□ 1428

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO INSIST ON DISAGREEMENT TO SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 3010, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I move to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H.R. 3010, with the Senate amendment and to insist on disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, this is a simple motion to insist on the House position, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TERRY). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2018

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) at 8 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4241, DEFICIT REDUCTION ACT OF 2005

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 560 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 560

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4241) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 201(a) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2006. The bill shall be considered as read. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration of H.R. 4241 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to a time designated by the Speaker.

SEC. 3. After passage of H.R. 4241, it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table S. 1932 and to consider the Senate bill in the House. All points of order against the Senate bill and against its consideration are waived. It shall be in order to move to strike all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and to insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 4241 as passed by the House. All points of order against that motion are waived.

UNFUNDED MANDATE POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to section 426 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, I make a point of order against the consideration of this rule, H. Res. 560.

Section 425 of that same act states that the point of order lies against legislation which imposes an unfunded mandate in excess of specified amounts against State or local governments.

Section 426 of the Budget Act specifically states that the Rules Committee may not waive this point of order.

The first section of H. Res. 560 proposes to waive all points of order against consideration of the bill and against provisions in the bill, as amended.

The legislation, H.R. 4241, brought up by the rule, includes provisions on child support enforcement, which the Congressional Budget Office informs us impose an intergovernmental mandate as defined by the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act.

Therefore, I make a point of order that this rule may not be considered pursuant to section 426.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington makes a point of order that the resolution violates section 426(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

In accordance with section 426(b)(2) of that Act, the gentleman has met the threshold burden to identify the specific language in the resolution on which the point of order is predicated.

Under section 426(b)(4) of the Act, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PUTNAM) each will control 10 minutes of debate on the question of consideration.

Pursuant to section 426(b)(3) of the Act, after the debate, the Chair will put the question of consideration, to wit: Will the House now consider the resolution?

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, Americans on the front line in protecting and defending our most vulnerable children have been sending out an SOS. They do not merely solve problems every day. They save lives.

Their message is loud and clear. The child support provisions included in reconciliation undermine the Federal commitment to child support enforcement. Republican reconciliation is reckless disregard for safeguarding children.

It is a license for people to break their promise of child support because enforcement will be lax. Eighty percent of the children receiving support live in low- and moderate-income families. The bill would reduce the share of child support enforcement costs that are paid by the Federal Government from 66 percent to 50 percent by 2010. Federal funding to the program would be cut by $5 billion over the next 5 years, a nearly 40 percent cut in funding for the program by 2010. We make the money go away, but not the problems or the needs.

The CBO estimated that child support provisions in the reconciliation bill would reduce collections sent to families by $21 billion over the next 10 years.

As a result, more deadbeat dads will be left off the hook, while more low-income families will look to State and Federal programs to make up the difference in lost income. But we will not be there, just like the deadbeat dads.

In 2004, more than $4 was collected for every dollar spent in the program. Even President Bush's 2006 budget cites the program as ''effective'' and ''one of the highest rated block formula grants of all reviewed programs government-wide.''

A hard-working program will fall on hard times if we leave the reconciliation bill as it is. People will be hurt. Children will be hurt. Republicans will be responsible. And for what?

Mr. Speaker, this is the season of giving, and Republicans are going to be very generous with those very few Americans rolling in dough.

Republican leaders have scheduled their midnight express to roll through town again tonight. Republicans will climb aboard to run over the American people in the dead of the night.

Child Support Enforcement, that is not even in the baggage car. Republicans like doing things in the dark, behind closed doors, in the dead of night, hoping the American people will not notice.

Well, not today. Today's light shines on their darkness. If one candle can curse the darkness, we are going to use a search light. It is the Republican season of giving, and here is what it means: we take from the sack of the poor children in this country 330,000 child-care dollars and put it in the rich sock. It is Christmas time. Take $700 million from Social Security and put it in the rich stocking. Take child support, $21 billion from Child Support Enforcement and put it in the rich stocking.

Take Medicaid from the poor, $10 billion, and put it in the rich stocking. Student loans, $14 million. I take $14 billion from student loans and give that to the rich stocking. And food stamps from 300,000 tables we take and put it in the rich stocking. Finally, foster children, $600 million from foster children in this country goes into the sock, later tomorrow, of the rich because we have taken it from the poor and we have given it to the rich.

That is what this bill before us is all about. Tonight in the dead of night you are going to give to the rich who do not need it and take from the needy who cannot afford to lose it. You will disguise this as a Christmas stocking with presents, just in time for the holidays. But it is a heavy-handed club used on the American people. The heartland is not heartless. Not even the dead of the night will hide what you intend to do to the American people tonight. Even the rich will be ashamed. I wonder if the Republicans will. They should be.

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

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's clever props, notwithstanding the holiday stockings, I would point out to the gentleman who repeatedly referred to this being done in the dead of night that in his home district it is 5:30 in the afternoon and people are driving home from work. So for the dead of night on the west coast, the people on the east coast will know that we are not working a nine to five job and that we are pushing ahead with the agenda of reforming the inefficiencies that lay in government.

I would also point out to the gentleman that between 1999 and 2003, total child support enforcement administrative expenditures went up almost 30 percent; 29 percent between 1999 and 2003, as the case load declined 8 percent. Again, their rhetoric does not match well with the facts.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is utilizing the rules that are at his disposal, and I think that it is appropriate that he do that. It is a positive reflection on this House that these types of tools are available to the minority to stymie the progress, and we appreciate the gentleman's ability to use those. But it would be important to have the facts be accurate, and the facts are that these administrative costs that are being discussed in this bill are a shift in what has been a double-dipping practice that has been used by States to draw down Federal dollars and then collect administrative costs as if the original Federal dollar had been generated in that State in the first place. This is not, as the gentleman has characterized, the Grinch or any other mean-spirited person taking treats from children or from their holiday stockings that have arrived a month and a half early.

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. PUTNAM, I will read you the facts from the Congressional Budget Office estimate, that this action will result in a reduction over the next 10 years of $24 billion in child support. That is the Congressional Budget estimate, and that takes into account adjustments the States might make in providing more money for administration. This is the most callous, callous reflection of your fiscal irresponsibility. You have driven yourselves and this country into so much debt, now you are reaching into the homes of this country. This is antifamily. This is antikids. There is no defense of it.

□ 2030

This money is for administrative purposes. We have been paying two-thirds. The result of it, and it was part of welfare reform, is that child support has gone up and up. The kids have benefited. And now what you are going to do is to reduce those benefits. And we will hear from your side, oh, child support is going to go up, anyway. This is a fact and I close with this. CBO says if anyone votes for this, they are going to reduce child support payments over 10 years by $24 billion. I say to you, you go home, you face the kids in your district, you face the parents in your district, and you tell them you voted for this. If you won't tell them, we will.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's reference to the CBO numbers. We also have the CBO numbers. They are available on a bipartisan basis. The CBO numbers clearly show that total collections will continue to go up. $24.8 billion in 2006, $26 billion in 2010, $31.7 billion by 2015. The gentleman has referred to this provision as the most callous part of the deficit reduction package. I hope that everyone else on his team remembers that because you can only have one number one. You can only have one most egregious part.

So as we get into the discussions about Medicaid and food stamps and student loans and all the things that we heard about this morning when we were talking about the continuing resolution, let us remember that this one is the most egregious, that this one is the most callous because you can only have one number one. I know that this is nothing but the first salvo in a historic debate about the direction that this country is heading.

I agree with the gentleman that it is important that we go back to our districts and we talk about these plans, because the fact of the matter is we have a plan. And the fact of the matter is that you don't. The fact of the matter is that you can criticize all you want about where we have chosen to reform government, to find efficiencies, to better deliver services to the people who need them the most while you can go home and criticize the changes that we offer without having to defend your own plan.

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

Mr. POMEROY. This chart says it all. CBO estimates lower spending on child support program leads to lower collections to the tune of $21 billion. It is truly stunning to me that Republicans in this House would line up together to cut the funds used to collect child support. I just never expected to see them give deadbeat dads a pass, those deadbeat dads who refuse to pay what they owe for the upbringing of their own children.

The majority Members of this body are quick to boast of their support for family values. Well, I ask you this, what kind of family value is it that cuts back on the efforts to make deadbeat dads pay what they owe, when deadbeat dads walk away from their obligations? It won't be you smug in your own comfortable life who will feel the pain. It will be young mothers who can't pay rent. It will be little children whose lives are upended by financial abandonment. For every dollar we spend collecting on child support, we collect more than $4. In North Dakota, that means for every dollar collected, the Federal Government gets $2.78 back in recoveries and costs forgone.

State governments also gain, which is precisely why the Congressional Budget Office has found this to be an unfunded mandate. When Republicans cut child support collections, deadbeat dads win. State governments lose. That is why tonight's proposal is an unfunded mandate and must be stopped.

CBO has estimated by cutting collections $4.9 billion as you do, we lose more than $24 billion in support not collected. That hits children. That hits families. And that hits States which is what makes this an unfunded mandate. Support the effort to stop this unfunded mandate. Support the effort to block this cut in child support enforcement.

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

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the point of order from the gentleman from Washington. I am here to speak to my colleagues, but especially the 235 of you who, like me, served in legislatures throughout the country prior to coming to Congress. The fiscal sleight of hand that we are undertaking here today is simply that of a financial shell game, and the loser is already clear, it is our States. You don't have to take my word for it.

The Congressional Budget Office has spoken and they have identified that the reduction in child support without a change in the requirements is a violation of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 that many of you were here that supported on a bipartisan basis. It is a violation of the law.

We can play this ridiculous game of pretend and safely ensconce ourselves in these walls but do you truly believe that the actions today will go unnoticed and that State legislatures are not watching what we do? I know that the National Conference of State Legislatures is watching. I hope that ALEC is watching, too, and I suspect that the National Governors Association is taking notes. I can assure you that they are tuning in to C–SPAN and taking careful notice of today's proceedings because besides illegal, today's vote will have a direct impact on their ability to serve the people of their States, the same people who live in our districts.

In fact, President Ronald Reagan's promise of federalism today is nowhere in this Chamber. President Reagan's famous debate line with Mr. Mondale is frighteningly apropos in this exercise: ''There you go again.'' And yes, here we go again attempting to balance our Federal budget on the backs of 50 States.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding.

We have heard a lot about what devastation from this small little act we are going tonight to try to reform welfare and improve the system of delivering the services and goods to those who are truly in trouble in our culture.

One of the things that is surprising to me, though, is that there is really no plan on the other side. I have seen in the hallways of the office buildings that house Members of Congress offices hold billboards that are put up about the Federal deficit and how we must do something about the Federal deficit, but I have yet to see a plan to try to deal with the deficit that the Democrats themselves are complaining about.

Blue Dog Democrats, each in front of their office, have billboards that says the Federal deficit so much for each family to pay back, we have got to do something about it, but there is no plan. There are more plans on the television show West Wing than the Democrats have here in the United States House of Representatives. There are more plans on the other political shows about how to deal with the problems of today but we get no plans or help from the other side.

So what I think we ought to see here is some Blue Dog Democrats that are the type of dogs that will actually hunt. Dogs that we have some bite instead of the bark, because right now all we hear is a lot of noise and we don't have any action or plan. We are hearing complaining about how we are trying to improve the system.

I will give you one example quickly. In Kansas, delivering Medicaid is only correct three out of four times. One out of four times the payment is inaccurate. We need to reform that system. You would not get on an airplane today if you had a three out of four chance of getting to your destination. You would not start a trip today if you had only a three out of four chance of getting to your destination. When we make a Medicaid payment in the State of Kansas, our State government is wrong 24 percent of the time. This legislation has reforms in it to help improve our Medicaid system, so those who are truly in need get the services they require.

But we cannot do that according to the other side. We need to pass this legislation, reform the welfare system, and do the right thing about the Federal budget.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have the responsibility of closure, right?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Florida has the right to close.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Does he have any other speakers?

Mr. PUTNAM. We do not have any additional speakers, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington has 30 seconds.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. He says a whole lot, but he has no one else to speak, Mr. Speaker, because they want the people to believe that this is a fight between Democrats and Republicans. But it is not true. In reality, Republican Governors oppose these child support cuts, including Governor Schwarzenegger of California. Republicans in the Senate oppose these cuts including Senator CORNYN of Texas. Religious organizations oppose these cuts, including the Conference of Catholic Bishops. All program administrators and poverty experts oppose these cuts. Cutting child support payments to needy families is a policy supported only by the extreme right wing which currently is running the House of Representatives. I urge the Members to vote ''no'' on this motion.

Mr. PUTNAM. Mr. Speaker, this is an important opening to the grand debate that we are unveiling here this evening about the direction of entitlement spending and the direction of Federal spending in this Congress and for our Nation. We have heard an awful lot about the term ''cuts'' and we have seen the cute props and we have heard the first of what will be many metaphors of snatching food from the mouths of children and all kinds of heated rhetoric. But at the end of the day, the numbers don't lie. The numbers are that child support collections under this proposal continue to go up.

Do they go up as fast as the Democrats would like? Apparently not, judging by the rhetoric. But only in Washington and only in their rhetoric is that a cut. The bottom line is that this next fiscal year, 2006, it is $23.8 billion. By 2010, it is $26 billion. And by 2015, it is almost $32 billion. Under every arithmetic, old math, new math, poor school districts, wealthy school districts, all across America, those numbers are going up. Those numbers mean more money to those States for the important task of enforcing child support responsibilities by all noncustodial parents.

So despite the references to the smugness, despite the fact that we have been accused of being in the pockets of deadbeat dads, the numbers continue to climb for administrative costs. None of these even affect the actual program. They are defending the administration of the program instead of the outcome of that program, which is more money getting to those families, more fathers, more mothers who are noncustodial living up to their obligations. That is really what it ought to be about, is it not, the outcome? Not the administrative fees, that are going up anyway?

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that the rule has given the gentleman this opportunity for us to open the debate in this way. Unfortunately his rhetoric outpaces the facts. I would urge the Members to reject this proposal and allow us to move forward with reforming government.

With that, I would ask the Members to vote ''yes.''

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is: Will the House now consider the resolution?

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 198, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 600]

YEAS—224

Aderholt	Calvert	English (PA)
Akin	Camp	Everett
Alexander	Cannon	Feeney
Bachus	Cantor	Ferguson
Baker	Capito	Fitzpatrick (PA)
Barrett (SC)	Carter	Flake
Bartlett (MD)	Castle	Foley
Barton (TX)	Chabot	Forbes
Bass	Chocola	Fossella
Beauprez	Coble	Foxx
Biggert	Cole (OK)	Franks (AZ)
Bilirakis	Conaway	Frelinghuysen
Bishop (UT)	Crenshaw	Gallegly
Blackburn	Cubin	Garrett (NJ)
Blunt	Culberson	Gerlach
Boehlert	Cunningham	Gibbons
Boehner	Davis (KY)	Gilchrest
Bonilla	Davis, Jo Ann	Gillmor
Bonner	Davis, Tom	Gingrey
Bono	Deal (GA)	Gohmert
Boozman	DeLay	Goode
Boustany	Dent	Goodlatte
Bradley (NH)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Granger
Brady (TX)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Graves
Brown (SC)	Doolittle	Green (WI)
Brown-Waite, Ginny	Drake	Gutknecht
	Dreier	Hall
Burgess	Duncan	Harris
Burton (IN)	Ehlers	Hart
Buyer	Emerson	Hastert

Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schmidt
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)

NAYS—198

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
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
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sherman
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOT VOTING—12

Boswell
Cardin
Engel
Fortenberry
Hoekstra
Hyde
Mollohan
Radanovich
Ryan (OH)
Towns
Walden (OR)
Young (FL)

N O T I C E

Incomplete record of House proceedings.
Today's House proceedings will be continued in Book II.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5266. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on U.S. military personnel and U.S. individual civilians retained as contractors involved in supporting Plan Colombia, pursuant to Public Law 106–246, section 3204 (f) (114 Stat. 577); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5267. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General Robert H. Foglesong, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5268. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of the enclosed list of officers to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5269. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting written notification of the determination that a public health emergency exists and has existed in the state of Texas and Louisiana since September 20, 2005, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 247d(a) Public Law 107–188, section 144(a); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5270. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, DEA, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances; Placement of Pregabalin Into Schedule V [Docket No. DEA-267F] received September 2, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5271. A letter from the Senior Vice President, Policy & Government Affairs, Verizon Wireless, transmitting a letter from Denny Strigl, CEO of Verizon Wireless, provided to Federal Comunications Commission Chairman Kevin Martin regarding the company's efforts to serve customers impacted by Hurricane Katrina; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5272. A letter from the Office of Independent Counsel, transmitting the annual report on Audit and Investigative Activities, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 595(a)(2); to the Committee on Government Reform.

5273. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Reiterment Thrift Investment Board, transmitting a list of the five audit reports issued during fiscal year 2005 regarding the Agency and the Thrift Savings Plan; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5274. A letter from the General Counsel, Institute of Museum and Library Services, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5275. A letter from the Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, ''Letter to Chairman Cropp and Members of the Council of the District of Columbia on the Auditor's Concerns Regarding Matters that May Adversely Affect the Financial Operations of the Washington Convention Center.''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

5276. A letter from the Office of the Special Counsel, transmitting the fiscal year 2005 reports required by the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act and the Inspector General Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform.

5277. A letter from the Acting Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Seventeenth Report of the Federal Absentee Voting Act; to the Committee on House Administration.

5278. A letter from the Acting Inspector General, House of Representatives, transmitting the final report on the U.S. House of Representatives Child Care Center; to the Committee on House Administration.

5279. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Sabine-Neches Canal to Sabine River, Orange, TX [COTP Port Arthur-05-001] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5280. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Napa River, California [COTP San Francisco Bay 05-001] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5281. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Moving Safety Zone — Motor Vessel ZHEN HUA; San Francisco Bay, California [COTP San Francisco Bay 05-002] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5

U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5282. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Security Zones for designated vessels; Savannah COTP Zone [COTP Savannah 04-065] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5283. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Savannah River, Savannah, GA [COTP Savannah-05-011] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5284. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Missouri River Mile Marker 731.5 to Mile Marker 731.9, South Sioux City, 0NE [COTP St. Louis-04-047] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5285. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River Mile Marker 203.0 to Mile Marker 205.0, Alton, IL [COTP St. Louis-05-002] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5286. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Pensacola Caucus Channel and Pensacola Bay Channel, Pensacola, FL [COTP Mobile-04-060] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5287. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Bayou Casotte Ship Channel, Horn Island Ship Channel, Pascagoula, MS [COTP Mobile-04-062] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5288. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Saftey Zone; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway Mile 222 to Mile 225, Destin, FL [COTP Mobile-04-063] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5289. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 122.0 to Mile Marker 134.0, Above Head of Passes, Laplace, LA [COTP New Orleans-05-011] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5290. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 126.0 to Mile Marker 134.0, Above Head of Passes, Laplace, LA [COTP New Orleans-05-012] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5291. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Below Head of Passes, Mile Marker Minus 18.0 to Mile Marker Minus 20.0, in the vicinity of the entrance to Southwest Pass, LA [COTP New Orlenas-05-013] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5292. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 177.0 to Mile Marker 180.0, Above Head of Passes, Geismar, LA [COTP New Orleans-05-014] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5293. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Lower Mississippi River, Mile Marker 148.0 to Mile Marker 158.0, Above Head of Passes, Convent, LA [COTP New Orleans-05-015] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

5294. A letter from the Administrator, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the FY 2004 annual report on the Federal participation in the development and use of voluntary consensus standards, pursuant to Public Law 104–113, section 12(d)(3) (110 Stat. 783); to the Committee on Science.

5295. A letter from the Acting President & CEO, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's annual Management Report for FY 2004, Performance Budget for FY 2006, Performance and Accountability Report for FY 2004, and Report on Development and U.S. Effects on OPIC's FY 2004 projects and Report on Cooperation with Private Insurers, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; jointly to the Committees on Government Reform and International Relations.