselves to even more troops and even more money and an even greater failed policy.

People stand there and say, are you kidding me? Did you hear anything I said? And for 12 years, the answer increasingly was no. We didn't hear anything you said. We didn't try, and in fact our ears were attuned to a very different set of people.

So now, this revolution that happened here isn't terribly revolutionary. We are finally starting to listen to people again, and that means investing in alternative energy, that means setting a new course in Iraq, that means making it easier for kids to go to college.

These aren't new ideas. These are ideas that people have been talking about in bars and in diners and pancake breakfasts and pasta dinners for years.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I don't want to say it is fun, because there are a lot of people that are still struggling, but it is so much better now to go back to your district and people ask you, what are you doing about gas prices? And we have got a great budget, and it is not immediate. That is the painful thing that you have to realize. People are struggling and people who are driving from lab to lab, they somehow have to use a lot of transportation, it is hard.

But we have something here that we are passing from the House that is going to significantly over time reduce our dependence on foreign oil, and it is going to benefit the average American consumer.

So, let's look at this in the broad sense. Of all the promises, the Democrats made promises, they got in, we

gave them a shot. We are taking advantage of this shot. One, we didn't raise taxes, first of all.

But look at what we did. If you are the average person sitting out there, you now in July will have an increase in the minimum wage to over \$7 an hour. So anyone who is associated with that will get an increase. Those people slightly above will also get an increase. Included in that was a tax cut for small businesses, so that those people who are bearing the brunt of this will benefit as well.

Then you are getting \$700 more in your Pell Grant. So if you have got kids in school, you are going to get an extra \$700 a year grant money. If you are in Ohio, Governor Strickland's budget, a former Democratic Member of Congress who is now Governor, passed a budget where there is a zero percent increase in tuition in Ohio next year, zero percent the following year, which traditionally has been almost a 9 percent increase over the past 5 or 6 years.

So if you are a student in Ohio, you are getting a 9 percent cut in your tuition from an increase that would have happened to zero, and you are getting an extra \$700 Pell Grant. You are talking about an almost \$2,000 tax cut for average families in Ohio if you go to school.

So you got the minimum wage, you got the Pell Grant, you have community health clinics, about \$400 million increase between the supplemental and what we are doing in this year's bill. There will be hundreds of more health clinics around the country this year. People can get their healthcare. We are investing in research, 3,500 scientists will be funded through this bill in all of these different areas for alternative energy research. Increased funding in Head Start, Even Start, after school programs. This is a bill for the people.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. These are bills, because it is plural, that truly think about what the needs are of the average person, the person that we have been talking about for this whole hour that has a paycheck come in and has to figure out how they are going to pay all the bills with the money that comes in.

The help that we need to give them to do is to make sure not that we put money in their pocket, because like you said, Mr. RYAN, government can't do everything. Government is here to provide assistance when it is needed, when the person doesn't have the ability to deal with the issue on their own.

□ 2130

Like the cost of a student loan, like making sure that they earn a minimal amount of money so they can pay their bills and making sure that the government ensures that the domestic homeland security needs are taken care of, that we have an appropriate number of Border Patrol which has been woefully and inadequately funded under the Bush administration.

They spend a whole lot of time beating on their chest and saying how important it is that we have a strong Border Patrol. The Bush administration did not fund as many or even ask for as many Border Patrol agents as the Clinton administration did. It is just rampant hypocrisy. That is all I have seen in the 2½ years that I have been here. It is blah, blah, blah. All they do is talk, and it is hollow and empty behind the words.

They have the wrong kind of transparency on their side of the aisle, and folks see through it. That is why they are counting on us to make sure that we take care of these things.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. One of the miracles of what is happening here, we are starting to change those priorities without spending more money in order to do that. You can tack onto your list of help to kids and families the fact that we passed legislation that could bring on average \$4,000 in relief to students by lowering the interest rate on student loans. That is \$4,000 back in the pocket of a young man or woman graduating from college, that is going to be looking to pile on a mortgage on top of their debt. And we did it at no additional expense to the taxpayers. We changed in a small way the amount of money that we guarantee to banks, and the banks are doing pretty well out there already, and we got \$4,000 back in the pockets of American students and graduates without costing anybody else a dime. Same thing on the energy policy.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. When you look at why are we doing this, because we are competing against 1.3 billion people in China. We are competing with 1.2 citizens in India. Not only do we have to do that, but we have to put the pedal to the metal and increase the speed of what we are doing here. This is just the beginning of what we need to do to be competitive, to make sure that we have enough engineers and scientists doing the kind of research that we are passing bills on now, starting to lay the groundwork for, so more kids can afford college.

And we have to ask all of the citizens of this country to step up to bat and really make sure that you are developing your skills and talents to the best of your ability because we can't do it for you. We are going to help with funding and after school. We are going to make sure that kids get the kind of support that they need, but we need Americans to step up to bat and develop the kids so we can compete.

We only have 300 million people in the country. We are competing against 1.3 billion in China and 1.2 billion in India. We need everybody to develop to their fullest extent.

One final point, we are creating through these bills new industries that will pay dividends for our country. The alternative energy is one. With all of the funding in research, it is going to create things and scientists are going to develop things and partner with the

private sector. Ten years from now, we can't even imagine what will come with this investment just this year.

In committee we had testimony that there was a blip in energy research, an increase in the late seventies when President Carter was here, and then it went right back down. In those 2 years, solar panels were developed. In those 2 years of that increase in funding.

Give these bright people the resources they need. And also, we have been able to move stem cell research which the President has vetoed. We can't even imagine the health care advances that will come from that research.

So we are creating new areas for young people to grow into and to create jobs for American people.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. RYAN, you try to come up with what you can compare this to as far as the situation we are in and who we are dealing with here. It is like we are in the 21st century and we are negotiating with the Cro Magnon man, people who are stuck in the Paleozoic era. How do you even begin a conversation?

If it is not their values, maybe it is that they are literally—maybe the tape recorder is broken. Maybe they are stuck in the age of dinosaurs. You can watch TV and see there are commercials on with Cro Magnon man. Maybe they have infiltrated the United States Congress.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I see a commercial here. They are going to be mad at you. Why are you making fun of the caveman?

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. I know, I know, I am going to offend the cavemen. But we work with a lot of them. People who think like cavemen. That is not a constituency I have to worry about too much right now. Really, that is what we have to deal with.

Can you imagine sitting around the negotiating table with a caveman. How easy would be it to move the caveman off their view. Not very easy. We need the American people to help continue to communicate with our colleagues and tug them into the 21st century where we are dwelling.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I am excited that we almost got to the end of the hour without a five syllable word until Paleozoic. That is in part why I joined the 30-something Working Group, to get that kind of vocabulary help.

There is a lot of anger coming from the minority side right now, and I think there is probably reason for them to be angry. When 1 or 2 percent of the population gets the run of the place for 12 years.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. They brought it on themselves. They have only themselves to blame.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. When the other 98 percent get their government back, I would be angry myself if all of a sudden my day was over.

But let's not overstate the partisan differences here because when we have

put on the House floor good legislation for the American people, that student loan cut that we talked about, investment in alternative energy, stem cell research, when we put that before the House a lot of Republicans came over and supported it.

So there is a group of leadership, that is frankly the ones that come down the House floor and do most of talking, but there are a bunch of Republicans when Democrats finally put an agenda that is sticking up for regular people, they are going to support us on that. The newspapers and the TV talk shows are filled with the Republican leadership who, frankly, it seems to me, after 6 months on the job, don't speak for a lot of people on that side of the aisle.

I think what we are doing here over time is when you get past a lot of the rhetoric, a lot of the votes end up being pretty bipartisan because when you get beyond the leadership, you have Republicans who are appreciative of the fact that Democrats have finally returned this place to the American people.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. It is going to be interesting to watch the contortions with our friends on the other side of the aisle, you can see their strategy is to blame the \$3 trillion that they ran up somehow on us when we weren't in charge of anything, and then they are going to start taking credit for things like the earmark transparency that we, we are in charge here, so if it passes, we have done it. What we have done they are going to try to take credit for.

But it will be so much nicer, I think, next year when all of this is passed and the American people recognize it is the Democrats that has done this. And if the President vetoes it, let's go out and campaign, take that one to the American people and let the President defend not hiring 3,500 scientists in DOE to do alternative energy research. Let him say he is going to veto the Pell Grants. It will be easier because we won't have to come to the floor as much, occasionally just to remind the American people what we are doing instead of trying to push what we are doing now. I think that will be a good time for us.

So we are happy that we do get some support. As I stated earlier, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HOBSON) has been a tremendous advocate for putting this budget together through the Energy Department, but the extremists in their party which have been governing their party for the last 6 years, are still coming kicking and screaming into the high-tech research and development economy that we are in now, and somehow think if they cut taxes for a millionaire and that millionaire invests that money in a plant in China, that somehow is benefiting average Americans. Wages have been stagnant for 30 years. So we are trying to create new economies, new sectors of the economy that will grow and provide opportunity for most people.

I just saw a poll yesterday, 7 in 10 Americans think the economy is get-

ting worse for them. That is obviously not shared prosperity, and our friends come to the floor and say the stock market is doing great. Well, that is great if you have stocks. And even if you do, I don't know if it makes up for the stagnant wages and the 20 percent increase in health care costs.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. We need some more bipartisanship. And the Six in 06 agenda, the Medicare legislation to ensure that we can negotiate for lower drug prices, the repeal of the \$14 billion in subsidies, the passage of the 9/11 Commission recommendations, the minimum wage, those bills had an average of 65 Republican votes. We are glad to have the rank and file Members who clearly were stymied and strangled by their leadership in the majority who are willing to do the right thing and come along with us.

I wish we could see more of that bipartisanship and wide open eyes on the war in Iraq because we still have a bunch of lemmings who continue to just be willing to walk off the plank and not ask any questions and continue the same mantra. It is really startling.

The bills that we put out on this floor to establish a timeline and to establish benchmarks and to ensure that we can begin to turn this conflict over to the Iraq government, maybe we got two Republican votes on those bills. And one we got one Republican vote on it.

You know, over the weekend, because we have been waiting, and they all say wait until September. There are 14 who went to the White House and said to the President, you have until September. We are going to hang with you, but in September we better see some results or else.

Over the weekend, in my papers we saw commentary from General Petraeus who said, you know, it is not looking like we are going to be able to do any significant draw down or any draw down of troops in September. In fact, we may need to be in Iraq for 10 years. Ten years.

Mr. Speaker, my children will be adults in 10 years. My oldest kids are 8. That means we will have spent virtually because what we are going on, 6 years in Iraq now, that means we will have spent my children's entire life in Iraq. Can you imagine. Their entire childhood twisted and mired in another country's conflict that we created for no good reason or at least for a reason that wasn't accurate with an administration who can't admit when they are wrong. There is no bipartisanship there, and let's just make that clear.

When, God forbid, when we are still twisted in this war in Iraq next year, we will do our best that we vote to bring those troops home and establish those benchmarks and some accountability. But if we don't have the votes to override a veto with our Republican colleagues, we will still be there next year, and that is what is going to decide the 2008 election.

It is not that I hope that happens because I don't. I want to make sure that the troops come home and are reunited with their family, but we will have a Democratic President at that point because the American people are done. Stick a fork in them, done.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, for all those people out there who came out to the polls and voted on national security or fiscal responsibility or competence in government, no matter what you hear late at night here or on the talk radio shows from the Republicans, pay attention to what happens here in the House of Representatives over the coming weeks and months.

Pay attention to the Democratic majority's plan to balance this budget, to pass on tax relief to people that need it, to start restoring order in this world so we are fighting the right fight at the right time. Pay attention to what happens here.

□ 2145

As we have said over and over again, for the first time in over a decade, words are going to be matched with actions. From one side of this Chamber, from the Republican side, you're going to see words. From the Democratic side, you're going to see words and action to follow. As a new Member of the 30-somethings and as a new Member of this Congress, that's what makes me proud to be here, is that we're saying the right things and then we're doing the right things behind it. All those people who came out and cast their votes based on those ideas are going to find those ideas put into action here.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Let's reassure those soldiers and their families who are serving that this will not be another Vietnam when these kids come home. I think we've already seen that. In the VA budget, \$1.7 billion above the President's request for medical services. We have major construction, \$3.6 billion, \$193 million over the President's request. For medical administration, these vets have been backlogged for years, mental health and substance abuse, increase \$100 million over the 07 request. Assistance for homeless vets, health care sharing incentive fund. A lot of money that's going to take care of them.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Two things I just wanted to add on that. For veterans, it means the largest single increase in the 77-year history for veterans health care in the Veterans Administration. What that means is that the people that I serve and that you serve that are veterans who are waiting 7 and 8 months to get their health care taken care of at their local VA hospitals, they're going to get taken care of. Actions to match words, just like the gentleman from Connecticut said.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Let's just remember that we're doing all this without raising taxes. Check your form this year, compare it to next year, there

will be no tax increase. We're reducing the budget. We balance it in 5 years, unlike what has happened over the past 6 years with a Republican House, a Republican Senate and a Republican White House.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to remind the American people of this, that they borrowed billions and billions, \$644 billion from Japan, \$349 billion from China, \$100 billion in 06 from OPEC countries in order to begin the largest debt, \$3 trillion. Our friends on the other side have raised the debt limit while they were in charge five times so they can borrow more money from Japan and China and put our national security at risk here and, quite frankly, not account for the budget in the United States like they should.

It was an honor to be here with our friend from Florida.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Same here.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Our friend from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Thank you, Mr. RYAN.

It's a privilege to be a part of the 30-somethings, Speaker PELOSI's working group. You can e-mail us at 30somethingdems@mail.house.gov. You can visit us on the Speaker's Web page, www.speaker.gov and there's a link there to the 30-something's page.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TOWN OF RONDA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the centennial of the town of Ronda, North Carolina. This week, Ronda celebrates the 100th anniversary of its 1907 incorporation.

Ronda, a thriving community in Wilkes County, North Carolina, is home to a rich heritage of hardworking families, and I am very proud to represent them.

The town traces its roots all the way back to 1779, when the surrounding area was deeded to Benjamin Cleveland in what would become the eastern part of Wilkes County.

Cleveland established a farming operation which became known as Roundabout Farm, named for the way the Yadkin River cut through the land around the farm. As these things usually turn out, the term Roundabout was shortened and the name Ronda was born.

Manufacturing operations and agriculture have played a large role in the town's 100-year history, making Ronda one of the economic epicenters of Wilkes County during the past century. While the town of Ronda has certainly seen its share of economic storms, it remains a strong and united American community today.

I wish to honor this fine North Carolina community for its steadfast commitment to the small town values that help make this Nation great. Happy centennial, Ronda. Here's to 100 more years of small town living.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ORTIZ (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal health reasons.

Mr. MCCOTTER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for June 18.

Mr. SULLIVAN (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today and June 19.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for June 19.

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. CAPUANO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SESTAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCINTYRE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, June 27.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, June 27.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, for 5 minutes, today and June 21.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. FOXX, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILLS 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. 277. An act to modify the boundaries of Grand Teton National Park to include certain land within the GT Park Subdivision, and for other purposes to the Committee on Natural Resources.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 21, 2007, 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:

2270. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; California Route 12 Drawbridge, near Isleton, CA [CGD11-07-011] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received June 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2271. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Illinois Waterway, Beardstown, IL [CGD08-07-012] received June 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2272. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Burns Cutoff, Stockton, CA [CGD11-07-010] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received June 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2273. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Large Passenger Vessel Crew Requirements [USCG-2007-27761] (RIN: 1625-AB16) received June 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2274. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Navigation and Navigable Waters; Technical, Organizational, and Conforming Amendments [USCG-2006-25150] (RIN: 1625-ZA08) received June 13, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2275. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Guidance to clarify the treatment of certain distributions under Internal Revenue Code section 897(h)(1) [Notice 2007-55] received June 15, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2276. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Publications Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — 26 CFR 601.201: Rulings and determination letters (Also, Part 1, 401; 1.401(b)-1.) (Rev. Proc. 2007-44) received June 15, 2007, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. CARDOZA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 502. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2771) making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2008, and for other purposes (Rept. 110-201). 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. PETERSON of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. NUNES, Mr. EDWARDS, and Mr. MELANCON):

H.R. 2784. A bill to greatly enhance the Nation's environmental, energy, economic, and national security by terminating long-standing Federal prohibitions on the domestic production of abundant offshore supplies of natural gas, to dedicate fixed percentages of the resultant royalties for environmental restoration projects, renewable energy and carbon sequestration research, and weatherization and energy assistance for those in need, and to share a portion of such royalties with producing States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and the Budget, 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. WELCH of Vermont:

H.R. 2785. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the exception from the treatment of publicly traded partnerships as corporations for partnerships with passive-type income shall not apply to partnerships directly or indirectly deriving income from providing investment adviser and related asset management services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself, Mr. PEARCE, Ms. WATERS, Mr. BOREN, Mr. RENZI, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts):

H.R. 2786. A bill to reauthorize the programs for housing assistance for Native Americans; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH (for himself, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas):

H.R. 2787. A bill to amend the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards Act of 1974 to require that weather radios be installed in all manufactured homes manufactured or sold in the United States; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FLAKE:

H.R. 2788. A bill to require each piece included in a mass mailing sent by a Member of the House of Representatives as franked mail to include a statement of the costs of producing and mailing the mass mailing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FORTUÑO (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. WELLER, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 2789. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to apply automatic "deemed" enrollment under part B of the Medicare Program to residents of Puerto Rico; 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. HARE (for himself and Mr. MORAN of Kansas):

H.R. 2790. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish the position of Director of Physician Assistant Services within the office of the Under Secretary of Veterans Affairs for Health; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. HOOLEY (for herself and Mr. DOYLE):

H.R. 2791. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for establishment of a unique device identification system for medical devices; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 2792. A bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to permit leave to care for a same-sex spouse, domestic partner, parent-in-law, adult child, sibling, or grandparent who has a serious health condition; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, and Oversight and 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. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 2793. A bill to provide for the reinstatement of a license for a certain Federal Energy Regulatory Commission project; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PASTOR:

H.R. 2794. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to increase the number of qualified nursing faculty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 2795. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to set the rate of reimbursement under the beneficiary travel program of the Department of Veterans Affairs at \$0.21 per mile; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 2796. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals to defer recognition of reinvested capital gains distributions from regulated investment companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. FORBES, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. SMITH of Texas):

H.R. 2797. A bill to amend title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to establish a National White Collar Crime Center grants program for purposes of improving the identification, investigation, and prosecution of certain criminal conspiracies and activities and terrorist conspiracies and activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

H.R. 2798. A bill to reauthorize the programs of the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 2799. A bill to require a quadrennial review of the diplomatic strategy and structure of the Department of State and its related agencies to determine how the Department can best fulfill its mission in the 21st century and meet the challenges of a changing world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THORNBERRY:

H.R. 2800. A bill to improve the conduct of strategic communication by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 2801. A bill to provide for the inclusion of certain non-Federal land in the Izembek and Alaska Peninsula Wildlife Refuges and Wilderness in the State of Alaska and for the granting of a right-of-way for safe and reliable access for the Native Village of King Cove, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TANCREDO:

H. Con. Res. 171. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to relocating the United States Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MACK, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. FORTUÑO, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina):

H. Res. 500. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives in opposition to efforts by major natural gas exporting countries to establish a cartel or other mechanism to manipulate the supply of natural gas to the world market for the purpose of setting an arbitrary and non-market price or as an instrument of political pressure; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. POE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CARTER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. SHUSTER):

H. Res. 501. A resolution commending Craig Biggio of the Houston Astros for reaching 3,000 base hits as a Major League Baseball player and for his outstanding service to baseball and the Houston, Texas, region; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself and Mr. SHAYS):

H. Res. 503. A resolution commending the Middle East Investment Initiative; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BAIRD (for himself, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois):

H. Res. 504. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that legislation and conference reports be available on the Internet for 72 hours before consideration by the House, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KLEIN of Florida (for himself, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. TANNER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan):

H. Res. 505. A resolution recognizing the innumerable contributions of the recreational boating community and the boating industry to the continuing prosperity and affluence of the United States; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California (for herself, Mr. WOLF, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H. Res. 506. A resolution condemning ongoing human rights abuses in Vietnam, and expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should remove permanent normal trade relations status with Vietnam unless all political and religious prisoners are released and significant and immediate human rights reforms are made by the Government of Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 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 Ms. SCHWARTZ (for herself and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas):

H. Res. 507. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Save for Retirement Week; to the Committee on Financial Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

84. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 25 opposing any effort to implement a trinational political, governmental entity among the United States, Canada, and Mexico; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 23: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 77: Mr. STEARNS.
H.R. 98: Mr. KING of New York.
H.R. 171: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 176: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 180: Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 181: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 364: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. HONDA, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 369: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 371: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 402: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
H.R. 480: Mr. CARTER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. WAMP, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. AKIN, Mr. WALBERG, and Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.

H.R. 503: Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. SARBANES, and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 513: Mr. MURTHA, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 662: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 690: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

H.R. 711: Mr. BAIRD and Mr. MELANCON.
H.R. 757: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 760: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
H.R. 767: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.

H.R. 819: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 821: Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas.

H.R. 864: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 900: Mr. UDALL of Colorado and Mr. MCCARTHY of California.

H.R. 946: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 962: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 971: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 980: Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Mr. KLEIN of Florida.

H.R. 1073: Mr. CLAY and Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 1120: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. POE, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. KELLER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 1125: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ISSA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. CLEAVER, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 1134: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 1142: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FARR, and Mr. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 1239: Mr. SESTAK, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1259: Mr. COHEN and Mr. BERRY.
H.R. 1273: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 1275: Ms. ESHOO, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. SARBANES, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1293: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. BOYD of Florida.

H.R. 1320: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 1384: Mr. DREIER and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 1385: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1386: Mr. OBERSTAR and Ms. HIRONO.
H.R. 1420: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 1428: Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee and Mr. PLATTS.

H.R. 1456: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H.R. 1459: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
H.R. 1474: Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 1479: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
H.R. 1518: Mr. BOYD of Florida.

H.R. 1551: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 1567: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1589: Mr. BOUCHER and Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

H.R. 1653: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 1655: Mr. KING of New York, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1671: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1693: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 1705: Ms. HARMAN and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 1707: Ms. HOOLEY and Mrs. GILLIBRAND.

H.R. 1713: Mr. SCHIFF.
H. Con. Res. 1742: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 1746: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 1755: Ms. BALDWIN.
H.R. 1759: Mr. COBLE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. WEINER, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. HUNTER, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 1761: Mr. KELLER.
H.R. 1821: Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

H.R. 1851: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1909: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 1940: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 1945: Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1959: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 2003: Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 2005: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2017: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

H.R. 2064: Ms. HIRONO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. CARNAHAN.

H.R. 2079: Mr. MCCOTTER.
H.R. 2123: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 2125: Mr. PAUL and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.

H.R. 2164: Mr. DAVID DAVIS of Tennessee.
H.R. 2165: Mr. MEEKS of New York and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 2183: Mr. ROSS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, and Mr. BARROW.

H.R. 2185: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2211: Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 2216: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 2217: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2226: Mr. KAGEN.
H.R. 2233: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 2265: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2286: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H.R. 2287: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 2295: Mr. RADANOVICH and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 2353: Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 2371: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 2405: Ms. SOLIS, Mr. STARK, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. WATSON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. HIRONO.

H.R. 2417: Mr. CUELLAR.
H.R. 2485: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 2508: Mr. HUNTER and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 2567: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 2572: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. PAS-TOR.

H.R. 2596: Mr. ABERCROMBIE and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2608: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida.

H.R. 2619: Mr. TOWNS.
H.R. 2654: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 2669: Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, and Mr. WU.

H.R. 2702: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. CARSON, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 2715: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 2736: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 2738: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 2740: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FILNER, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 2744: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 2765: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 2779: Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. HELLER.

H. Con. Res. 75: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H. Con. Res. 102: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H. Con. Res. 113: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 138: Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. BOSWELL.

H. Con. Res. 162: Mr. GONZALEZ and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H. Res. 18: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H. Res. 106: Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KUHL of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. BARROW.

H. Res. 143: Mr. FARR, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H. Res. 169: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H. Res. 194: Mr. McNULTY and Mr. LOEB-SACK.

H. Res. 282: Ms. KILPATRICK and Mr. ENGEL.
H. Res. 294: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. BEAN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. WELCH of Vermont, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. LEE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, and Mr. CUELLAR.

H. Res. 353: Mr. CLAY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. CARSON, Mr. GILCHREST, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Res. 356: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H. Res. 389: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, and Mr. HONDA.

H. Res. 426: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H. Res. 444: Mr. GONZALEZ.
 H. Res. 447: Mr. SCHIFF.
 H. Res. 457: Mr. FORTUÑO and Mr. TIBERI.
 H. Res. 467: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Mr. GERLACH.
 H. Res. 490: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. WATT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HAYES, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CARTER, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. BONO, Mr. ISSA, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. POE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CLAY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. BACA, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. HALL of Texas.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

70. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Board of County Commissioner of Miami-Dade County, Florida, relative to Resolution No. R-470-07 urging the Florida Legislature increase funding for Florida's voluntary pre-kindergarten education program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

71. Also, a petition of the Legislature of Tompkins County, New York, relative to Resolution No. 55 supporting the Federal recognition and funding for the National 2-1-1 initiative; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

72. Also, a petition of the National Sorority of Phi Delta Kappa, Inc., relative to a petition supporting the actions taken by CBS Radio and MSNBC in terminating the services of Don Imus; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

73. Also, a petition of the Board of County Commissioners of Miami-Dade County, Florida, relative to Resolution No. R-472-07 urging the Florida Legislature to defeat legislation that would preempt local regulation of limerock mining; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

74. Also, a petition of the Legislature of Rockland County, New York, relative to Resolution No. 215 requesting that the Congress of the United States pass S. 431 and H.R. 719, the Keeping the Internet Devoid of Sexual Predators Act of 2207 or the Kids Act of 2007; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

75. Also, a petition of the Town of Lanesborough, Massachusetts, relative to a Resolution to impeach President George W. Bush and Vice President Richard B. Cheney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

76. Also, a petition of the City Council of Oberlin, Ohio, relative to Resolution No. R07-06 petitioning the Congress of the United States initiate impeachment proceedings of President George W. Bush and Vice President Richard B. Cheney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

77. Also, a petition of the Town of Whately, Massachusetts, relative to a Resolution to impeach President George W. Bush and Vice President Richard B. Cheney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

78. Also, a petition of the Board of Supervisors of Seneca County, New York, relative to Resolution No. 140-07 requesting continued support for an immigration reform bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

79. Also, a petition of the Board of County Commissioners of Miami-Dade County, Florida, relative to Resolution No. R-473-07 urging the Florida Legislature to not pass legislation related to the South Florida Regional Transportation Authority that increases the statutorily-mandated local funding requirements unless it includes a dedicated funding source; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

80. Also, a petition of the Board of County Commissioners of Miami-Dade County, Florida, relative to Resolution No. R-471-07 urging the Florida Legislature to defeat legislation that would preempt local regulation of wetlands; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MR. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT NO. 28: Page 2, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$36,700,000)".

Page 40, line 26, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$36,700,000)".

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MR. FLAKE

AMENDMENT NO. 29: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to fund nongovernmental organizations, specifically named in the report accompanying the Act, outside of a competitive bidding process.

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 30: Page 49, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$13,860,000)".

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 31: Page 50, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$47,700,000)".

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 32: Page 51, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,203,480,000)".

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 33: Page 70, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$27,563,000)".

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 34: Page 70, strike line 11 and all that follows through line 15.

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 35: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following: SEC. _____. Appropriations made in title V of this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of \$79,642,000.

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 36: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following: None of the funds in this act may be used by the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology.

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 37: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following: SEC. _____. Appropriations made under the heading "Funds Appropriated to the President" in title III of this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of \$1,052,833,000.

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 38: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following: SEC. _____. Appropriations made under the heading "Funds Appropriated to the President" in title III of this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of \$65,208,000.

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 39: Page 5, line 26, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$55,729,000)".

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 40: Page 8, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$203,082,000)".

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 41: Page 9, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$195,000,000)".

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 42: Page 12, strike line 13 and all that follows through line 17.

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 43: Page 23, strike line 17 and all that follows through line 8 on page 26.

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MR. HENSARLING

AMENDMENT NO. 44: Page 28, strike line 7 and all that follows through line 11.

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MR. ISSA

AMENDMENT NO. 45: Page 2, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$25,000,000)".

Page 4, line 18, insert at the end before the period the following: ": Provided further, That of the amount made available under this heading, \$232,244,000 shall be available for the Bureau of Consular Affairs' Passport Operations".

Page 46, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$25,000,000)".

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MR. LAMBORN

AMENDMENT NO. 46: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act for assistance under the West Bank and Gaza program may be made available to or through any individual, private or government entity, or educational institution that does not expressly recognize the right of the State of Israel to exist.

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MR. MCCAUL OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 47: Page 9, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$30,000,000)".

Page 52, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$30,000,000)".

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MRS. MUSGRAVE

AMENDMENT NO. 48: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

SEC. 699D. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 0.5 percent.

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MR. PENCE

AMENDMENT No. 49: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR DISTRIBUTION OF ASSETS FROM LIQUIDATION OR DISSOLUTION OF ENTERPRISE FUNDS

SEC. 6xx. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under titles II through V of this Act may be used to provide for the distribution of any assets from any liquidation or dissolution of an Enterprise Fund, in whole or in part, to an entity other than the United States Treasury.

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MR. PENCE

AMENDMENT No. 50: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following new section:

LIMITATION ON FUNDS FOR DISTRIBUTION OF ASSETS FROM LIQUIDATION OR DISSOLUTION OF ENTERPRISE FUNDS

SEC. 6xx. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available under titles II through V of this Act may be used to provide for the distribution of more than 50 percent of any assets from any liquidation or dissolution of an Enterprise Fund, in whole or in part, to an entity other than the United States Treasury.

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MR. POE

AMENDMENT No. 51: At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following new section:

SEC. 6 _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to provide an immigrant or non-immigrant visa to a national or citizen of a country the central government of which has notified the Secretary of State of its refusal to extradite to the United States any individual indicted in the United States for killing a law enforcement officer, as specified in a United States extradition request.

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

AMENDMENT No. 52: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. Appropriations made in this Act are hereby reduced in the amount of \$342,430,000.

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MS. ROS-LEHTINEN

AMENDMENT No. 53: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Department of State as a contribution for the United Nations Human Rights Council.

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MS. ROS-LEHTINEN

AMENDMENT No. 54: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Department of State as a contribution for the United Nations Human Rights Council.

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MRS. MUSGRAVE

AMENDMENT No. 55: Page 51, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$175,000)".

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MR. PORTER

AMENDMENT No. 56: Page 183, line 16, after "low-income women" insert ", including women who are victims of trafficking in persons,".

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MR. SHAYS

AMENDMENT No. 57: Page 2, line 22, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 17, line 19, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MR. SHAYS

AMENDMENT No. 58: Page 40, line 26, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$50,000,000) (reduced by \$50,000,000)".

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MR. SHAYS

AMENDMENT No. 59: Page 2, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$35,000,000)".

Page 58, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$35,000,000)".

H.R. 2764

OFFERED BY: MR. SHERMAN

AMENDMENT No. 60: Page 29, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$65,000,000)".

Page 30, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$65,000,000)".

Page 70, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$65,000,000)".