287, no further amendment to the bill may be offered except:

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

Amendments printed in the RECORD and numbered 3, 6, 8, 11, 13, and 17;

Amendments printed in the RECORD and numbered 1, 4, 5, and 14, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

An amendment by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) regarding environmental justice, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

An amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) regarding a $500 million increase in Clean Water State Revolving Fund and tax matters;

An amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) regarding a $100 million increase in Clean Water State Revolving Fund, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

An amendment by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR) regarding State and Tribal Assistance Grants;

An amendment by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) or the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) regarding the Tongass National Forest, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

An amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) regarding making spending on certain accounts subject to authorization;

An amendment by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) regarding intentional dosing;

An amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) to amendment No. 5;

An amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) regarding concession sales;

An amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) or the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) regarding Lower Klamath and Tule Lake; and

An amendment by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) regarding funding levels.

Each such amendment may be offered only by the Member named in this request or a designee, or 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 as specified, and except that the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and the Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies 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 opponent. 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 Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am trying to stall for time while we clear up a controversy that has arisen.

□ 1500

I certainly am in support of the intention of the gentleman's request, but it is my understanding that there may be a problem with one of the amendments. I am hoping that by the time I am done filibustering here the gentleman's staff will have worked it out with the Parliamentarian and we will be able to proceed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). The Chair will inquire of the gentleman from North Carolina, does the request include a possible modified form of amendment No. 1?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, with that understanding, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanoa Evans, one of his secretaries.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 287 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. 2361.

□ 1502

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. 2361) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, with Mr. SHIMKUS (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the bill had been read through page 53, line 17.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, no further amendment to the bill may be offered except:

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

Amendments printed in the RECORD and numbered 3, 6, 8, 11, 13, and 17;

Amendments printed in the RECORD and numbered 1 subject to a modification to the amendment as printed in the RECORD, 4, 5, and 14, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

An amendment by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) regarding environmental justice, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

An amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) regarding a $500 million increase in Clean Water State Revolving Fund and tax matters;

An amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) regarding a $100 million increase in Clean Water State Revolving Fund, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

An amendment by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR) regarding State and Tribal Assistance Grants;

An amendment by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) or the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) regarding the Tongass National Forest, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

An amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO) regarding making spending on certain accounts subject to authorization;

An amendment by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) regarding intentional dosing;

An amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) to amendment No. 5;

An amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) regarding concession sales;

An amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) or the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) regarding Lower Klamath and Tule Lake; and

An amendment by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) regarding funding levels.

Each amendment may be offered only by the Member named in the request or a designee, or 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 as specified, and except that the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and the Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies 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.

Except as otherwise specified, each amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 105. No funds provided in this title may be expended by the Department of the Interior to conduct offshore oil and natural

gas preleasing, leasing and related activities in the eastern Gulf of Mexico planning area for any lands located outside Sale 181, as identified in the final Outer Continental Shelf 5-Year Oil and Gas Leasing Program, 1997–2002.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. ISTOOK

Mr. ISTOOK. 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. 14 offered by Mr. ISTOOK:

Page 53, line 24, after the period, insert the following: ''This section shall not apply on and after any date on which the Energy Information Administration publishes data (as required by section 57 of the Federal Energy Administration Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 790f) demonstrating that net imports of crude oil account for more than two-thirds of oil consumption in the United States.''.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK).

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, as we heard earlier, a major reason that we have skyrocketing energy prices in the United States is because this bill has been used for a vehicle for 30 years to restrict the ability to explore in the Outer Continental Shelf. When those restrictions were first adopted, America was importing 28 percent of its oil from foreign shores. Today, that has risen to 58 percent and it continues to climb dramatically each year.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, says it is about time that we create a commonsense trigger. At such time as two-thirds of our energy consumption is coming from overseas, then we will lift the moratorium in the area that has the most promise, which in this case is the eastern Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. Chairman, I know the big issue to people is, is it environmentally safe to do so? I realize that is the concern and I would like to focus on that. America has not had any major spill from an offshore oil well since 1969. Why? It is not because we are not drilling offshore. We are getting 25 percent of our oil from offshore, actually 30 percent of oil and a fourth of the natural gas. But we are not allowing drilling in most of the areas. Ninety percent of the coastal areas in the lower 48 States are closed by these moratoria. To drill offshore, however, you have to obtain 17 major Federal permits. You have to obey 90 sets of Federal regulations which have been put in place during the years of these moratoria. All of those are designed to protect the environment. They have been 99.999 percent effective in keeping the environment safe. Less than one one-thousandth of 1 percent of the oil that is produced offshore has been spilled. Who else has a safety record like that, 99.999 percent? We also are able to produce it from fewer offshore platforms because we have horizontal drilling that allows multiple wells to be drilled from a single location. And of the oil spills, the very few that have happened, 97 percent are of less than one barrel of oil.

We are talking about drilling at least 10 miles offshore in Federal waters. In most of these cases, we are talking about drilling 100-plus miles offshore. There is enormous potential for this. The official estimate says there is 76 billion barrels of oil and 406 trillion cubic feet of natural gas in the Outer Continental Shelf. But 90 percent of these resources in the lower 48 have been placed off-limits.

This is not about the oil or gas industry. This is about our national security. This is about the fact that we are spending $180 billion a year to bring in foreign oil when we ought to be producing so much more of that here and employing hundreds of thousands more people in the United States, bringing about better availability, lower prices, more jobs, and all in a way that we have proven through the offshore production that is happening, we have proven it can be done in an environmentally safe manner, it is being done in an environmentally safe manner.

The amendment says it is time to say, this is not a perpetual ban. When we reach a point, which we will in a few years, that two-thirds—two-thirds—of the oil and gas we use is coming from foreign shores, is it not about time that we find a commonsense approach to lift the bans and have environmentally clean and responsible ways to produce this energy America needs?

Mr. Chairman, the recent steep rise of energy prices has convinced consumers that America needs more energy, and we need to be producing it ourselves. We don't want to rely on supplies halfway around the world, and we don't want to ship tens of billions of American dollars overseas each year to buy foreign oil. We're spending $180 billion dollars each year to buy foreign oil. If we could spend those billions right here in the USA, to produce more of the energy we use, we could add hundreds of thousands of high-paying American jobs.

Why aren't we doing this? Unfortunately, some well-intentioned concerns for the environment have grown into ungrounded fears. Rather than balancing environmental issues with our need to produce more energy, we've let things get out of kilter. One of our biggest failures is that we've placed so much of our oil and gas reserves off limits. We've done that by including provisions in this Interior appropriations bill—provisions we've had in it now for decades—that have banned drilling in most areas of the Outer Continental Shelf. What's worse, we have failed to review and adjust those provisions, to recognize that things are different now than when we first adopted those restrictions.

There is no longer a conflict between our ability to protect the environment and our ability to produce energy by drilling offshore. We're talking about areas at least 10 miles offshore, and usually much farther offshore, 100 miles, even 200 miles and more.

Our failure to review and adjust these offshore drilling bans is now costing this country dearly. Every time you pay your utility bill or buy gasoline, remember that these prices would not be so high if Congress had simply used common-sense, years ago, to let us drill more offshore areas in an environmentally-responsible way. Instead of promoting safe ways to drill, we've totally banned that drilling in most of our offshore areas.

My amendment doesn't lift the ban immediately, but creates a way for us to plan ahead. It establishes a tipping point for ending the ban in the most promising area—the eastern Gulf of Mexico, saying that the ban will end if imports rise to two-thirds of the oil we use. We're at 58% today, and going up at the rate of 1% to 2% each year.

ENVIRONMENTAL SAFETY

People naturally ask, ''Is this environmentally safe?'' The answer is ''Yes.''

America has not had any major spill from an offshore oil well since 1969.

Why is this? It's not because we're not drilling offshore; it's because we have succeeded in protecting the environment while we drill. Oil and gas operations in the Outer Continental Shelf are among the most tightly regulated economic activity in the world.

Despite the moratoria that has closed many areas, America still produces almost one-third of its oil (30%) and almost one-fourth (23%) of its natural gas from offshore wells. There's a lot of coastal drilling, and it is safe drilling, and it would be just as safe to drill in the areas where it's being banned.

To drill offshore, you must obtain 17 major federal permits and obey 90 sets of federal regulations, all designed to protect the environment. Most of those went into effect in 1975, and they have been 99.999% effective in keeping the environment safe. That's because less than 1/1,000 of 1% of the oil produced offshore has been spilled. What other industry has a safety record like that—99.999%!

We also produce more from fewer offshore platforms, thanks to horizontal drilling that allows multiple wells to be drilled from a single platform. Technological advances during the past 30 years allow us to extract more resources with less impact on the environment.

And most of them are tiny—97% of the offshore spills are of less than one barrel of oil.

OCS BACKGROUND

The Outer Continental Shelf is composed of lands generally beyond the 3-mile area of state jurisdiction and 10-mile area of state jurisdiction in Florida and encompasses about 1.76 billion acres. About 25% of the oil and gas produced in the United States comes from the OCS. But there's a lot more potential than that. About 60% of America's remaining oil and 41% of our remaining gas resources are in the OCS.

The official estimate is that there are 76 billion barrels of oil and 406 trillion cubic feet of natural gas in the OCS. But we have placed about 90% of the areas offshore the lower 48 states off-limits, banning drilling in those areas. Imagine that—as Americans pay high prices, Congress says that 90% of this huge resource is off-limits, and drilling is banned. So we pay sky-high prices because we depend on foreign oil, and we ship hundreds of

thousands of jobs overseas, along with tens of billions of dollars each year.

Congress has restricted drilling in the OCS for over 30 years. During this time, the percentage of net imports of petroleum has risen from 28% to 58% today.

FOREIGN SOURCES

And what does it mean if we don't have those resources?

Domestic energy independence isn't just about the energy industry. It's about our national security. Currently, about 58% of our net petroleum imports came from foreign sources. During the past ten years, this percentage has risen by one percentage point on average each year. So ten years ago we imported about 48% and today it's about 58%. The Energy Information Administration predicts that by 2025, dependence on petroleum imports is projected to reach 68% of net imports.

ECONOMIC SECURITY

This not only affects our national security, it also affects our economic security. Last week, consumers were paying an average $2.18 for a gallon of motor gasoline. That's a 62 cent a gallon increase in just five years!

Natural gas prices have been even more devastating for consumers. Residential prices have doubled in the past four years. Commercial and industrial prices have tripled. 90,000 jobs in the chemical industry have been lost along with $50 billion of business because of natural gas prices in the U.S.

When we talk about the need for domestic energy production, or independence, it's not just about the energy industry. It's about all of us. If we want gasoline prices to stop skyrocketing we must act. If we want to stop losing manufacturing jobs, we must act.

We all know that China, India, and other countries' economies are expanding and their demand for oil and natural gas worldwide will continue to grow. As the demand for oil grows globally, the United States cannot be left behind by limiting its supply.

CONCLUSION

Why aren't we pursuing this offshore oil and gas? It's because this appropriations bill has several provisions banning offshore drilling. Not just one ban, but a whole series of them. And we've been including these bans in this bill for over 30 years.

This amendment would protect our national security. This amendment would only open up a portion of the Eastern Gulf of Mexico and only when the Energy Information Administration publishes data showing that more than two-third of net imports of crude oil come from foreign sources.

My amendment singles out only one of these many areas where drilling has been banned, namely the eastern Gulf of Mexico. That area is selected for two simple reasons: First, it has the largest oil land gas deposits. Second, it's the farthest offshore, away from the coastline and the beaches. In all cases more than 10 miles offshore, land in most cases more than 100 miles offshore. It is not in state waters. It is in federal waters.

Congress has restricted activity in the OCS for over 30 years. During this time, the percentage of net imports of petroleum has risen from 28% to 58% today. Our constituents all feel the pinch that higher energy prices bring to their budget.

Let's use common sense and create a plan to end the moratorium in an environmentally sound way, as I've proposed in this amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve my point of order, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS).

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, hardworking American families are paying a high price at the gas pump today because of our Nation's dependence upon foreign oil. Unless we get tough and show OPEC nations that Americans are serious about becoming less dependent upon their self-serving oil cartel, our working families and our Nation's economy will continue to be the victims of high energy costs. That is why I am supporting the Istook amendment.

Environmentally safe drilling for oil and natural gas in the Outer Continental Shelf in the eastern Gulf of Mexico would be possible under this amendment. This production could be done safely and cleanly. It does not require new technology. It is not some type of new experiment. The fact is that already Outer Continental Shelf production represents 30 percent of all U.S. domestic oil production and 23 percent of our natural gas production.

What OCS energy production does do is provide 42,000 Americans with good jobs and brings this $6 billion a year to our U.S. Treasury. With more energy production that puts more Americans to work, we can send a clear message to the OPEC cartel that we are fed up with their cartel which is busting the budgets of America's working families.

It is time to say we are sick and tired of the OPEC tax which costs American families $20 billion for every 25-cent increase in the price of gasoline. Tapping major oil and gas reserves in the eastern Gulf, something we are already doing off the Texas and Louisiana coasts, will create thousands of new American jobs, bring in billions of dollars to reduce the Federal deficit and our terrible trade deficit, and save working families money every time they go to the gasoline pump. That is a good deal and a smart deal for millions of hardworking American families.

By voting ''yes'' on the Istook amendment, we are voting ''no'' on the OPEC tax, which is hurting most those who can least afford it.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague from North Carolina for yielding time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to first correct some statements that the gentleman from Oklahoma made in his arguments. He said that 40 percent of the OCS gas is unavailable to leasing. As he knows, Minerals Management Service conducts a survey every 5 years and the latest assessment of resources on the Outer Continental Shelf was done in the year 2003. It includes estimates of undiscovered technically recoverable oil and natural gas. This assessment shows that 81 percent of the Nation's undiscovered technically recovered OCS gas is located in the central and western parts of the Gulf of Mexico where drilling is allowed.

□ 1515

And he also claims that it is such a safe industry. I would like to remind him, those of us who live on the central coast of California remember with an indelible mark the 1996 oil spill of platform A that devastated our economy and our environmental resources for decades. We are still living with some of the results of this.

This is an amendment in which the House had a vote just a few years ago, a similar kind of amendment in the 107th Congress. Seventy Republicans joined 176 Democrats to block oil and gas developments in the eastern Gulf of Mexico. A vote against this amendment will accomplish the same thing, a vote to protect the eastern Gulf of Mexico from new drilling. This amendment is the first step to drilling in areas now off limits, including North Carolina, New Jersey, California, and even the Great Lakes.

So we should reject this amendment and not weaken existing protections for our coastal waters. This amendment guts the longstanding bipartisan moratoria that currently protects our Nation's most sensitive coastal marine areas.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

(Mr. KING of Iowa asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I point out that the U.S.-produced nitrogen fertilizer that American farmers have historically relied upon is being outsourced to foreign producers. Of the 16½ million tons of nitrogen fertilizer production capacity that existed in this country prior to the year 2000, nearly 20 percent has been closed permanently and there are another 4 million tons, 25 percent again at risk of closing within the next 2 years.

We have outsourced our nitrogen fertilizer protection to foreign countries like Venezuela and Russia, where they are subsidizing their natural gas. Here we refuse to develop our natural gas. And now we are faced with Chinese involvement in the Western hemisphere, who are involved in capital investment, and I know that there is drilling going on offshore for Cuba. I do not know if it is affected by this bill. But I know this: The gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) was right. It is not the question of whether we are going to drill for this oil. We will do it sometime. It is just a question of whether we do it before or after we lose the jobs, before or after we lose the production of this natural gas to foreign countries.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in opposition to the amendment and would like to again point out that this Congress has already taken a very significant step towards addressing the need for additional drilling for oil and gas in the Gulf of Mexico. We are currently drilling in the central and western Gulf. This Congress has passed additional financial incentives for deepwater drilling. This is an important step towards addressing the problem of supply.

This amendment goes much further than that and exposes areas for drilling just a few miles off the coast of Florida without any clear indication that there will be no risk to the beaches of Florida. This is very important to our economy. Many Members of Congress are rising today to defend the economy in their State. No one is going to stand on this floor and say that the beaches of Florida are not the most important part of our economy in addition to the work skills of our Floridians.

We do not want to take this risk. There is a very small proportion of supply available off the coast of Florida. There is an enormous proportion available in the central and western Gulf. This Congress has already acted. We provide additional financial incentives to get the supply where it is to be had.

I urge opposition to the amendment.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma, my neighbor, for yielding me this time.

It is interesting that there is potential production of our natural resources that people oppose. This amendment only covers the eastern Gulf of Mexico. It only covers off the coast of Florida. Not California, not the northeast United States, even though there may be potential there. This is just the eastern Gulf of Mexico.

I just do not understand what is going to happen to our country if we continue to import more and more oil, and obviously we are having to import more and more natural gas. I do not know what the folks in California are going to do about energy. I know they have high prices. Get ready to have them even higher, unless we can start bringing production on line that is domestic production, and right now the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) and the gentleman from Texas's (Mr. EDWARDS) amendment is the best potential because off the western coast of Florida is some of the most productive potential for natural gas and oil fields.

I guess it is frustrating because off the nation of Cuba we have Chinese and Spanish companies that are drilling closer to Florida than U.S. companies can drill close to Florida. So we have a foreign country who can drill closer to Florida. This only covers the eastern Gulf of Mexico, and that is why I think some people will say no to anything. And I do not know what is their solution. More windmills? I love windmills and we can do that. We need energy, no matter whether that comes from oil, natural gas, windmills, or anything else.

The United States produces some of the safest energy that we can. The nations of Norway, Denmark, Canada, Japan, and the United Kingdom are successfully producing oil and gas from their coastal waters, and yet we leave a great deal of ours except off of Texas, Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, and Alaska.

So, again, even though those beaches may be pristine, because I like the beaches in Texas and I consider them pristine, but we do not need to keep our head in the sand of those beaches and not realize we have to have more energy resources in our country.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, those who support this amendment should really look at solving the current energy crisis. If they wanted to, they would invest in renewable energy sources and energy efficiency and conservation. For example, providing tax incentives for the construction of energy efficient buildings and manufacturing energy efficient heating and water heating equipment could save 300 trillion cubic feet of natural gas over 50 years. This is more than 12 times the Department of Interior's mean estimate of economically recoverable gas outside the central and western Gulf of Mexico.

So why are we here today discussing offshore oil drilling instead of promoting efficient and renewable energy sources? It could be that we are pandering to big oil companies.

We not only have to worry about oil spills from offshore oil rigs, we also have to worry about the damaging way that they drill for oil and natural gas. An average of 180,000 gallons per well of drilling muds that are used to lubricate drill bits and maintain downhole pressure are dumped untreated back into the surrounding waters. Water brought up from a well along with oil and gas typically contains a variety of toxic pollutants.

I will vote against this amendment. I consider it dangerous and it is absolutely no solution to our gas and energy shortage.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am not an extreme environmentalist. I am a conservationist. And that is why I find it difficult, most of the time on fighting some of the people who are speaking against this amendment, that I find myself allied with them on this particular issue.

Most of the time we quote studies. The first thing we do is see who did the study, who paid for it, and what is their agenda. The National Academy of Sciences is neither pro-business nor pro-environment. They are pro-science, and they are peer reviewed. The National Academy of Science: Gas and oil exploration will, not may, will, cause irreputable damage to the environment and to the economy off the coast of California.

I understand the gentleman from Texas. I trained with the Navy in Texas. Their beaches are not pristine like Florida and California. That is why all of their folks come to California for the good weather and the nice beaches, and we want to keep it that way. We want them to come back to California.

But I want to tell the Members something. The moratorium that we have had has protected the shorelines. During the gas debate, I talked about Batigitos Lagoon and our beaches. A lot of our economy is based on tourism. I heard, well, it is just the oil tankers leaking in Long Beach or it is seepage. It is not. The National Academy of Sciences said if we drill those new leases, then it is going to cause irreputable damage.

They have slant drilling, but when they have the technology to stop the damage, I will be along with them.

Nancy, my bride, and I walk along the beaches. That is what we do for fun with the kids. I have walked at Long Beach. And it took me 2 weeks to get the oil off of my Jack Russell terrier, and the bottom of our feet. We have to use kerosene. That is what we are trying to protect. And if they want to do something, I read where an oil company from the United States had a $12 billion profit the first quarter. I am pro-business, but I am not for pro-rip-off, and that is what we ought to look at in the cost of gas.

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

Mr. Chairman, I read the National Academy of Sciences' studies very differently. In fact, they say that two-thirds of the oil in the oceans is natural seepage and very little of it comes from the drilling that we are describing.

To those who say we never want to drill in these offshore areas, they should be honest with their constituents, and they should say ''It is fine with us for you to pay the skyrocketing energy prices. It is fine with us to spend $180 billion a year to bring most of our oil across the oceans overseas and bring it to America and send American jobs and American money over there in their place.''

It is environmentally safe. We have made so many advances since people made these moratoria, and yet people

do not want to look at those. It is time we take an honest look at it. We should not say that these areas are off limits forever. As the oil import problem rises, we should be looking at drilling in these offshore areas.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOSSELLA). The time of the gentleman has expired.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriation bill, and we certainly would not want that. Therefore, it violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The rule states in pertinent part: ''An amendment to a general appropriation bill shall not be in order if changing existing law . . . ''

The amendment poses additional duties.

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

Hearing none, the Chair finds that this amendment includes language requiring a new determination. The amendment therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the amendment is not in order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 106. No funds provided in this title may be expended by the Department of the Interior to conduct oil and natural gas preleasing, leasing and related activities in the Mid-Atlantic and South Atlantic planning areas.

SEC. 107. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the National Park Service shall not develop or implement a reduced entrance fee program to accommodate non-local travel through a unit. The Secretary may provide for and regulate local non-recreational passage through units of the National Park System, allowing each unit to develop guidelines and permits for such activity appropriate to that unit.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

For the purpose of engaging in a colloquy, I yield to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Ms. HERSETH).

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman TAYLOR) for yielding to me to engage in a colloquy concerning a devastating event that recently occurred on the Crow Creek Reservation in my home State of South Dakota.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I would be happy to discuss this matter with the gentlewoman from South Dakota.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I yield to the gentlewoman from South Dakota.

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Chairman, in the middle of the night on April 24, a fire broke out in a school dormitory on the Crow Creek Reservation in Stephan, South Dakota and did extensive damage to the structure. This dormitory on the campus of the Crow Creek Tribal School housed 230 of the students who attend that school, the only high school on the reservation.

□ 1530

Fortunately, even miraculously, no one was seriously injured in this fire.

School officials scrambled to find housing for the seniors who were attending the school at the time, but the students in the other grades could not be accommodated. For many of them, the school year simply ended unceremoniously on April 24.

The facility that burned also contained the kitchen and dining facilities for the school. The Crow Creek middle and high schools are now left without any dormitory, kitchen, or dining space for the more than 430 students enrolled there.

The needs that have been created by this tragic event are dire and immediate. I am asking the chairman to join me in urging officials at the Bureau of Indian Affairs to reprogram existing funds so school officials can immediately begin construction of adequate temporary dormitory facilities for the students at this school.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am aware of the devastating fire that occurred on the Crow Creek Reservation. I agree with the gentlewoman that it is vital that the BIA begin construction of temporary facilities immediately so that they can be ready for the beginning of the school year this fall. Reprogramming requests for Crow Creek Tribal education facilities that come before this committee will be reviewed and approved as quickly as possible.

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that Congress has granted the BIA certain emergency authorities to reprogram funds from other accounts when situations such as this arise. I would certainly consider a devastating fire that threatened the educational mission of the only high school on an Indian reservation as a situation that would trigger BIA's emergency authorities.

The Office of Management and Budget may also seek to approve any BIA reprogramming requests to address these needs, and I ask the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) to join me in urging OMB to review these questions as quickly as possible. Does the gentleman agree with me on these points?

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree with the gentlewoman that this fire was unexpected and devastating to the school, and that that is precisely the type of event that would trigger the emergency authority of the BIA to reprogram funds, and I join the gentlewoman in urging the OMB to review these requests as soon as possible.

Ms. HERSETH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his recognition of the serious nature of the situation and for his willingness to work with me to address the very real needs of the children and students on the Crow Creek Indian Reservation.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 108. Appropriations made in this Act under the headings Bureau of Indian Affairs and Office of Special Trustee for American Indians and any unobligated balances from prior appropriations Acts made under the same headings shall be available for expenditure or transfer for Indian trust management and reform activities, except that total funding for historical accounting activities shall not exceed amounts specifically designated in this Act for such purpose.

SEC. 109. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for the purpose of reducing the backlog of Indian probate cases in the Department of the Interior, the hearing requirements of chapter 10 of title 25, United States Code, are deemed satisfied by a proceeding conducted by an Indian probate judge, appointed by the Secretary without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing the appointments in the competitive service, for such period of time as the Secretary determines necessary: *Provided*, That the basic pay of an Indian probate judge so appointed may be fixed by the Secretary without regard to the provisions of chapter 51, and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, governing the classification and pay of General Schedule employees, except that no such Indian probate judge may be paid at a level which exceeds the maximum rate payable for the highest grade of the General Schedule, including locality pay.

SEC. 110. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to redistribute any Tribal Priority Allocation funds, including tribal base funds, to alleviate tribal funding inequities by transferring funds to address identified, unmet needs, dual enrollment, overlapping service areas or inaccurate distribution methodologies. No tribe shall receive a reduction in Tribal Priority Allocation funds of more than 10 percent in fiscal year 2006. Under circumstances of dual enrollment, overlapping service areas or inaccurate distribution methodologies, the 10 percent limitation does not apply.

SEC. 111. Funds appropriated for the Bureau of Indian Affairs for postsecondary schools for fiscal year 2006 shall be allocated among the schools proportionate to the unmet need of the schools as determined by the Postsecondary Funding Formula adopted by the Office of Indian Education Programs.

SEC. 112. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in conveying the Twin Cities Research Center under the authority provided by Public Law 104–134, as amended by Public Law 104–208, the Secretary may accept and retain land and other forms of reimbursement: *Provided*, That the Secretary may retain and use any such reimbursement until expended and without further appropriation: (1) for the benefit of the National Wildlife Refuge System within the State of Minnesota; and (2) for all activities authorized by Public Law 100–696; 16 U.S.C. 460zz.

SEC. 113. The Secretary of the Interior may use or contract for the use of helicopters or motor vehicles on the Sheldon and Hart National Wildlife Refuges for the purpose of capturing and transporting horses and burros. The provisions of subsection (a) of the Act of September 8, 1959 (18 U.S.C. 47(a)) shall not be applicable to such use. Such use shall be in accordance with humane procedures prescribed by the Secretary.

SEC. 114. Funds provided in this Act for Federal land acquisition by the National Park Service for Shenandoah Valley Battlefields National Historic District and Ice Age National Scenic Trail may be used for a grant to a State, a local government, or any other land management entity for the acquisition of lands without regard to any restriction on the use of Federal land acquisition funds provided through the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 as amended.

SEC. 115. None of the funds made available by this Act may be obligated or expended by the National Park Service to enter into or implement a concession contract which permits or requires the removal of the underground lunchroom at the Carlsbad Caverns National Park.

SEC. 116. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used: (1) to demolish the bridge between Jersey City, New Jersey, and Ellis Island; or (2) to prevent pedestrian use of such bridge, when such pedestrian use is consistent with generally accepted safety standards.

SEC. 117. None of the funds in this or any other Act can be used to compensate the Special Master and the Special Master-Monitor, and all variations thereto, appointed by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia in the Cobell v. Norton litigation at an annual rate that exceeds 200 percent of the highest Senior Executive Service rate of pay for the Washington-Baltimore locality pay area.

SEC. 118. The Secretary of the Interior may use discretionary funds to pay private attorneys fees and costs for employees and former employees of the Department of the Interior reasonably incurred in connection with Cobell v. Norton to the extent that such fees and costs are not paid by the Department of Justice or by private insurance. In no case shall the Secretary make payments under this section that would result in payment of hourly fees in excess of the highest hourly rate approved by the District Court for the District of Columbia for counsel in Cobell v. Norton.

SEC. 119. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall, in carrying out its responsibilities to protect threatened and endangered species of salmon, implement a system of mass marking of salmonid stocks, intended for harvest, that are released from Federally operated or Federally financed hatcheries including but not limited to fish releases of coho, chinook, and steelhead species. Marked fish must have a visible mark that can be readily identified by commercial and recreational fishers.

SEC. 120. Such sums as may be necessary from ''Departmental Management, Salaries and Expenses'', may be transferred to ''United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Resource Management'' for operational needs at the Midway Atoll National Wildlife Refuge airport.

SEC. 121. (a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in section 134 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2002 (115 Stat. 443) affects the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the 10th Circuit in Sac and Fox Nation v. Norton, 240 F.3d 1250 (2001).

(b) USE OF CERTAIN INDIAN LAND.—Nothing in this section permits the conduct of gaming under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) on land described in section 123 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2001 (114 Stat. 944), or land that is contiguous to that land, regardless of whether the land or contiguous land has been taken into trust by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 122. No funds appropriated for the Department of the Interior by this Act or any other Act shall be used to study or implement any plan to drain Lake Powell or to reduce the water level of the lake below the range of water levels required for the operation of the Glen Canyon Dam.

SEC. 123. Notwithstanding the limitation in subparagraph (2)(B) of section 18(a) of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2717(a)), the total amount of all fees imposed by the National Indian Gaming Commission for fiscal year 2007 shall not exceed $12,000,000.

SEC. 124. Notwithstanding any implementation of the Department of the Interior's trust reorganization or reengineering plans, or the implementation of the ''To Be'' Model, funds appropriated for fiscal year 2006 shall be available to the tribes within the California Tribal Trust Reform Consortium and to the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation and the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boys Reservation through the same methodology as funds were distributed in fiscal year 2004. This Demonstration Project shall continue to operate separate and apart from the Department of the Interior's trust reform and reorganization and the Department shall not impose its trust management infrastructure upon or alter the existing trust resource management systems of the above referenced tribes having a self-governance compact and operating in accordance with the Tribal Self-Governance Program set forth in 25 U.S.C. 458aa–458hh: *Provided*, That the California Trust Reform Consortium and any other participating tribe agree to carry out their responsibilities under the same written and implemented fiduciary standards as those being carried by the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided further*, That they demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Secretary that they have the capability to do so: *Provided further*, That the Department shall provide funds to the tribes in an amount equal to that required by 25 U.S.C. 458cc(g)(3), including funds specifically or functionally related to the provision of trust services to the tribes or their members.

SEC. 125. Notwithstanding any provision of law, including 42 U.S.C. 4321 et. seq., nonrenewable grazing permits authorized in the Jarbidge Field Office, Bureau of Land Management within the past 9 years, shall be renewed. The Animal Unit Months contained in the most recently expired nonrenewable grazing permit, authorized between March 1, 1997, and February 28, 2003, shall continue in effect under the renewed permit. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to extend the nonrenewable permits beyond the standard 1-year term.

SEC. 126. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire lands, waters, or interests therein including the use of all or part of any pier, dock, or landing within the State of New York and the State of New Jersey, for the purpose of operating and maintaining facilities in the support of transportation and accommodation of visitors to Ellis, Governors, and Liberty Islands, and of other program and administrative activities, by donation or with appropriated funds, including franchise fees (and other monetary consideration), or by exchange; and the Secretary is authorized to negotiate and enter into leases, subleases, concession contracts or other agreements for the use of such facilities on such terms and conditions as the Secretary may determine reasonable.

SEC. 127. Upon the request of the permittee for the Clark Mountain Allotment lands adjacent to the Mojave National Preserve, the Secretary shall also issue a special use permit for that portion of the grazing allotment located within the Preserve. The special use permit shall be issued with the same terms and conditions as the most recently-issued permit for that allotment and the Secretary shall consider the permit to be one transferred in accordance with section 325 of Public Law 108–108.

SEC. 128. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the National Park Service final winter use rules published in part VII of the Federal Register for November 10, 2004, 69 Fed. Reg. 65348 et seq., shall be in force and effect for the winter use season of 2005–2006 that commences on or about December 15, 2005.

SEC. 129. None of the funds in this Act may be used to compensate more than 34 full time equivalent employees in the Department's Office of Law Enforcement and Security. The total number of staff detailed from other offices and reimbursable staff may not exceed 8 at any given time.

TITLE II—ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

For science and technology, including research and development activities, which shall include research and development activities under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended; necessary expenses for personnel and related costs and travel expenses, including uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; procurement of laboratory equipment and supplies; other operating expenses in support of research and development; construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $85,000 per project, $765,340,000 which shall remain available until September 30, 2007.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. TERRY

Mr. TERRY. 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. TERRY:

In the item relating to ''ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY—SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY'', after the second dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $130,000,000)''.

In the item relating to ''ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY—HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND'', after the second dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $130,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House today, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY).

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment increases the EPA's Superfund dollars by 10 percent over the amount in the underlying bill. This extra funding would help provide the cleanup of the Nation's worst hazardous waste sites.

I thank the gentlemen from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) and Washington (Mr. DICKS) for the $11 million Superfund increase in the committee-approved bill, but I believe more should be done.

My amendment provides Superfund with an additional $130 million. This extra funding is offset from the EPA's Science and Technology Account which received $765 million in the committee-approved bill.

My district is home to one of America's largest residential environmental cleanups. In early 2003, a large section of East Omaha, Nebraska was placed on the Superfund list after hundreds of children and thousands of yards tested positive for high lead levels. A nearby lead-refining plant, which operated from the early 1870s until 1997, is likely to blame for what HHS estimates to be as many as 1,600 children in eastern Omaha with harmful levels of lead there in their bodies.

Let me be clear. I support the philosophy of polluter pays. While I am encouraged that more than 70 percent of all Superfund sites are cleaned up by those responsible for the pollution; in some cases, such as in my district, Omaha, Nebraska, and in about 20 other States other than Nebraska, those who did the actual polluting are either insolvent or no longer in business.

More dollars in the national Superfund is the only hope for 86,000 Omaha residents, including 15,000 children who live within the Superfund designated area. Without adequate funds, this cleanup could take more than a decade. These children and these families should not wait that long.

But the same is true for the other 1,243 Superfund sites across this country. Nationwide, it is estimated that 11 million people, including 3 million to 4 million children, live within a mile of a hazardous Superfund site. All these Americans need assurances that sufficient resources will be dedicated to their cleanups.

Some will oppose the amendment. I expect the chairman of the subcommittee, my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina, to perhaps oppose this amendment. Now, while I support the EPA's Science and Technology Account, it is not my mission to destroy this fund, but simply create or state what the priorities should be, and that should be to clean up these hazardous areas in the fastest time possible to protect those families.

Make no mistake: the Superfund needs more than these additional funds. It also needs structural reform. Earlier this year, I introduced what would not only boost the Superfund by $620 million over 5 years, but would also cap the Superfund's administrative costs at the 2002 fiscal level so that more Superfund dollars could be spent for actual cleanup. This is in response to a recent report by the EPA Inspector General revealing that the Superfund administrative expenses have increased $37 million over the last 5 years, while actual Superfund cleanup expenditures have decreased by $174 million.

Today, however, we must focus on the funding of this vital program. I urge my colleagues, especially my colleagues who have Superfund sites in their districts, one of the 1,243 sites, to support this amendment. It is time we dedicate the resources necessary to protect our children by cleaning up the Nation's worst and pressing environmental and health risks in a timely fashion.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The amendment would increase funding for the Superfund program at the expense of EPA's research program funded under the Science and Technology Account.

I note that the Superfund program received an $8 million increase over the 2005 level under the committee's recommendations, while the total amount for EPA is $348 million below the 2005 level, so the Superfund site received much better treatment than most of our programs. The bill as a whole is more than $800 million below the 2005 level.

Now, we have received many requests from Members of Congress asking that we fund programs for EPA's research, and we are able to do so only to a limited extent, and many people want the science and technology area just as well. A cut of the $130 million in science and technology would decimate the program's restorations. These research programs provide critical support to all other EPA programs, including the Superfund program.

The Superfund program was treated the same as the Science and Technology Account in that limited increases were provided for proposed initiatives associated with homeland security. The committee bill balances the many competing needs of the EPA within a constrained allocation. And while I understand the gentleman's concern, given the funding we have already done and the limited funding we have totally, I cannot accept the gentleman's amendment. I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. In general, I do think we should fund the Superfund cleanup program at levels higher than what is contained in this bill. However, the budget allocation that we are dealing with today prohibits us from agreeing to the gentleman's proposal to increase Superfund by a whopping $130 million at the expense of the EPA's science and technology programs, which he uses as an offset.

This bill provides Superfund with $1.26 billion for 2006, which is an $11 million increase over this year's funding level. I understand that there are transfers contained in this bill from the Superfund program to EPA science and technology research and to the EPA Inspector General's Office, but these transfers are for Superfund-related activities.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, I certainly respect my friends from Washington and North Carolina, and I understand the delicacy of the numbers which have been assigned to these respective programs.

I stand here for the families that are affected in these, or next to these, Superfund sites, including the constituents in my district and their children, the 1,600 children estimated to have high levels of lead in their bloodstreams, creating immediate risk and health risks to them. Immediate, now.

The fund, the science and technology fund, does provide a great service to America, including the $60 million worth of earmarks to a lot of our universities, as well as paying the salaries for 2,513 bureaucrats within this agency.

□ 1545

My thought is that perhaps for this one time we can just slide a little bit of their $765 million budget to the more immediate and pressing health issues facing constituents, our constituents, and American families, and that is what I am here asking.

I understand the delicacy of balancing these type of numbers in this type of bill. So I do ask that my colleagues, for the sake of these families that have immediate health risks, that we increase the number of dollars by $130 million to begin cleanup or continue at a faster pace the cleanups that have already begun in those areas.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire if there are other speakers?

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOSSELLA). The gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) has yielded back.

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

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

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

Mr. TERRY. 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 Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

For environmental programs and management, including necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for personnel and related

costs and travel expenses, including uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901–5902; services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; purchase of reprints; library memberships in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $85,000 per project; and not to exceed $9,000 for official reception and representation expenses, $2,389,491,000, which shall remain available until September 30, 2007, including administrative costs of the brownfields program under the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act of 2002.

AMENDMENT OFFERED NO. 17 BY MR. GRIJALVA

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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. GRIJALVA:

Page 64, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $1,903,000) (decreased by $1,903,000)''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that shifts funding within the EPA environmental program and management account.

Although the rules of the House prevent me from specifying in the amendment where the funding will go, it is my intention to restore funding for EPA's environmental justice program.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, we would accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the chairman and the ranking member.

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. GRIJALVA).

The amendment was agreed to.

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, as amended, and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $85,000 per project, $37,955,000 to remain available until September 30, 2007.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of, or for use by, the Environmental Protection Agency, $40,218,000 to remain available until expended.

HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended, including sections 111(c)(3), (c)(5), (c)(6), and (e)(4) (42 U.S.C. 9611), and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $85,000 per project; $1,258,333,000, to remain available until expended, consisting of such sums as are available in the Trust Fund upon the date of enactment of this Act as authorized by section 517(a) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA) and up to $1,258,333,000 as a payment from general revenues to the Hazardous Substance Superfund for purposes as authorized by section 517(b) of SARA, as amended: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this heading may be allocated to other Federal agencies in accordance with section 111(a) of CERCLA: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, $13,536,000 shall be transferred to the ''Office of Inspector General'' appropriation to remain available until September 30, 2007, and $30,606,000 shall be transferred to the ''Science and technology'' appropriation to remain available until September 30, 2007.

LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out leaking underground storage tank cleanup activities authorized by section 205 of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, and for construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities, not to exceed $85,000 per project, $73,027,000, to remain available until expended.

OIL SPILL RESPONSE

For expenses necessary to carry out the Environmental Protection Agency's responsibilities under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, $15,863,000, to be derived from the Oil Spill Liability trust fund, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. 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. OBEY:

On page 66 after line 20, insert the following new section:

CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND

(INCLUDING REVENUE OFFSETS)

In addition to amounts otherwise made available in this Act, $500,000,000 shall be available for making capitalization grants for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund under title IV of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended: Provided, that, notwithstanding provisions of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Act of 2001 and the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003, in the case of taxpayers with adjusted gross income in excess of $1,000,000 for calendar year 2006, the amount of tax reduction resulting from such acts shall be reduced by 1.562 percent.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I would like to reserve a point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina reserves a point of order.

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

Mr. Chairman, several weeks ago this House chose to make $140,000 tax cuts for persons who make more than a million dollars a year a higher priority than dealing with the $300 billion-plus backlog that our States and communities have in dealing with their sewer and water problems.

When I came to this Congress, the population of this country was 203 million people and our principal program to attack the lack of clean water was a multi-billion dollar grant program to local communities.

Today, our population is 35 percent higher, and yet we have moved principally to a loan program to our local communities represented by the Clean Water Revolving Fund.

And yet, despite that huge population increase, that huge increase in demand, the committee has chosen to cut this key program by 40 percent over a 2-year period. I am simply asking this House to reconsider its earlier priority decision. I am asking them to approve an amendment that will scale back that $140,000 tax cut to $138,000.

What do we do with that money? Do we expand the clean water program? No. All we are trying to do is to bring it back to the level that it was at 2 years ago before we went on this cutting binge. I know that this amendment is subject to a point of order, because the Rules Committee chose not to protect it.

I would hope, however, that no Member of the House would lodge that point of order. If they do not, we would be able to make this priorities change and send it on to the Senate. It seems to me that if you ask any man or woman on the street in this country whether they think it is more important to provide a $140,000 tax cut for the most fortunate 1 percent of people in this country or whether they would be willing to settle for a $138,000 tax cut so we have enough money in the budget to clean up our dirty water for our local communities, they would certainly choose the latter.

I am tired of reading headlines in newspapers like the Milwaukee Journal, for instance, reporting on the cryptosporidium outbreak in Milwaukee because of a bad sewer and water system. I am tired of seeing communities dump their overflow sewage into Lake Michigan or Lake Superior or any other lake in this country every time they have a storm.

It is about time that we make mature choices, and I think this amendment is an effort to push the Congress into making one.

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

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment because it proposes to change existing law and constitutes legislation in an appropriations bill, and therefore violates clause 2, rule XXI.

The rule states, in pertinent part, an amendment to a general appropriations bill shall not be in order in changing existing law, the amendment modifies existing powers and duties.

I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

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

Mr. OBEY. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the Budget Act was to force the Congress to make tough trade-off choices, by making trade-offs between individual programs on the spending side and by making trade-offs between revenue levels and spending levels.

The problem with the way the budget process is being approached these days is that instead of forcing Congress to look at those trade-offs clearly, the process has been fragmented so that spending decisions occur at one point in the year, revenue decisions occur at another, and the public is therefore never aware of the connection that exists between the two.

Unfortunately, because that is the way the majority has proceeded it means that this amendment is subject to a point of order if any Member chooses to make one, and so I very regretfully concede the point of order.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The point of order is conceded and sustained.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

(INCLUDING RESCISSIONS OF FUNDS)

For environmental programs and infrastructure assistance, including capitalization grants for State revolving funds and performance partnership grants, $3,127,800,000, to remain available until expended, of which $750,000,000 shall be for making capitalization grants for the Clean Water State Revolving Funds under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (the ''Act''), of which up to $50,000,000 shall be available for loans, including interest free loans as authorized by 33 U.S.C. 1383(d)(1)(A), to municipal, intermunicipal, interstate, or State agencies or nonprofit entities for projects that provide treatment for or that minimize sewage or stormwater discharges using one or more approaches which include, but are not limited to, decentralized or distributed stormwater controls, decentralized wastewater treatment, low-impact development practices, conservation easements, stream buffers, or wetlands restoration; $850,000,000 shall be for capitalization grants for the Drinking Water State Revolving Funds under section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended, except that, notwithstanding section 1452(n) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, as amended, none of the funds made available under this heading in this Act, or in previous appropriations Acts, shall be reserved by the Administrator for health effects studies on drinking water contaminants; $50,000,000 shall be for architectural, engineering, planning, design, construction and related activities in connection with the construction of high priority water and wastewater facilities in the area of the United States-Mexico Border, after consultation with the appropriate border commission; $15,000,000 shall be for grants to the State of Alaska to address drinking water and waste infrastructure needs of rural and Alaska Native Villages; $200,000,000 shall be for making grants for the construction of drinking water, wastewater and storm water infrastructure and for water quality protection (''special project grants'') in accordance with the terms and conditions specified for such grants in the joint explanatory statement of the managers accompanying this Act, and, for purposes of these grants, each grantee shall contribute not less than 45 percent of the cost of the project unless the grantee is approved for a waiver by the Agency; $95,500,000 shall be to carry out section 104(k) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), as amended, including grants, interagency agreements, and associated program support costs; $4,000,000 shall be for a grant to Puerto Rico for drinking water infrastructure improvements to the Metropolitano community water system in San Juan; $10,000,000 for cost-shared grants for school bus retrofit and replacement projects that reduce diesel emissions: *Provided*, That beginning in fiscal year 2006 and thereafter, the Administrator is authorized to make such grants, subject to terms and conditions as the Administrator shall establish, to State, tribal, and local governmental entities responsible for providing school bus services to one or more school districts; and $1,153,300,000 shall be for grants, including associated program support costs, to States, federally recognized tribes, interstate agencies, tribal consortia, and air pollution control agencies for multi-media or single media pollution prevention, control and abatement and related activities, including activities pursuant to the provisions set forth under this heading in Public Law 104–134, and for making grants under section 103 of the Clean Air Act for particulate matter monitoring and data collection activities of which and subject to terms and conditions specified by the Administrator, of which $52,000,000 shall be for carrying out section 128 of CERCLA, as amended, and $20,000,000 shall be for Environmental Information Exchange Network grants, including associated program support costs, and $15,000,000 shall be for making competitive targeted watershed grants: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2006, State authority under section 302(a) of Public Law 104–182 shall remain in effect: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 603(d)(7) of the Act, the limitation on the amounts in a State water pollution control revolving fund that may be used by a State to administer the fund shall not apply to amounts included as principal in loans made by such fund in fiscal year 2006 and prior years where such amounts represent costs of administering the fund to the extent that such amounts are or were deemed reasonable by the Administrator, accounted for separately from other assets in the fund, and used for eligible purposes of the fund, including administration: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2006, and notwithstanding section 518(f) of the Act, the Administrator is authorized to use the amounts appropriated for any fiscal year under section 319 of that Act to make grants to Indian tribes pursuant to sections 319(h) and 518(e) of that Act: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2006, notwithstanding the limitation on amounts in section 518(c) of the Act, up to a total of 1½ percent of the funds appropriated for State Revolving Funds under title VI of that Act may be reserved by the Administrator for grants under section 518(c) of that Act: *Provided further*, That no funds provided by this legislation to address the water, wastewater and other critical infrastructure needs of the colonias in the United States along the United States-Mexico border shall be made available to a county or municipal government unless that government has established an enforceable local ordinance, or other zoning rule, which prevents in that jurisdiction the development or construction of any additional colonia areas, or the development within an existing colonia the construction of any new home, business, or other structure which lacks water, wastewater, or other necessary infrastructure: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, such funds that were appropriated under this heading for special project grants in fiscal year 2000 or before and for which the Agency has not received an application and issued a grant by September 30, 2006, shall be made available to the Clean Water or Drinking Water Revolving Fund, as appropriate, for the State in which the special project grant recipient is located: *Provided further*, That excess funds remaining after completion of a special project grant shall be made available to the Clean Water or Drinking Water Revolving Fund, as appropriate, for the State in which the special project grant recipient is located: *Provided further*, That in the event that a special project is determined by the Agency to be ineligible for a grant, the funds for that project shall be made available to the Clean Water or Drinking Water Revolving Fund, as appropriate, for the State in which the special project grant recipient is located: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, heretofore and hereafter, after consultation with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and for the purpose of making technical corrections, the Administrator is authorized to award grants under this heading to entities and for purposes other than those listed in the joint explanatory statements of the managers accompanying the Agency's appropriations Acts for the construction of drinking water, wastewater and storm water infrastructure and for water quality protection.

POINTS OF ORDER

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order.

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

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order to the language beginning with quote, except that notwithstanding section 1452(n) on page 67, line 17 through water contaminants on line 22, violates clause 2 of rule XXI of the rules of the House of Representatives prohibiting legislation on appropriation bills.

The language that I have cited says that notwithstanding the provisions of the Safe Drinking Water Act none of the money in the fiscal year 2005 Department of Interior appropriations bill or even previous appropriations acts may be reserved by the EPA Administrator for health effects studies on drinking water contaminants.

This language clearly constitutes legislating on an appropriations bill, and as such, violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

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

The Chair finds that the provision explicitly supersedes existing law. The provision therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

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

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Chairman, I have two more points of order.

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

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order to the language beginning with, that beginning in fiscal year 2006 on page 68 line 23, through school districts on page 69 line 3 violates clause 2 of rule XXI of the rules of the House of Representatives prohibiting legislation on appropriation bills.

The language that I have cited authorizes the Administrator of the EPA to set terms and conditions for grants concerning the retrofitting and replacement of diesel engines in school bus services that contract with communities.

This language clearly constitutes legislating on an appropriations bill, and as such violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

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

Hearing none, the Chair will rule.

The Chair finds that this provision includes language conferring authority. The provision therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

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

Mr. GILLMOR. Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

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

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the language beginning with, quote, that for fiscal year 2006 on page 69, line 19 through ''further'' on line 22 violates clause 2 of rule XXI of the House of Representatives prohibiting legislation on appropriations bills.

The language that I have cited provides for State authority to remain in effect under section 302(a) of Public Law 104–182 allowing States to swap a portion of their drinking water and waste water trust funds between accounts.

This language clearly constitutes legislating on an appropriations bill and as such violates clause 2 of rule XXI.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Does any Member wish to be heard on the point of order? Hearing none the Chair will rule.

The Chair finds that this provision includes language conferring authority. The provision therefore constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained. The provision is stricken from the bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. 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. OBEY:

1. On page 67, line 1 with respect to the funding level for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, strike the figure $750,000,000 and insert $850,000,000.

2. On page 68, line 5 strike the figure $200,000,000 and insert $100,000,000:

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) each will control 10 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, unlike the previous amendment, which I would have preferred, this amendment is not subject to a point of order. And let me explain what it does.

This amendment simply eliminates one-half of the cut that the committee recommendation would make in the Clean Water Revolving Fund, and pays for it by taking $100 million out of STAG grants.

Now, I know everyone in this House likes STAG grants. I like them myself. The problem is that if you take a look at last year's committee report, for instance, you will find over 10 pages listing hundreds of individual tiny grants, $75,000, $100,000, $125,000 a piece, tiny little grants to communities all over the country to supposedly help them pay for their sewer and water problems.

□ 1600

The problem is that we are fooling ourselves because those STAG grants are being paid for by reductions in the basic loan program that we use to assist communities all over the country deal with the same problem.

What it means is that each Member is able to go home and dangle a little grant that we have gotten for our district—and I have done it myself, I will get whatever money I can for my district—but we go home and dangle that tiny little bit of money when, in fact, what we need is to have a major increase in the loan program that every community in this country applies for from time to time.

The fact is that the Clean Water State Revolving Fund is the crucial program for helping local communities with sewage treatment plants infrastructure. It is a keystone of the Clean Water Act; and yet this committee is recommending with the cut in the bill this year that we effectively cut this program by 40 percent over 2 years. It was already cut 19 percent last year. I think that is a terrible, terrible decision to make.

Our communities have more than $300 billion in backlog requirements to clean up their sewer and water systems. There are communities in my district that right now are having difficulty, for instance, even allowing the Park Service to attach its new headquarters to the sewage system in one of the cities in my district because that system is so out of compliance that the State Department of Natural Resources is urging that they hook up no further users.

We have seen, as I said earlier, stories of overflow, sewage overflow every time there is a huge storm. In the Milwaukee Journal, there was a picture of a huge sewage plume in Lake Michigan after heavy storms just last year.

We are being incredibly negligent if we do not add money to this fund, rather than cut it; and yet today, because of the budget resolution, we are prevented from adding money. We would at least like to reduce the size of the cut by 50 percent, by moving money over from the STAG grant program.

As I say, I have nothing against the STAG grant program, but if you fund STAG grants by cutting your basic loan program, you are literally robbing Peter to pay Peter, and I think that makes no sense whatsoever.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The amendment would increase the Clean Water State Revolving Fund by $100 million and cut special project grants under the State and Tribal Assistance programs by $100 million.

The committee's recommendation for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund is identical to the level in the House bill for this program in fiscal year 2005.

Almost every Member of Congress wrote to the subcommittee requesting one or more STAG projects. These projects are often the only recourse for rural communities that, for whatever reason, are unable to qualify for a loan under the Clean Water or Drinking Water revolving funds.

I admire the gentleman from Wisconsin's (Mr. OBEY) willingness to sacrifice special STAG projects to increase the Clean Water Fund. The Committee has a very difficult time in making these decisions. I do not believe it is an appropriate approach, given that these projects address critical infrastructure needs that otherwise might never be addressed, and I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. MCHUGH). The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the tougher issues in our bill. I feel that we are inadequately funding the State revolving grants, and this program goes out to each of the States and they are able to make loans to the local communities at low interest rates

in order to fund projects that are crucially important.

I know in my own district I have got cities like Shelton and Hoodsport, Belfair, Tacoma, all of which depend on this source of funding. STAG grants are important, and I support the program.

I wish we could do more in both areas. It is just unfortunate that, unlike when EPA was first created, we had 3 or $4 billion of funding for grants at a 90–10 Federal match; and yet we moved away from those programs. I do not believe we are funding this adequately. This means less money to the States and then less money goes out to the communities. I hope that as we go further in the process we can find a way to help correct this problem.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has his approach, which I am supporting; and I think this is one of the jobs that appropriators have to do. We have to make difficult choices, and this is a very difficult choice; but I think it is the correct one.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 4½ minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), my friend, for allowing me this time.

The purpose of these amendments, this one and the one previous to it, in part at least, is to demonstrate how misaligned the priorities of this Congress have become and how far we have devolved, how we have regressed from a period in the 1970s when the Clean Water Act was passed and this Congress demonstrated its concern and understanding of the environmental needs of our Nation.

In the last 3 years, this fund has been cut by almost 50 percent; and prior to those 3 years, it had been cut previously, leaving the States with little or no money to deal with the issue of clean water.

Thirty years ago, we recognized that the waters of this country should be swimable, fishable and drinkable. The waters of this country are becoming less so in each of those three categories as a result of the mismanagement of funding by this Congress, by the devolution of our philosophy in this Congress, and by the priorities set by the leadership of this Congress.

People in this country are experiencing conditions that are less safe, less secure, and less healthy as a result of the mismanagement of the people's funds. My colleagues are more concerned with cutting taxes for millionaires than providing safety and security and good drinking water for the American people. These priorities must change.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would repeat, the special grants program under STAG would be cut by $100 million under this amendment. As I mentioned, these projects are often the only recourse for rural communities that, for whatever reason, are unable to qualify for a loan under the Clean Water or Drinking Water state revolving funds.

It is a difficult decision in our bill in allocating money. The STAG grants are one way that we can answer the needs made by their representatives who are elected to this Congress. To oppose this, I think, is taking away the right of the membership to look in their districts for those needs which maybe go beyond the official needs, and I oppose this amendment and hope everyone else will also.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the remainder of the time.

Mr. Chairman, I do not in any way criticize the subcommittee chairman for decisions he has made. The problem does not lie with his decisions. The problem lies with the budget resolution which imposes those decisions on him.

I certainly understand Members asking for STAG grants if that is their only access, and I have no objection to that, but my objection is simply this: the budget resolution, which the majority party voted for, decided that it was so important to provide tax cuts of $140,000 a year to people who make over a million bucks that they are willing to cut back the basic program that helps communities deal with their sewer and water problems by 40 percent over a 2-year period.

Then what they do after they have imposed those kind of cuts on this program, then they go to the STAG program. They get a tiny little $100,000 or $150,000 program for their districts. They go to their districts, they say, ''Oh, look, what a good boy am I, look what a friend I am for clean water.'' Meanwhile, the votes that they have cast on the budget resolution have gutted the ability of this Congress to provide meaningful help to communities who need real help on sewer and water.

I think we are sort of chasing our tail; and so, as the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) says, this is a very difficult priorities choice, and I do not fault the gentleman from North Carolina at all for the choice he has made. I think we have an obligation to try to put some more money back into the basic program first. That is what the amendment tries to do, and I would urge a ''yes'' vote.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Obey amendment. Three weeks ago, by a bare three-vote margin, the House of Representatives approved the Republican budget. Today, we're dealing with the consequences of that vote and the majority's misguided priorities. The budget that was agreed to contained more than $100 billion in additional cuts—the vast majority of which disproportionately benefit the very richest individuals in this country. At the same time, the budget calls for billions of dollars in spending cuts, nearly all of which were not specified.

Well, the chickens have come home to roost. The bill before the House contains a $241 million cut in Clean Water funding, a reduction of 22 percent. This cut comes on top of the Clean Water funding reductions that were approved last year.

There was a time during the 1970s and 1980s when the Federal Government provided most of the funding to upgrade water treatment plants and improve sewer infrastructure around this country. Today, there is really only one Federal program left to help communities improve sewer infrastructure to keep pollution out of our lakes, rivers and streams, and that's the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Program.

Let me tell you what this program has done in my district. In the mid-1990s, fourteen communities in my district were confronted with the difficult necessity of upgrading the Twelve Towns Drain. The problem was that whenever there was a significant storm in Southeastern Michigan, the Drain would quickly overflow and spill millions of gallons of partially treated sewage into the Clinton River. The result was deteriorating water quality in the Clinton River and beach closures at the River's terminus in Lake St. Clair.

The solution was to expand the retention basin to prevent the sewage overflows, but the cost was enormous: $130 million.

The Twelve Towns Drain improvements could not have been accomplished without the Clean Water State Revolving Fund. The communities involved with this project borrowed more than $100 million from the revolving fund. Giving these communities the ability to borrow the needed money at below-market interest rates is the least the Federal government could do, and that's what the State Revolving Fund makes possible. Thanks to the Revolving Loan Program, this massive water infrastructure effort will be completed later this year. This is an example of the kind of water quality work that will be sacrificed unless we approve this amendment.

Earlier this week, I received a letter from the Director of the Michigan Department on Environmental Quality. This is what he says: ''Discharges from aging and failing sewerage systems, urban storm water, and other sources continue to pose serious threats to Michigan's lakes, rivers, and estuaries, endangering our public health, tourism, and recreation areas.'' He goes on to say that the proposed State Revolving Fund cuts ''will likely severely impede the amount of water infrastructure projects that can be funded in the state of Michigan.''

There isn't a Member of this House who supports polluted waterways or beach closures, but there is a chasm between rhetoric and reality when it comes to providing the needed resources. If this Congress wants to be on the side of rivers, lakes and streams that are drinkable, swimmable and fishable, it's time to put your money where your mouth is. Vote for the Obey amendment.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Again, I say this is a very difficult choice to make, and the committee has tried to be as bipartisan as possible.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GILLMOR

Mr. GILLMOR. 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. GILLMOR:

Page 71, line 21, strike ''*Provided*'' and all that follows through page 72, line 6, and insert the following:

Provided further, That notwithstanding this or previous appropriations Acts, after consultation with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and for the purposes of making technical corrections, the Administrator is authorized to award grants to entities under this heading for purposes other than those listed in the joint explanatory statements of the managers accompanying the Agency's appropriations Acts for the construction of drinking water, waste water and storm water infrastructure, and for water quality protection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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

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

I am offering this amendment today to clarify some language in the bill that is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. It is a good amendment that I hope we can adopt today.

As part of the debate on this amendment, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), the chairman of the Subcommittee on the Interior, Environment and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations.

First, however, let me thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman Taylor) for his patience and express my appreciation both to him and to his staff for the fair way that they have worked with me and my staff to remove authorizing provisions in the appropriations bill, which are under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLMOR. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to work with the authorizing committee chairman.

I want to assure the chairman that I will work to remove or modify objectionable provisions under his jurisdiction as we move the bill into conference.

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for this, and I also note that the amendment I am offering today represents a compromise on a provision dealing with corrections to the State and Tribal grants technical correction authority to make it clear that it applies solely to earmarked grants in the conference agreement that are incorporated by reference in the appropriations bill and that the authority does not apply to future appropriations.

□ 1615

I understand the chairman's need for language that allows him to conduct some technical housekeeping of some grant provisions in predecessor spending bills. I look forward to further discussions with him regarding the terms ''for other purposes'' to ensure that this language is clearly and narrowly understood as applying to corrections that are technical in nature and not broadly defined to include changes in policy.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, I have reviewed the gentleman's amendment and am willing to accept it. I have already notified the Senate of the changes we agreed upon with respect to the ''special projects'' correction authority, and I look forward to working with the gentleman as the bill moves forward this year and on future appropriation bills.

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

Mr. GILLMOR. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman. I think it is a good amendment and concur with our chairman that we should accept it.

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their cooperation and support and I urge passage of the amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MS. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON OF TEXAS

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 13 offered by Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

Page 68, line 14, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)'' after ''$95,500,000''.

Page 69, line 4, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)'' after ''$1,153,300,000''.

Page 69, line 14, insert ''(reduced by $2,000,000)'' after ''$52,000,000''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment will provide an additional $2 million for brownfield assessments and cleanups, while fully funding grants for States to administer their voluntary cleanup programs.

The assessment and cleanup of brownfields are critical to the economic and environmental health of communities across the Nation. Brownfields represent lost opportunity where they exist.

In 2002, President Bush signed the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act. That bill authorized $200 million annually in Federal assistance to States and local communities to assess brownfield sites and to conduct cleanup where the assessment indicated that cleanup was warranted. The law also authorized $50 million annually in grants to States to assist States in implementing voluntary cleanup programs.

The committees that wrote this legislation, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Energy and Commerce, following years of hearings, discussions and considerations, determined an assessment on cleanup of brownfields required at least $200 million annually and that State voluntary cleanup programs should be supported at $50 million annually.

The bill before the House provides $52 million for the State programs and only $95.5 million for assessment and cleanups. My amendment simply transfers this unauthorized $2 million in grants to the State bureaucracies to the actual assessment and cleanup of brownfield sites, and I believe that it will be more useful to do that.

When the President signed the Brownfields Revitalization Act in 2002, it represented the centerpiece of the administration's environmental agenda. It was widely praised and received broad bipartisan support. According to the Government Accountability Office, there are well over 500,000 brownfields across the country.

These abandoned and underused sites represent a blight to neighborhoods, pose health and safety threats, and create a drain on economic activity. Brownfield grants generate economic returns in excess of five to one.

The City of Dallas, which I represent, one of the first cities designated as a

Brownfield Showcase Community by the Environmental Protection Agency, has used assessment and remediation grant programs to redevelop 35 sites in the core of the city.

A Federal investment of less than $2 million has leveraged more than $370 million in private investment and created or helped to retain close to 3,000 permanent full-time jobs. Over 1,600 units of housing, including 134 units of affordable housing, have been developed on former brownfield sites. The program has brought new vitality to long distressed portions of the city, boosting the tax base and bringing important economic opportunities to the neighborhoods.

Unfortunately, this bill, and the administration budget request it represents, prefers to fund more State bureaucracy rather than more actual cleanup and economic redevelopment. Mr. Chairman, the inadequate funding level for cleanup that was in the President's budget is just another example of the administration touting authorization legislation and failing to follow through with the actual funding.

According to the Conference of Mayors, EPA regularly turns away about two-thirds of the applicants for brownfield assistance because of the lack of available funds. So I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, and I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentlewoman's amendment, and I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding me this time.

This amendment will provide more funding for brownfield site assessments and cleanup and bring the appropriation for State voluntary cleanup programs in line with the level authorized by the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act.

This Brownfields Revitalization Act was legislation which came through our Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment, which I have the privilege to chair and on which the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) serves as the ranking minority member, and the Congress passed this legislation in 2002.

Brownfields cleanup and redevelopment are very important to our communities and the economy. There are hundreds of thousands of brownfield sites around the Nation waiting to be cleaned up. We need to continue directing funds toward cleaning up and revitalizing these sites by fully funding State voluntary cleanup programs.

The gentlewoman's amendment helps accomplish this goal, and I urge all Members to support this amendment.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume simply to say that with such persuasive statements from the gentlewoman and the gentleman from Tennessee, I have no objection to this amendment.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, the Ranking Democrat of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. The amendment moves $2 million from grants for state administrative expenses to grants for communities to conduct actual cleanup of contaminated brownfields.

The Bush administration has called the federal brownfields program, enacted by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure in 2001, "one of the administration's top priorities and a key to restoring contaminated sites to productive use." Yet, despite this praise, the administration's budget requests for the cleanup of brownfields demonstrate its lack of commitment to the cleanups necessary to reduce the risks to human health and the environment.

In fiscal year 2006, the administration requested $210 million for Environmental Protection Agency's brownfields program; however, of this amount, approximately 45 percent, or $90 million, is earmarked for Federal and state bureaucrats to manage the program. That leaves only $120 million of a $210 million request devoted to actual cleanups—shovels in the ground—and this bill further reduces that amount by about 20%.

Since 2001, the Bush administration has consistently requested far less than the fully-authorized levels for assessment and cleanups, yet attempts to take credit for fully-funding the brownfields program.

While the budgetary constraints of the House Republican Leadership prevent us from fully-funding brownfields cleanups, the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. JOHNSON, shifts dollars away from the management of the program to actual cleanups.

The amendment reduces, by $2 million, the amount appropriated for State Response programs under section 128 of the Superfund law to $50 million, the total authorized level of funding for these programs.

The amendment adds $2 million to the site assessment and cleanup portion of the brownfields program, raising this level from $95.5 million to $97.5 million. Under current law, the brownfields sites assessment and cleanup program is authorized at $200 million annually by section 104(k) of the Superfund law, so even this increase leaves the program at less than 50 percent of its authorized funding level.

Mr. Chairman, the brownfields program is critical for the restoration and reuse of the legacies of this Nation's industrial era, many of which have plagued our cities and communities for decades.

In this time of scarce Federal resources, it is important that we devote what limited dollars are available to actually accomplishing what the brownfields program set out to do over five years ago—redeveloping the underused and abandoned brownfields across this country.

I strongly support the amendment offered by Ms. JOHNSON, and urge my colleagues to vote "aye."

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional amount for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund, $100,000,000 shall be made available from the rescissions of multi-year and no-year funding, previously appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency, the availability of which under the original appropriation accounts has not expired, and $100,000,000 in such funding is hereby rescinded: *Provided*, That such rescissions shall be taken solely from amounts associated with grants, contracts, and interagency agreements whose availability under the original period for obligation for such grant, contract, or interagency agreement has expired based on the April 2005 review by the Government Accountability Office.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

For fiscal year 2006, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 6303(1) and 6305(1), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in carrying out the Agency's function to implement directly Federal environmental programs required or authorized by law in the absence of an acceptable tribal program, may award cooperative agreements to federally-recognized Indian Tribes or Intertribal consortia, if authorized by their member Tribes, to assist the Administrator in implementing Federal environmental programs for Indian Tribes required or authorized by law, except that no such cooperative agreements may be awarded from funds designated for State financial assistance agreements.

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency is authorized to collect and obligate pesticide registration service fees in accordance with section 33 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (as added by subsection (f)(2) of the Pesticide Registration Improvement Act of 2003), as amended.

Notwithstanding CERCLA 104(k)(4)(B)(i)(IV), appropriated funds for fiscal year 2006 may be used to award grants or loans under section 104(k) of CERCLA to eligible entities that satisfy all of the elements set forth in CERCLA section 101(40) to qualify as a bona fide prospective purchaser except that the date of acquisition of the property was prior to the date of enactment of the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfield Revitalization Act of 2001.

For fiscal years 2006 through 2011, the Administrator may, after consultation with the Office of Personnel Management, make not to exceed five appointments in any fiscal year under the authority provided in 42 U.S.C. 209 for the Office of Research and Development.

TITLE III—RELATED AGENCIES

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

FOREST SERVICE

FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

For necessary expenses of forest and rangeland research as authorized by law, $285,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the funds provided, $62,100,000 is for the forest inventory and analysis program.

STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY

For necessary expenses of cooperating with and providing technical and financial assistance to States, territories, possessions, and

others, and for forest health management, including treatments of pests, pathogens, and invasive or noxious plants and for restoring and rehabilitating forests damaged by pests or invasive plants, cooperative forestry, and education and land conservation activities and conducting an international program as authorized, $254,875,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by law of which $25,000,000 is to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided under this heading for the acquisition of lands or interests in lands shall be available until the Forest Service notifies the House Committee on Appropriations and the Senate Committee on Appropriations, in writing, of specific contractual and grant details including the non-Federal cost share: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided herein, $1,000,000 shall be provided to Custer County, Idaho for economic development in accordance with the Central Idaho Economic Development and Recreation Act, subject to authorization.

NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

For necessary expenses of the Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, for management, protection, improvement, and utilization of the National Forest System, $1,423,920,000, to remain available until expended, which shall include 50 percent of all moneys received during prior fiscal years as fees collected under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended, in accordance with section 4 of the Act (16 U.S.C. 4601–6a(i)): *Provided*, That unobligated balances under this heading available at the start of fiscal year 2006 shall be displayed by budget line item in the fiscal year 2007 budget justification.

WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for forest fire presuppression activities on National Forest System lands, for emergency fire suppression on or adjacent to such lands or other lands under fire protection agreement, hazardous fuels reduction on or adjacent to such lands, and for emergency rehabilitation of burned-over National Forest System lands and water, $1,790,506,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such funds including unobligated balances under this heading, are available for repayment of advances from other appropriations accounts previously transferred for such purposes: *Provided further*, That such funds shall be available to reimburse State and other cooperating entities for services provided in response to wildfire and other emergencies or disasters to the extent such reimbursements by the Forest Service for non-fire emergencies are fully repaid by the responsible emergency management agency: *Provided further*, That not less than 50 percent of any unobligated balances remaining (exclusive of amounts for hazardous fuels reduction) at the end of fiscal year 2005 shall be transferred, as repayment for past advances that have not been repaid, to the fund established pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 71–319 (16 U.S.C. 576 et seq.): *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, $8,000,000 of funds appropriated under this appropriation shall be used for Fire Science Research in support of the Joint Fire Science Program: *Provided further*, That all authorities for the use of funds, including the use of contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements, available to execute the Forest and Rangeland Research appropriation, are also available in the utilization of these funds for Fire Science Research: *Provided further*, That funds provided shall be available for emergency rehabilitation and restoration, hazardous fuels reduction activities in the urban-wildland interface, support to Federal emergency response, and wildfire suppression activities of the Forest Service: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided, $286,000,000 is for hazardous fuels reduction activities, $9,281,000 is for rehabilitation and restoration, $21,719,000 is for research activities and to make competitive research grants pursuant to the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1641 et seq.), $41,000,000 is for State fire assistance, $8,000,000 is for volunteer fire assistance, $15,000,000 is for forest health activities on Federal lands and $10,000,000 is for forest health activities on State and private lands: *Provided further*, That amounts in this paragraph may be transferred to the ''State and Private Forestry'', ''National Forest System'', and ''Forest and Rangeland Research'' accounts to fund State fire assistance, volunteer fire assistance, forest health management, forest and rangeland research, vegetation and watershed management, heritage site rehabilitation, and wildlife and fish habitat management and restoration: *Provided further*, That transfers of any amounts in excess of those authorized in this paragraph, shall require approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in compliance with reprogramming procedures contained in the report accompanying this Act: *Provided further*, That funds provided under this heading for hazardous fuels treatments may be transferred to and made a part of the ''National Forest System'' account at the sole discretion of the Chief of the Forest Service thirty days after notifying the House and the Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided further*, That the costs of implementing any cooperative agreement between the Federal Government and any non-Federal entity may be shared, as mutually agreed on by the affected parties: *Provided further*, That in addition to funds provided for State Fire Assistance programs, and subject to all authorities available to the Forest Service under the State and Private Forestry Appropriations, up to $15,000,000 may be used on adjacent non-Federal lands for the purpose of protecting communities when hazard reduction activities are planned on national forest lands that have the potential to place such communities at risk: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may authorize the transfer of funds appropriated for wildland fire management, in an aggregate amount not to exceed $9,000,000, between the Departments when such transfers would facilitate and expedite jointly funded wildland fire management programs and projects: *Provided further*, That funds designated for wildfire suppression, shall be assessed for indirect costs, in a manner consistent with such assessments against other agency programs.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TAYLOR OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. TAYLOR of North 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 offered by Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina:

On page 75, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert, ''(increased by $1,000,000)''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment adds $1 million for the National Forest System, and I believe we have agreement on both sides.

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

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to advise that we do agree with the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. BEAUPREZ

Mr. BEAUPREZ. 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. 6 offered by Mr. BEAUPREZ:

In title III of the bill under the heading ''WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)'', insert after the first dollar amount on Page 76 the following ''(increased by $27,500,000)''

Insert after the first dollar amount on page 77 ''(increased by $27,500,000)''

In title III of the bill in the item relating to ''NATONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS—GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION'', insert after the first dollar amount on Page 106 the following ''(reduced by 30,000,000)''

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce funding for the National Endowment of the Arts by $30 million and transfer the funds to the United States Forest Service for thinning projects to reduce the threat of catastrophic wildfires.

As Members of this Chamber will certainly remember, the summers of 2000 and 2002 were the two largest and most destructive fire seasons in the last 50 years. According to information presented by the United States Forest Service Chief, Dale Bosworth, in 2002, some 73 million acres of the 192 million acres managed by the United States Forest Service remain at risk to catastrophic wildfire. That is greater than the size of the entire State of Arizona.

The Wall Street Journal reported that parts of the National Forest System contain more than 400 tons of dry fuel per acre, or 10 times the manageable or appropriate level. Disease and insect infestations have also attributed

to an increase in combustible fuels. In Colorado alone, surveys have recorded that approximately 1.2 million trees have been killed by mountain pine beetle outbreaks in 2004. This is nearly 100 times the mortality rate reported in 1996.

This is the kind of timber that turns small fires into kinds of infernos that have devastated Colorado and other western States in recent years, destroying homes, poisoning the air, scorching critical habitat, and choking streams and rivers with tons of soot and sediment.

Positive steps have been made recently, most notably the passage of the Healthy Forest Act, which enabled forest managers to begin the process of restoring our forests to more sustainable and natural states. This legislation has helped land managers cut through the red tape that has delayed badly needed thinning projects.

However, even with increased attention to thinning and fuels treatment efforts, more funding is needed. Since the majority of our forests are federally owned, the burden to protect our States and local communities from the devastating effects of forest fires lies with the Federal agencies designated to protect them. Congress must fully fund their needs.

While cooler temperatures and increased moisture have brought some relief to the West this past winter, we cannot forget the need to continue to support responsible forest management. Another dry season is just one hot summer away. The human consequences from past fires have taught us we must continue to be proactive with our forest management. It far outweighs the devastating economic, ecological, and social cost of forest fires.

In 2002, hundreds of homes and other structures were destroyed and thousands more were evacuated. Twenty-three firefighters lost their lives, and the American taxpayer spent in excess of $1.5 billion containing 2002's record-setting blazes. Rural economies that rely on tourism suffered significant losses.

This amendment is a modest attempt to provide additional funding that can be used on the ground immediately in a way that will help ensure cleaner air and water, protection of sensitive ecosystems, keep western communities safe from catastrophic wildfire, and improve the health of our forests and watersheds. Simply, it reduces funding for the NEA by $30 million and transfers funds to the United States Forest Service for thinning projects.

The question arises, why take funds from the NEA. I applaud the progress that has been made recently by the NEA in repairing a very damaged image in the view of many Americans. One of my sons is actually a student of the arts, and my wife and I are certainly avid arts supporters and particularly appreciate ''public art.''

□ 1630

However, a very small percentage of artistic funds comes from the Federal Government. Still, since fiscal year 2000, NEA funding from the Federal Government has increased by 19 percent. In 2001, the NEA budget as a percentage of total revenues in the nonprofit arts sector was less than 0.4 percent.

Most of the funding happens to come from everyday patrons of the arts who enjoy them, philanthropists and corporate donations that foster the development of artistic communities.

I commend these individuals and organizations for doing so. However, it should be a greater priority of Congress to ensure the safety of our western communities, prevent forest fires, and save lives rather than spend taxpayer dollars for artistic endeavors, enjoyable as they may be.

When Congress spends so much annually to put out wildfires, does it not make more sense to spend that money on additional thinning treatments that could help prevent forest fires from starting in the first place? I was pleased when the Healthy Forest Initiative was passed by Congress and signed into law by the President. However, I worried that we still lacked the economic incentives that could make the management of our forests, the removal of dead fuel for an inferno, an opportunity. That incentive now exists.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this amendment and ask my colleagues to join me in voting ''aye.''

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I share the gentleman's concern for forests. The Department of the Interior bill has focused on forest health and wildlife management. We have large increases for the most important parts of the national fire plan. The bill has substantially increased due to the administration's Healthy Forest and National Fire Plan Initiatives. The bill has a $33 million increase in funding over the last year for hazardous fuel management. This is a serious increase. We have increased hazardous fuel funding dramatically in the last 4 years. It is not clear that the proposed increase could be used efficiently.

I share the gentleman's interest in caring for public lands. A large part of my district is national forests and national parks, so I understand we need to take care of this important land.

The Department of the Interior bill also increases funding for other wildlife programs and forest health management. This is a tight allocation, and I think we have done a careful balancing act. As I opposed the amendment to increase funding in the arts earlier, trying to balance our concerns, I must also reluctantly oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the gentleman's amendment. Make no mistake, the principle purpose of this amendment is to cut the National Endowment for the Arts. I absolutely share the gentleman's concern that the forest system and BLM have sufficient funding to meet the challenge of fighting fires.

In fact, last year I worked closely with the gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman TAYLOR) to provide 2 years of emergency funding to fight wildfires which totaled $1 billion. This bill does not contain that emergency money, but non-emergency firefighting is increased by $116 million when compared to the non-emergency funding in 2005. Of course, I do worry that an extremely bad fire season could exhaust this increased funding. However, I do not think the NEA is the place to augment firefighting funding. But again, I think the purpose of this amendment is more to raise issues about the NEA.

I appreciate the gentleman saying he is a supporter of the arts. I wish we had the emergency money that we have had the last 2 years, but we do not. I think I would say to the gentleman as we look and see how the season unfolds, we may have to do something further in conference; but I think this amendment is the wrong approach. I strongly support our chairman and urge that the committee defeat the amendment.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I have always been a strong supporter of funding for arts programs and will continue to be. The arts community in my district is vibrant, and funding for the National Endowment for the Arts is an invaluable part of education and social enrichment throughout Oregon. I was pleased to see the amendment offered by Congresswoman SLAUGHTER and Ranking Member DICKS, which would increase funding for the NEA, approved by a voice vote.

But we have an unresolved crisis on our public lands that needs to be addressed. A lot of members would probably like to believe that by passing the Healthy Forests restoration Act, Congress solved the forest health and hazardous fuel build-up problem. Nothing could be further from the truth.

I fought hard to get funding for fuel reduction projects included as part of HFRA. That bill eventually authorized $760 million annually for critical fuel reduction, but Congress hasn't even begun to approach that commitment as evidenced by the appropriations bill we're considering today.

This Interior bill contains $211 million in hazardous fuel reduction for the Bureau of Land Management and $286 million for the Forest Service. That's an increase of $9.8 million and $23.5 million respectively. I very much appreciate the Chairman and Ranking Member for including these increases in the bill, but they fall far short of what is needed to reduce hazardous fuel and the yearly threat of wildfire throughout the West.

The GAO recently stated that at these anemic spending levels we will continue to fall further and further behind. The GAO says that if we doubled the funding for fuel reduction, we would only stay even with the problem. Earlier this year when the agency testified before the Forests Subcommittee on which I serve, they

said we would need to triple the funding for fuel reduction if we wish to begin to address the build-up of dangerous trees and shrubs in our national forests.

If we tripled the overall funding, more than 60 percent of that money could be spent under the expedited environmental analysis and judicial review authorized by HFRA, instead of using budget gimmicks to only claim that we are fully funding that important law. But the administration thus far has used that authority on less than 10 percent of projects. And the vast majority of those projects are simply burning rangeland, which does virtually nothing to improve forest health and reduce wildfire risk. The bottom line is that we are not even beginning to address the fuel build-up problem on forested federal land and we won't start with this bill. We gave them the authority to get more done in an expedited way, now let's give them the money necessary to do it.

The administration plans to treat only about 1 percent of the acres that they claim are in need of fuel reduction. The money in the amendment offered by Mr. BEAUPREZ would be small compared to the need, but every additional dollar helps. This amendment would allow them to do 60,000 more acres of fuel reduction next year. And not of only burning sagebrush, but actually treating 60,000 more acres of forested lands which are overstocked tinder boxes that could result in catastrophic fires and threaten our communities.

Congress needs to get serious about funding hazardous fuel reduction projects and fullfil the commitment made when it passed HFRA. This amendment would be a small but important step toward that goal and I urge its adoption.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon). All time has expired.

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

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

Mr. DICKS. 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 Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ) will be postponed.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order: amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY); amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON); amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY); amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY); and amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BEAUPREZ).

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HEFLEY

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

The Clerk will designate the amendments.

The Clerk designated the amendments.

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 109, noes 311, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 191]

AYES—109

Akin
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Berkley
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Brady (TX)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Cannon
Chabot
Cox
Cubin
Culberson
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Doolittle
Emerson
Everett
Feeney
Flake
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
King (IA)
Kline
Kuhl (NY)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McHenry
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Norwood
Nunes
Otter
Paul
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pitts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Putnam
Radanovich
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shuster
Skelton
Stearns
Sullivan
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)

NOES—311

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Bass
Bean
Becerra
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Simmons
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sweeney
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Conaway
Harman
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (GA)
Lucas
Millender-McDonald
Shays
Strickland
Tancredo
Weldon (PA)

□ 1701

Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Mr. RENZI, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Messrs. CARTER, SMITH of Texas and RUPPERSBERGER changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. PETERSON of Minnesota, GINGREY, SULLIVAN, YOUNG of Alaska, Miss McMORRIS, and Mr. KUHL of New York changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. PETERSON OF PENNSYLVANIA

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

The Clerk will designate the amendments.

The Clerk designated the amendments.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 157, noes 262, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 192]

AYES—157

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Beauprez
Berry
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Cannon
Carter
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Cooper
Cramer
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis (TN)
Deal (GA)
Dent
Doolittle
Doyle
Duncan
Edwards
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Flake
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutknecht
Hall
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hinojosa
Hoekstra
Holden
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Istook
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCaul (TX)
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McMorris
Melancon
Mica
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Oberstar
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Porter
Price (GA)
Regula
Renzi
Reyes
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ross
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Sullivan
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Upton
Weller
Westmoreland
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)

NOES—262

Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bass
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Butterfield
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Cox
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Drake
Dreier
Ehlers
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gordon
Green (WI)
Grijalva
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hobson
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kucinich
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Petri
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Rehberg
Reichert
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Sherman
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sweeney
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Conaway
Gutierrez
Harman
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (GA)
Lucas
Millender-McDonald
Shays
Strickland
Tancredo
Weldon (PA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. BASS) (during the vote). Members are advised that 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1709

So the amendments were rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall Nos. 191 and 192, I am not recorded because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. TERRY

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 4 offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) 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 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 76, noes 344, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 193]

AYES—76

Akin
Barrow
Bean
Bishop (UT)
Boehner
Boren
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Camp
Cannon
Capuano
Chocola
Costello
Cubin
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Fattah
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Hall
Hayworth
Hensarling
Hinchey
Holden
Hostettler
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Kanjorski
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
LoBiondo
Maloney
Markey
Matsui
McKinney
Menendez
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Nadler
Norwood
Osborne
Pallone
Pascrell
Pearce
Pence
Pitts
Poe
Ramstad
Ruppersberger
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Saxton
Schwartz (PA)
Shimkus
Shuster
Smith (WA)
Stupak
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Weller
Wu
Wynn

NOES—344

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)

Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutknecht
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Nunes
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Platts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Souder
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Harman
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Kolbe
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (GA)
Lucas
Millender-McDonald
Peterson (PA)
Shays
Strickland
Tancredo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

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

□ 1716

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 235, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 194]

AYES—186

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

NOES—235

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capuano
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cox
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Olver
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Stupak
Sweeney
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—12

Harman
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (GA)
Lucas
Millender-McDonald
Shays
Strickland
Sullivan
Tancredo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

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

□ 1726

Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. BEAUPREZ

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 122, noes 298, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 195]

AYES—122

Akin
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Beauprez
Blackburn
Boehner
Bonilla
Boren
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Cox
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeLay
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Dreier
Emerson
Feeney
Flake
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Issa
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kline
Kuhl (NY)
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McHenry
McMorris
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Otter
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Renzi
Rogers (AL)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salazar
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Taylor (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Udall (CO)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)

NOES—298

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Camp
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Castle
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conaway
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Tom
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Drake
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Lee
Levin
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Northup
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Platts
Pomeroy
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Simmons
Simpson
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—13

Bishop (UT)
Butterfield
Harman
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (GA)
Lucas
Millender-McDonald
Shays
Strickland
Tancredo

□ 1735

Mr. ROSS changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOLEY). The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG) assumed the chair.

A FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A further message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word for the purposes of engaging in a colloquy with the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, at the outset let me thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) for bringing forward a bill that I believe addresses many of the critical issues for the Department of the Interior.

It is impossible not to note that this budget environment creates genuinely tough challenges for the Department of the Interior. With that said, I believe the subcommittee has done an excellent job in crafting a bill that addresses those major problems.

Several years ago this committee provided funds for a new visitors center at Chickasaw National Recreation Area in my district. The bids came in high due to the rising cost of materials. Before the project could be downsized the Department of the Interior had to reprogram these funds for emergency wildfire suppression.

Mr. Chairman, I am asking that you consider restoring this project in conference should funds become available.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I understand the gentleman's concerns and the unfortunate turn of events which caused this project to be delayed, and I will give the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) every possible consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), our distinguished chairman, for offering to work with me and the committee to resolve this through the conference process.

I believe that this is an important and critical step toward addressing what has been a very real injustice. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR).

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill through page 128 line 12 be