United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 109th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 151 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 14, 2005 No. 78

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 14, 2005.

I hereby appoint the Honorable LYNN A. WESTMORELAND to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 25 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate extend beyond 9:50 a.m.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

RICE AS AN ALTERNATIVE ENERGY SOURCE

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to highlight the prospect of using rice as an alternative energy source in the production of ethanol.

We all understand the importance of securing affordable and reliable means of energy for future generations. On the heels of the comprehensive energy bill that this body passed in April, which encourages ethanol production, I submit that rice and rice farmers specifically could contribute to this endeavor.

Rice producers like those in my southeast Texas district face great difficulties in finding markets for their goods. Just a few years ago, there were over 600,000 acres in Texas that was farmed for rice, about the size of Rhode Island. Now, less than 200,000 acres are rice farmlands.

One untapped potential market is ethanol. While many folks think about ethanol developed from corn, not much attention has been directed to ethanol developed from rice. The process of cellulosic conversion can derive ethanol from various sources including rice. It is essential that the Department of Agriculture continue their work with the universities in Texas to fund research into this type of conversion to ethanol.

I understand the problems facing rice farmers in Texas. It is critical to support scientific research that develops new markets for our farmers. Cellulosic conversion holds the promise of deriving ethanol from rice along with other biomass materials.

Mr. Speaker, the President's budget was tough on farm programs and it is important that we support agricultural research that benefits American farmers and helps supply Americans with more energy.

AMERICA'S MILITARY PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak again about the dire situation in Iraq. A series of articles over the last week has drawn attention to two related issues, the slow training and improvement in quality of the Iraqi security forces, and the problems in recruitment in the American military, particularly in our Army that risk breaking our force.

I fear, though, that without greater attention to these two problems, we are endangering not only our efforts in Iraq, but also our future military force.

Mr. Speaker, Lieutenant General Dave Petraeus has had the mission of training the Iraqi security forces and turning them into the professional fighting force since last spring. He is a fine officer and a great leader.

But, this is a mammoth task. And over a year, they have only produced three battalions, around 5,000 soldiers capable of conducting fully independent operations. This is disheartening. And then when we read stories like the ones in last week's Washington Post, of embedded American trainers describing the Iraqi trainers as preschoolers with guns, it is easy to think that American forces would have to stay in Iraq a long time to get those forces to the point where they can handle their security on their own.

We have to speed up the process. Our NATO partners have promised to lend their efforts to training Iraqi security forces. They must get more engaged and soon. We have embedded trainers and transition teams with the Iraqis. We must commit even more trainees to the effort.

If that means moving more Air Force and Navy personnel to Army billets to free them up for this mission, we need to do this. We need to accomplish this mission as quickly as possible because time is not on our side.

Mr. Speaker, we are in a race against time. We are either going to lose the American people's support for this effort or break the Army. This month the Army's recruiting numbers are far below its goal, and it is an unmistakable trend. Although retention is holding, the toll is shaking the very foundation of American structure. Army marriages, broken under the strain of an unsustainable operations tempo are

Printed on recycled paper.

failing at an ever increasing rate. This is a sure sign of more troubles ahead.

To meet a critical need in the short term, the Army has reduced quality standards on its accessions. It is retaining problematic recruits and has relaxed commissioning qualifications for its officers. Anybody with a sense of history can understand the inherent risk in these policies, and they strike me as unwise.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Army will soon approach Congress for authority to offer enlistment bonuses of up to $40,000. That is a huge sum. And while I support it, I am doubtful it will have the effect the Army is looking for.

I wonder how long we can continue throwing money at this recruiting problem. I have always been a proud supporter of our troops. I have advocated pay raises for our service members and benefit increases for their families. I have done this for years. No one has been more consistent than I in calling for increased end strength, which I think would have alleviated many of these problems had they been enacted in a timely manner.

I cannot fault the Army for using everything in its power to attack the manpower challenge, but it is not the Army's problem it is the Nation's problem. Yesterday I sent a letter to the Secretary of Defense laying out the problem, which I would like to place in the RECORD at this time.

In this letter I urged the Secretary to develop a comprehensive vision of how the Department of Defense will approach the Army's crisis, and let him know that I would put out a call of my own to the youth of this Nation. We must not break the American support for our military. We must renew it by inspiring young people across our Nation to serve.

We cannot inspire that service by appealing to action in Iraq alone; it is defending our Nation from future threats and keeping our military the strongest in the world that may inspire their best. Along with the enlistment bonuses, they need a national call to service from our leaders that inspires them to keep our Nation and our military strong beyond Iraq. That will see us through the current fight and help us deter any future threat.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 13,2005.

Hon. DONALD L. RUMSFELD,
Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It is clear to me the most important key to our success in Iraq is the development of the Iraqi security forces, and the infrastructure that supports and sustains them. I know you share that assessment. However, I recently sat through a briefing by the Joint Staff on the subject, and while we are making progress, it is painfully slow indeed. We have no choice but to accelerate the training of Iraqi forces so that we can hand the mission off to them as soon as possible. It is a race against time: either the American people will sour on this war and demand our withdrawal prematurely, or the American Army will break.

Iraq now represents a crisis that didn't exist when we began the war two years ago. Even as public support for the war ebbs lower and lower, the United States Army is on the brink of collapsing. Indeed, it may be that serious damage has been done to it already. In any case, it will not recover fully for years, and that is a national security threat we can ill afford.

This month, the Army's recruiting numbers are far below its goal, and this is an unmistakable trend. Although retention is holding, the toll is shaking the very foundation of American social structure. Army marriages, broken under the strain of an unsustainable operations tempo, are failing at an ever increasing rate. That is a sure sign of more troubles ahead.

To meet a critical need in !the short term, the Army has reduced quality standards on its accessions. It is retaining problematic recruits and relaxed commissioning qualifications for its officers. Anybody with a sense of history can understand the inherent risk in these policies, and they strike me as unwise. Additionally, I understand that the Army will soon approach Congress for authority to offer enlistment bonuses of up to $40,000. That is a huge sum, and while I support it, I am doubtful it will have the effect the Army is looking for.

I wonder how long we can continue throwing money at this recruiting problem. It is not the expense, because we can pay the cost if we align our national priorities properly. Instead, it is about precedents and principles. This insurgency is essentially a war of ideologies and therefore one must ask: What message do we send to our enemy when they can recruit suicide bombers as fast as they need them but we cannot entice our young men and women to serve without large sums of cash up front?

Mr. Secretary, as you know, I have always been a proud supporter of our troops; I have advocated pay raises for our service members and benefit increases their families for years. No one has been more consistent than I in calling for increased endstrength, which I think would have alleviated a many of these problems, had they been enacted in a timely manner. I cannot fault the Army for using everything in its power to attack this manpower challenge, but this is not the Army's problem. It is the nation's problem.

I do not believe the youth of America is unwilling or incapable of serving their country for reasons other than a large bonus, but I think their country is not making a clear and compelling argument about why they should. Therefore, Mr. Secretary, I urge you to develop a comprehensive vision of how the Department of Defense will approach the Army's crisis.

In the absence of a unifying national message urging young Americans to consider military service, I will develop my own, and I will not miss an opportunity to deliver it. Frankly, it is becoming easier for me to articulate why it is important that we not lose in Iraq than it is to describe why we must win. It is not just about the dangers of losing a nation with the potential for representative self-government after so many years of tyranny, or about allowing a viper's nest of terrorism to flourish in the heart of the Middle East. Those reasons are powerful geopolitical considerations, but there are other compelling reasons for America as well.

Essentially, my message to these young people will be this: the issue is no longer just about what is good for the war in Iraq—this is about what is good for the long term health and security of our nation. While our nation's policies in Iraq have been poorly formulated at the strategic level by our civilian leadership—Congress included—the policy guidance has been superbly executed at lower levels by our military. Right now, the strength of our national effort is in the high quality of our military forces. We need high quality people to continue to step up to serve. If they will not, the military we built out of the ashes following the Vietnam war into the finest force in history will atrophy to the point where it will be unready to fight the next time it is called upon—whether that is responding to a terrorist attack, deterring a conflict on the Korean Peninsula or across the Taiwan Strait, or somewhere else we can't yet foresee. I sincerely hope that the Department of Defense will do everything it can to raise this issue to the forefront of the national consciousness.

Mr. Secretary, before the war in Iraq began I sent the President two letters outlining my concerns about how the war was going to be conducted and how the aftermath would be handled. Sadly, many of my concerns regarding the aftermath have been realized. I was right then, and I am right now. The training of the Iraqi security forces must take on even greater urgency, and we must act to avoid the concerns I have described in this letter.

Sincerely,

IKE SKELTON,
Ranking Democrat.

AFGHANISTAN, THE NEW FORGOTTEN WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. RYAN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for his leadership on the Armed Services Committee on the Democratic side, and his poignant remarks here this morning.

Not only are we dealing with the situation, Mr. Speaker, in Iraq, we are also dealing with a major forgotten situation in Afghanistan. And as we began the war in Iraq, many, many, many months ago, we began to shift our focus from Afghanistan to Iraq.

And we must remember that it was the Taliban who was harboring Osama bin Laden. And it was Osama bin Laden who funded and coordinated the attacks on September 11 on the World Trade Towers in New York, on the Pentagon in Washington, D.C.

So it is important for us to remember where this all started. And now, today, several years later, we have 19,000 troops in Afghanistan, and 140,000 troops in Iraq. We have forgotten and taken our eye off the ball. And one of the major concerns I have, Mr. Speaker, with the situation in Afghanistan is the issue of opium, the poppy cultivation in Afghanistan.

Two-and-a-half billion dollars, one-half of the GDP of Afghanistan is poppy, 70 percent of that sold in Europe as opium, funding through the black market, the terrorists cells not only in this country but all across the world. And it is very difficult for us to trace that underground economy. And I believe it was 5 or 6 months ago when the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs was before our Armed Services Committee. I asked him, what are we going to do

about the drug production and the farming going on in Afghanistan, and about this year's crop, and what are we going to do?

And General Myers said, ''Well, we have a little problem this year. The harvest came in early. The harvest came in early. So we missed it.''

Now, can you imagine, and it is the same as Mr. Skeleton has been saying, and many others in this chamber have been saying, we do not have enough troops in Afghanistan, and we did not have enough troops to get the job done in Iraq. That goes all of the way back to what was the planning, what was the end game, what was the exit strategy for both of these wars?

It is like our foreign policy has attention deficit disorder. We start a war in Afghanistan, it is not finished. We have not eradicated the poppy cultivation, $2 and a half billion. And then all of a sudden, before the job is finished we go off and we start something else. And now we are in Iraq with no end in sight. And that goes back to basic planning, basic military philosophy. You need an exit strategy. You need a game plan. And we have not been able to do it in Iraq, and we have not been able to do it in Afghanistan.

Just some statistics on what is going on in Afghanistan. 3 years after the fall of the Taliban, Afghanistan remains the world's sixth least developed country, 173rd out of 179 ranked by the United Nations. Miserable health and education systems, based on UN calculations, three-quarters of adult Afghanis are illiterate. Fewer than one in five girls go to school in many of the provinces in Afghanistan, and half of the Afghanis are poor. The average life expectancy for an Afghani is 45 and a half years, 20 years less than any neighboring country.

One Afghani woman dies in pregnancy every 30 minutes. We have been there for 3 years and we cannot set up basic health facilities so women could deliver a baby in safety? And it is because we have diverted our attention.

Four were injured yesterday in a car bombing, 20 were killed on June 1. Human Rights Watch is calling for NATO to send in more security forces to Afghanistan, following a marked deterioration of the security situation throughout May.

In the past month, Afghanistan has seen a series of political killings, violent protests, attacks on humanitarian workers, and bombings targeting foreign civilians and troops. Let us get it right. Let us focus on Afghanistan and make sure that the underground black market drug economy does not continue to fund terrorism.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 10 a.m. today.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 14 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 10 a.m.

□ 1000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM) at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

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

O God of spacious skies and patriots' dreams, today is a day of national patriotism as we honor the Flag of these United States of America.

Flags flown over this Capitol are a gift treasured by those who receive them. But You, Lord God, gift all Americans when they are moved to love this country and all its citizens by simply taking a few moments to make a solemn pledge.

We bless You and thank You for our women and men in the military who hoist this Flag over ships at sea and over makeshift camps on foreign soil; for senior citizen veterans who salute waving stars and stripes in a passing parade and for children in classrooms who hold their hearts and their hands before it.

May we join Americans across this country, around the world and from generations past and generations to come, as together we hope and pray to be people who will bring Your peace, liberty, and justice to a hungry world, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. KLINE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ADMINISTRATION SIDING WITH TOBACCO LOBBY

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

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the Justice Department's decision to launch an investigation into whether or not the political pressure played a role in their decision to only seek a fraction of the possible penalty against the tobacco industry.

The U.S. Government won its case against Big Tobacco; but rather than seeking the maximum penalty of $130 billion, the government suddenly decided to ask for only $10 billion. Funny enough, that was equal to the amount of the taxpayer bail-out of the industry last year approved by this Congress.

The stunning reversal shocked everyone, including Philip Morris' lawyer, who said the company was very surprised.

Nobody seems to know how the decision was made. Some are saying that it had something to do with the $40 million tobacco companies have given to the Republican Party since 1990. Or that it could have something to do with the $170,000 they gave to President Bush last year. But that would be cynical. After all, what does $40 million really get you nowadays?

Mr. Speaker, Americans want their justice unfiltered. Maybe we will even be able to get to the bottom of this Keystone Kops situation.

UNITED NATIONS REFORM

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, Thursday on the floor the House will take up the United Nations Reform Act of 2005. This is a comprehensive, indeed almost exhaustive, reform package aimed at the longstanding inefficiencies, inadequacies, and abuses at the U.N.

For all the frustration many Americans feel about the United Nations, the U.N., for all its faults, it remains the most established and immediately available forum for resolving international disputes and developing international consensus on a wide range of issues.

That said, most of the stated aims of the U.N.'s bureaucracy, to say nothing of the lofty ideal of its charter, have been undermined and in many cases brazenly contradicted by decades of waste, fraud, and abuse.

In the wake of the massive Oil-for-Food scandal still ripping through the U.N.'s headquarters, the American people, who currently provide 22 percent of the U.N.'s budget, can no longer trust that their dues payments are being responsibly spent.

The U.N., for all its strengths, should not be blindly trusted.

The clarity and transparency that defines democratic governments and institutions is nowhere to be seen in the U.N.'s financial management, or for that matter its human rights commission, its peculiar dislike for the State of Israel, its docile attitude towards the oppressive regimes, its handwringing and indecisiveness in times of crisis, and its anti-American policymaking apparatus.

The reform bill we will take up this week, the product of intense work by International Relations Chairman Henry Hyde will start to address these and other institutional shortcomings at the United Nations.

It would, most importantly, call for weighted voting on budgetary matters,

so that in the future the United States has more say in the U.N.'s budget than the representatives of Syria.

It would make the funding of certain inefficient programs voluntary, so that contributing nations will get more verifiable value for their contributions.

It would also finally cut back on the U.N.'s lavish international conference budget, which, hard as it is to believe, comprises the single largest section of the U.N.'s budget.

In addition, the Hyde bill will put in place human rights requirements that nations must meet before they may have a say in the U.N.'s human rights organizations.

On and on the list of reforms goes, all of which will be enforced by the promise in the Hyde bill that the U.N.'s failure to reform will trigger a withholding of 50 percent of the United States dues.

These necessary reforms and the necessary stick behind them are long overdue, Mr. Speaker, and may finally help create the United Nations the world has needed all along.

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD WITHDRAW FROM IRAQ

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

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, this report today from National Public Radio: a poll released Monday by the Gallup organizations shows that six in 10 Americans think the U.S. should withdraw some or all troops from Iraq. Support for withdrawal from Iraq is building across the country. And it is building in the Congress. This week, a bipartisan coalition of Members will come forward with a new plan for withdrawal from Iraq. The American people want us to withdraw from Iraq.

It is time for us to come together, whether we supported the war or not, Democratic and Republicans alike, to acknowledge it is time for a new direction in Iraq, and that direction is out. The time has come to begin withdrawal from Iraq. That is what the American people want.

SEX OFFENDER REGISTRATION AND NOTIFICATION ACT

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to give my strong support to 2423, the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act, introduced by my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

This bill will help protect our children by requiring sex offenders to register in person twice a year and calling on States to maintain searchable sex offender databases.

While the gentleman from Florida's (Mr. FOLEY) bill will provide a deterrent to the monsters who prey on our children, I hope we can pass provisions similar to those that the Nevada State legislature recently passed. The Nevada bill adds an extra level of protection by requiring sex offenders to renew their driver's licenses every year, a step made necessary by the fact that so many of these predators failed to register at all.

I want to close by expressing my sincere thanks to Donna Coleman, president of the Children's Advocacy Alliance. Ms. Coleman and her organization have been outspoken advocates of the most innocent among us, those who cannot speak out for themselves, the children. Their motto is, ''Putting the health and safety of children first''; and they have done that by tirelessly working in Nevada to ensure that laws are passed to support and defend their children.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY), Ms. Coleman and the Children's Advocacy Alliance and look forward to working with them to protect our children.

UNITED NATIONS REFORM

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, scandals at the United Nations have been going on for far too long and are far too many. Oil-For-Food scandal, UNICEF scandal, peacekeeping operation scandal, the list goes on and on with no end in sight. The days of giving the U.N. a blank check must come to an end.

Accountability and ethics must return to the United Nations. Somewhere in the mess of Saddam Hussein collecting kickbacks, workers collecting pay checks for work they never did and poor management of funds, it was forgotten that the goal of the U.N. was to provide assistance to those who need it most.

The case for reform could not be more clear. When an organization lacks the fundamental institutional control that is needed to operate in a fair and unbiased manner, changes must be made.

The time to streamline and prioritize programs and hold those in charge at the U.N. accountable has come. The focus of the United Nations has shifted from its intended purpose of protecting people and ensuring humanitarian aid to scandals that make the headlines in the tabloids and embarrass the world.

Mr. Speaker, it is time we ensure that the future of the United Nations is not a story of scandal, but a story of success.

AMERICA'S ECONOMY CONTINUES TO SURGE FORWARD

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I see encouraging news each week proving that President Bush's tax cuts and his economic policies are clearly paying off for the American people and the American economy.

In May, over 78,000 Americans found new jobs and over 3.5 million jobs have been created in the last 2 years. The job growth amounts to more jobs created in America than new jobs in France, Germany, England, Canada, and Japan combined. Although we have seen steady job gains for each of the last 24 months, I know President Bush will not be satisfied until every American who wants to work can find a job.

Additionally, the gross domestic product has been revised upward for the first quarter from 3.1 to 3.5 percent.

With more Americans working more than ever, our flourishing economy is also shrinking the national deficit. Last week, the Treasury Department announced the May deficit has decreased by $27 billion, which is the smallest deficit for the month of May since 2001. President Bush and the Republican Members of Congress are committed to cutting the deficit in half in 5 years.

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

DEARHAVEN THERAPEUTIC RIDING CENTER

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

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the grand opening of the DearHaven Therapeutic Riding Center located in Glade Valley, North Carolina, and to pay my respects to a woman whose dream of helping the disabled has finally come to fruition.

Susan Billings had a dream. She wanted to help people with disabilities find meaning in life by riding horses. This unique form of therapy improves flexibility, balance and muscle strength while increasing confidence in the disabled. In order to build DearHaven, Susan and her husband sold their home and devoted nearly all their time and resources to building the center. They assembled a board of directors and found their first clients.

Sadly, however, Susan never saw the final outcome of her dream. She passed away in a tragic automobile accident last November. She left behind a loving husband, two parents, four children, two stepchildren, and her dream for the DearHaven Therapeutic Riding Center.

Even though Susan passed away, her loved ones refused to let her dream die. The tragedy caused the community to unite in a way almost unimaginable. Following Susan's funeral, hours of free labor, monetary donations, and supplies came from every direction. The center was projected to cost $118,000, but due to the generosity of the community, ended up costing closer to $20,000.

One of the great tragedies in our society occurs when a person who has lived a long life lies on their deathbed and wonders if their life

had meaning. Susan Billings did not have to wonder this. She may have not lived what many consider to be a long life. But she touched many people in a way that will never be forgotten. May God bless Susan Billings, her family and friends, and the DearHaven Therapeutic Riding Centers.

□ 1015

MEANINGFUL, COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker I rise today to encourage this body the take up meaningful, comprehensive immigration reform. As conservatives, we believe in the rule of law. We believe that we ought to enforce the law, but before we can enforce the law, we need a law that we can enforce. That is what meaningful, comprehensive reform is all about.

We cannot simply focus on the border alone. We have to deal with the 10- to 15 million illegals who are here at present and have a program for them to go into. We have to have a law we can enforce, and as we do, it will make the border situation better.

When we create a legal framework for individuals to come and work and return home, we will have a much better chance of actually securing the border, which we desperately need.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JOEY RAGLAND

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

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Joey Ragland, a true public servant.

For years Joey was an outstanding citizen and member of the Liberty, Ohio, community. He loved the people of his community, and they, in turn, entrusted him with the position of township trustee. He quickly earned the respect of his peers and flourished in such a position of high trust.

In February, Joey was diagnosed with advanced lung cancer. Though his struggle with cancer was extremely difficult and accompanied by unbearable pain, Joey never once complained. Just as he had done in his role as township trustee, he continued to put others' needs before his own, until his death last month.

On June 30, Joey was to be married to his adoring fiancee, Margaret Brown. We extend our greatest sympathies to Margaret and to Joey's entire family as they mourn this incredible loss.

While words may do little to comfort them, I hope they will remember Joey for what he was: a model citizen, a strong leader, and a kind and decent man. His commitment to the people and community of Liberty will not be soon forgotten.

May God rest his soul.

REFORM THE U.N.

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the American people provide 22 percent of the U.N.'s budget, but the American people cannot impact what happens at the U.N.

For instance, the American people have no ability to force accountability in the billions stolen from the Oil-for-Food program. The American people have no way of objecting to the appointing of countries like Syria, Libya, North Korea and Cuba to the Human Rights Commission. The American people have no way of pressuring Kofi Annan to resign or force prosecutions of peacekeepers who raped the very people they were ordered to protect.

Today, the U.N. operates with little or no oversight from its member states. We have an opportunity to change that with H.R. 2745, which gives the American people the leveraging tool. By conditioning 50 percent of our U.N. dues to a series of reforms, the legislation would finally give the American people a voice on things like religious freedom, political oppression and abuses of power that have plagued the U.N. since its earliest days.

I urge support.

HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, within the past few weeks the Canadian Supreme Court has issued an opinion that it is unconstitutional for the State of Quebec to outlaw the private practice of medicine and private health care in the State of Quebec. This is an interesting development because we are frequently told that our neighbor to the north has solved their health care problems, while the United States languishes behind.

In an editorial yesterday in the Wall Street Journal, they point out that the Canadian Supreme Court found that access to a waiting list is not the same as access to care, and, in fact, for surgery across the board, no matter what type of surgery, the waiting time is over 18 weeks in Canada, and it would be longer if the United States were not just to the south of Canada. Henry Ford Hospital in Detroit probably takes a lot of the problems of the waiting lists in Toronto. Surely, those clamoring for a single payer system in this country must now rethink their position.

The Wall Street Journal points out that there are two ways to allocate goods and services. One is by price and a market-driven economy, and one is by placing people in waiting lines as in a government-run system.

Mr. Speaker, a doctor I knew from Cuba several years ago told me, sure, we have equality in our medical system in Cuba; unfortunately, that equality is absolutely at the bottom. We do not need to duplicate that here in the United States.

FREE LOVE FIELD

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I love freedom, and I think Americans should have the freedom to fly whenever they want to, wherever they want to and on whatever airline they want to.

Right now that is against the law in Dallas because of the Wright amendment. This outdated law restricts flights out of Dallas Love Field to just those States near Texas.

It is not the Federal Government's job to dictate to passengers how, when and where they can fly. That is why the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING) and I introduced the Right to Fly Act.

George Will noted Ronald Reagan's take on government saying, ''Washington's approach to intervening in industries is if it moves, tax it; if it keeps moving, regulate it; if it stops moving, subsidize it.''

Will continues, ''Regarding airlines, the policy is if they are failing, keep them flying; if they are prospering, burden them.''

Well, the Wright amendment has outlived its usefulness, and it is time to repeal it. I urge my colleagues to free Love Field and to cosponsor the Right to Fly.

THE U.N. MUST BE SAVED FROM ITSELF

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, systematic mismanagement and corruption within the United Nations organization has been part of the bureaucratic culture as never before. The United Nations is accountable neither to taxpayers nor to voters.

As a safeguard, the Henry Hyde United Nations Reform Act of 2005 targets crucial areas of the United Nations organization to ensure that U.S. taxpayer funds hauled off to Turtle Bay is spent in a deliberative, efficient, transparent and accountable manner.

Additionally, the bill before us this week empowers the administration to fix the United Nations by making it very clear that U.S. funding to that body will be drastically cut unless the United Nations takes the appropriate action to save itself.

The discrimination against Israel is one of the many problems in the United Nations. The viciousness with

which Israel continues to be attacked at the U.N., and the reluctance of many member states to defend Israel or to accord it the same treatment as other member states, suggests that there is considerable anti-Semitic components behind the policies pursued in the U.N. forums.

I believe that in the Henry Hyde United Nations Reform Act this week we will make sure that everyone will be on record to say that it is unacceptable that Israel, the only true democracy in the Middle East, should remain ostracized by the community of nations, and I urge my colleagues to pass the Henry Hyde U.N. Reform Act this week.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2862, SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 314 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 314

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2862) making appropriations for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived except for section 607. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 314 is an open rule providing for the consideration of H.R. 2862, the Science, State, Justice, Commerce and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for 2006.

The rule allows for 1 hour of general debate, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. It waives all points of order against consideration of the bill.

The rule provides that under the rules of the House, the bill shall be read for amendment by paragraph. It waives points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI, prohibiting unauthorized appropriations or legislative provisions in an appropriations bill.

Except as specified in the resolution, the rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Finally, it provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2862 funds our Nation's priorities without swelling our Federal budget. It is a bill of fiscal restraint, yet one that increases funding to some of our most important weapons in the fight on terror and crime, including the FBI, the DEA, and State and local law enforcement agencies.

As we continue to reassess our security and law enforcement priorities to meet threats abroad and at home, we must provide funding for programs that protect our communities. This bill accomplishes that goal.

Under H.R. 2862, funding for the Department of Justice will increase to almost $57.5 billion, with much of that additional money going to the agencies that are helping us fight the war on terror, the war on drugs and the war against gang violence.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation will see an increase of $542 million above the fiscal year 2005 level. The additional funding will go toward enhanced agent training and the hiring of additional analysts and translators to keep the FBI on the cutting edge of the war on terror. Increased funding means greater information technology, better counterintelligence capabilities and improved efforts to fight white-collar and gang crime.

The United States Marshals will see an increased funding of $41 million over last year, while the DEA, the Drug Enforcement Agency, will have $67 million additional to assist State and local law enforcement officials.

□ 1030

H.R. 2862 also funds important prevention programs for violence against women, gang crime, and juvenile delinquency. All of this adds up to better protection for our communities. This is the kind of fundamental support that Americans rely on Congress to pass. These are true national priorities, not frivolous programs tailored to special interests. This is legislation that deserves our support.

H.R. 2862 also funds our science agencies and provides for a vision of space exploration that has fascinated minds, both young and old, for generations, and provided many breakthrough technologies.

Mr. Speaker, I personally hope we will continue to prioritize science funding to ensure that our Nation remains at the forefront of scientific research and development into the future.

Through State Department funding, we have earmarked $1.5 billion to continue worldwide security improvements and the replacement of vulnerable United States embassies around the world.

Finally, and this is a very important point, H.R. 2862 provides $590 million for the Small Business Administration, and it supports a record level of business loans to help entrepreneurs across our great Nation access capital to start a small business. So much of our U.S. economy, of course, is driven, as we know, by small businesses.

As we begin the debate on this rule and the underlying appropriations bill, let us keep two things in mind: one, we must hold fast to our spending limits. To quote President Bush, ''The American people deserve to have their tax dollars spent wisely or not at all.''

Second, we must commit wholly and without reserve to funding our Nation's security and law enforcement priorities. Protecting our citizens from harm is the utmost duty of this Congress and our government. This protection stems from Federal agencies that stop gang violence, crack down on drug trafficking, and give counterterrorism and counterintelligence efforts the full support that they deserve.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, last night, the Committee on Rules considered H.R. 2862, the Science, State, Justice, Commerce and Related Agencies' appropriations bill for FY 2006. And while I am pleased that the committee reported an open rule, as is customary with appropriations bills, we all know the amendment process for these bills is very restrictive. This makes it easy for the majority to allow an open rule and still maintain tight control over what is debated and deliberated on the floor through the waiver process.

If we want to foster democracy in this body, we should take the time and thoughtfulness to debate all major legislation under an open rule, not just appropriations bills, which are already restricted. An open process should be the norm and not the exception.

That being said, I want to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), and the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), for working together to create a bill that seems to be

a fair and responsible piece of legislation.

I have always said that budgets are moral documents. Where and how we decide to spend the taxpayers' money says more about our values as a society than any speech or political rhetoric possibly could. If any of my fellow Americans really want to know who and what each party cares about in this country, look at where the money goes and the truth will be what follows. That is exactly what an appropriations bill such as this does. It gives us a road map to see what is important to our elected leadership.

That is why I want to congratulate my friends across the aisle for having the courage to essentially reject the White House's inadequate budget request for this bill. Clearly, many Republican Members in this body do not share the same values as the President, and I congratulate you for having the courage to demonstrate this rare moment of independence and moderation to the American people. The bill clearly rebuffs the White House's agenda on spending issues, such as funding for the National Science Foundation, which is still inadequate, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the Department of Justice, and the Drug Enforcement Agency by providing adequate, if not ideal, funding.

Also, I am pleased that Chairman WOLF and Ranking Member MOLLOHAN saw fit to prohibit the use of funds in this measure to support or justify the use of torture by the United States Government. Unfortunately, this language is both necessary and appropriate.

We also have language included today that will prohibit the White House from blocking the importation of discount prescription drugs through trade agreements. That means this body is acting to ensure that the White House does not try to subvert our authority and take further steps to prevent the American people from having access to life-saving, affordable prescription drugs. I strongly believe that access to affordable medication and health care should be a right in this country and not the fodder of a political power struggle.

Mr. Speaker, just when I saw the rays of hope sprinkled throughout the bill that this typically extreme leadership has finally begun to place the needs of everyday, hardworking Americans before their agenda, I was offered a reality check last night in the Committee on Rules. The moderation I had seen had merely been an illusion.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, brought to the Committee on Rules a necessary, important, and reasonable amendment to this bill. The amendment would have increased funding by $410 million for local law enforcement agencies and for COPS grants, which is the most successful crime prevention program in our Nation's history; and we have decimated it. It would have put more police on the streets in America's neighborhoods.

Additionally, it would have increased funding for EDA grants by $53 million, which spur the public and private investment in order to create new jobs in our struggling communities.

The cost of his amendment would have been offset through a less than 1.5 percent reduction in tax benefits for only the wealthiest Americans, those with annual incomes in excess of $1 million, and would have meant about a $2,000 decrease in their refund. But the Republican majority opposed it on a party-line vote, choosing the rich over safer neighborhoods.

This issue, I believe, gives us a clear picture of exactly the difference between the Republicans and the Democrats in the House. If anyone had a doubt who was fighting for everyday Americans, they should not any more. If there was a question over which party is the champion for the middle class, the safe neighborhoods, and for job creation, that question has been answered because the majority was willing to sacrifice placing police officers on the streets in our neighborhoods in order to protect a small tax cut for only the richest Americans.

Since 2001, our police have been asked to do more with a billion dollars less in Federal funding so that the millionaires can keep their extra $2,053. Today, we will have another opportunity to stand with the vast majority of everyday Americans and families instead of millionaires, and I will be asking Members on both sides of the aisle to vote ''no'' on the previous question so we can try once again to allow the Obey amendment to be considered on the floor today.

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

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to point out that this bill does provide $2.6 billion for assistance to State and local law enforcement for crime-fighting initiatives, and that is actually $1 billion above the President's request, in response to the gentlewoman's remarks about the Obey amendment.

Unfortunately, the Committee on Rules could not waive points of order against the gentleman's amendment. While the intent of his amendment is admirable, the means of his amendment does not comply with the rules of the House. The amendment would seek to offset an increase in funding for States and local law enforcement through a tax increase; and such changes in tax policy, as we know, are under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. Therefore, the amendment, as written, was not germane to H.R. 2862 and subject to a point of order.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER).

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and in support of the underlying bill; but I have some deep concerns with this bill, and I will probably support a number of amendments today. I want to lay out a little of my concerns about this bill.

This bill has to be taken in the context of a number of appropriation requests that the administration made in their budget. I chair the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources in the Committee on Government Reform, as well as cochair of the Speaker's Task Force; and I have been appalled at the President's approach to drug policy.

OMB did uninformed meddling in this budget process. There was lack of leadership out of the drug czar's office, and benign neglect out of the White House. There is no other simple way to say it. They proposed zeroing out Byrne grants, which would devastate all the drug task forces across the United States. They proposed zeroing out a number of other local law enforcement programs that are critical, including meth hot spots programs. In another appropriations bill, they proposed knocking out 60 percent of all State and local participation in HIDTAs and transferring it under Federal control and cutting the program immensely. They proposed changing the CPOT program, which gives aid to State and local law enforcement to fight methamphetamines and other issues, that and Safe and Drug Free Schools, which will be coming in another appropriations bill, they propose zeroing out the State and local funding for drug prevention.

The question is: Where is the antidrug strategy of this administration? Many of us on this side of the aisle took to the floor to criticize the last administration when in the first parts of their term they abandoned the national narcotics strategy and did misguided efforts. What should be good for one party should good for the other. We should have a consistent antidrug strategy.

And this is particularly appalling in the area of methamphetamines that are sweeping across every State and are moving increasingly from the rural areas into the suburbs and then into our major cities. If they hit our major cities and major suburbs, this will be an epidemic like we have never seen. The reaction out of the Federal Government is nothing. It is not in the national ad campaign. The Partnership For a Drug Free America is addressing it some, but it is not in our national ad campaign. It is not in our drug-free prevention programs.

They are proposing to zero out the meth hot spots programs, they propose to zero out the Byrne grant programs, they propose to knock out the meth hot spots, or the meth program that the last HIDTA is in, which is in Missouri. It was a meth program, and they said they did not want the new HIDTA programs.

Now, there will be a number of amendments today, we may have a few more this year, but these will be the only votes we will have that will enable us to address the meth question. Chairman WOLF, to his credit, in a very tight budget, recognized the failure of the administration's policies and put many of these dollars back. Unfortunately, in many of the categories, meth hot spots got more funding even than last year, even though the administration tried to zero it out. He put much of the Byrne grant money back in, much of the State and local funding back in, but the fact is we are still looking at merely a 50 percent whacking in some categories of these task forces.

There are likely to be a number of amendments today to try to address the Byrne grants, to try to address meth in particular, and a number of other subjects. I support Chairman WOLF and his efforts in every way; but at some point we have to stand up as a Congress and say, if this administration is not going to come up with a meth strategy, then this is the way it gets done on the House floor, amendment by amendment, in a fairly chaotic way.

It is time this administration faced up to the fact that gangs are not our number one problem in America, meth is our number one growing problem in America; and it is closely related to the gang problem. We need a coordinated methamphetamine strategy out of this administration. And quite frankly, the same thing is happening over in the United States Senate. And if administration does not address the meth question, then it will be addressed by the House and the Senate in the force of law, unfortunately often chaotically through the appropriations process or random little pieces of bills.

So while I plan to vote for this rule and I plan to vote for the underlying bill, even if these amendments do not pass, I strongly urge Members to realize what is happening here. We are going to have a meth epidemic in America unless we increasingly address it with some of the amendments that will be offered today.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to ask the gentleman from Georgia a question. In his opening statement, he indicated how many times, or how many waivers had been provided. In the gentleman's statement he indicated the number of waivers that this rule provided.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGREY. In response to the gentleman's question, I do not know the exact number of waivers that were granted.

Mr. OBEY. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I thought I heard the gentleman say something like 40.

Mr. GINGREY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, that was not part of my opening statement. You may be correct, but I am not sure of that number.

Mr. OBEY. But the committee has provided a number of waivers?

Mr. GINGREY. The committee has provided a number of waivers. I am just not sure what that number is.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GINGREY. Certainly.

Mr. OBEY. Let me just say, then, Mr. Speaker, that is why I intend to oppose the previous question and the rule on this bill, because the Committee on Rules did some picking and choosing. They provided waivers to the rules when they wanted to, and they did not when they did not want to.

As a result, they have tried to block my ability to offer the amendment that was our number one priority on the minority side of the aisle, which is to restore the funding for the local law enforcement grants and to restore the cuts in EPA that were made by simply reducing the size of the tax cut that persons making $1 million a year or more will get in this country by $2,000.

□ 1045

That would mean instead of getting $140,000 tax cut this year, a millionaire would have to settle for $138,000. I know there are many Members on the majority side of the aisle who get irritated when I keep bringing up this trade-off, but the fact is that the wealthiest one-thousandth of 1 percent of our citizens have seen their share of the national income double since 1980. The bottom 90 percent of earners in this economy have seen their share of income fall. The 400 most well-off taxpayers in this country make at least $87 million a year. Those earning $10 million per year pay a smaller share of their income in taxes than those making $100,000 a year. Meanwhile, while the upper crust is having a high old time, the folks in the middle are struggling. They struggle to pay unexpected bills. It is harder for them to send their kids to college. It is harder for local communities to provide needed services. Law enforcement services are being cut back.

The previous speaker mentioned what is happening to our antimeth programs around the country. I think it is important for the House to understand that, for instance, this bill has a substantial increase, over a billion dollars, for deep space programs, and yet since fiscal year 2001, local law enforcement programs have been cut by a billion dollars, and Economic Development Administration programs which are principally targeted to help small communities such as those I represent, that program has been cut by 50 percent since 2001.

I do not think that reflects the priorities of the American people. It certainly does not reflect the priorities of most people on this side of the aisle. So I am going to be voting against the previous question on the rule and the rule itself if there is a rollcall to protest the fact while the Committee on Rules has been magnanimous in providing many waivers, it has not provided a waiver for the key amendment that would enable us to restore needed funding for local law enforcement.

I do not believe the priorities represented by this committee's judgment represent the priorities of the American people. When the time comes, I will be offering whatever amendments I am allowed to offer under the rules to try to change those priorities.

The subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), is a very able Member, but he cannot perform a miracle without resources, and the allocation he was given are totally inadequate to the task at hand. The quality of America's law enforcement at the local level will suffer because of it.

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

Mr. Speaker, of course we represent that the President's request for State and local law enforcement was not sufficient. That is why the committee took the necessary steps to restore funding in a responsible manner. As an example, the gentleman from Indiana was just talking about some of that restoration. The committee restored approximately a billion of the $1.4 billion reduction that the President requested.

This bill provides $2.6 billion for crime-fighting initiatives, including the following restorations in funding: $355 million to reimburse States for criminal alien detention; $334 million for juvenile delinquency prevention and accountability programs; $387 million for violence against women and prosecution programs; $348 million for the Edward Byrne Justice Assistance Grants Program; $520 million for Community Oriented Policing Service, the COPS Program; and yes, $60 million for meth hot spots.

I would suggest to the gentleman in regard to his question about the point of order, the gentleman's amendment would not be subject to a point of order if the gentleman would alter his amendment to include offsets for his increase from within the programs under the jurisdiction of SSJC Appropriations Act. The amendment would then comply with the rules of the House and could be considered and voted upon by Congress.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), a member of the Committee on Rules.

(Ms. MATSUI asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, of late there has been much discussion on protecting Americans and what Congress can do to fund programs which prove effective and yield results. Yet here we are today cutting a program that our law enforcement officials rely upon to ensure the safety and security of our communities, the COPS Program. They are our first line of defense, and the COPS programs help States and localities put more police on our streets to keep our families safe.

My hometown of Sacramento has seen the practical benefits of this program. The COPS Program has put an additional 569 law enforcement officers on the streets of Sacramento in the past decade. Without this program, I do not know that this would have been possible.

I realize the cuts to the COPS Program could have been much more sizable. Congress did not go as far as President Bush recommended in downsizing this program. I am pleased at that, but I am truly disappointed that again for the fourth year in a row funding for this much-needed program is on the chopping block.

The men and women in law enforcement make a real difference not only in our cities and towns, but in the bigger effort to safeguard our country from the threat of terrorists. I am frustrated because we had the opportunity to correct this funding cut for a worthwhile program.

The Committee on Rules could have made in order under this rule an amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). It would have kept funding for the COPS programs at the previous year's level; no increase, but certainly no decrease. This would have been a smart amendment to make in order.

I am pleased to note, however, that this bill makes a significant commitment to strengthen research and education through increased NASA funding. Technology developed by NASA has long served as the engine of innovation which has driven our Nation's economic growth. Advances made by this Agency in areas of science and technology have played an integral role in the defense of our Nation. And most importantly, we are educating our Nation's next generation of scientists and engineers. I applaud the committee for their long-term planning in this area.

Although I would like to see a few changes to this bill, particularly a greater increase in law enforcement funding, I do support the underlying measure. I am pleased it was reported out in a bipartisan fashion. I commend the Committee on Appropriations for their hard work under such tough budgetary constraints.

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

Mr. Speaker, I point out to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) that just recently in the homeland security funding bill that we passed last month, we provided for $3.7 billion for first responders. The House-passed bill included grants to high-threat areas, firefighters, and emergency management.

Since September 11, 2001, the Congress has provided $32.4 billion to our first responders in funding their needs, such as terrorism prevention and preparedness, general law enforcement, firefighter responders, training 811,275 police, fire, and emergency medical personnel, and, yes, in this bill that we are talking about this morning, $520 million for the COPS Program.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I will be calling for a no vote on the previous question. If the previous question is defeated, I will amend the rule so we can consider the Obey amendment that was rejected in the Committee on Rules last night on a party-line vote.

The Obey amendment would give additional badly needed funds for grants to State and local law enforcement assistance and to the Economic Development Administration Grant Program. Specifically, it would increase by $410 million funding for formula grants to State and local law enforcement agencies as well as for the COPS Program, one of the most effective programs in its history.

It will also increase funding for Economic Development Assistance grants by $53 million, and restore this assistance to State and local governments to last year's level, money they badly need to create new jobs.

I also want to assure my colleagues that the cost of this amendment will not add a single dime to the deficit. It is fully paid for by making a very slight reduction of less than 1½ percent to the tax break received by people of annual incomes of over a million dollars, tax benefits that these fortunate individuals received as a result of the 2001 and 2003 tax cut legislation and will lose only $2,000 on their tax refunds if the Obey amendment is accepted.

I want to assure my colleagues that a no vote will not prevent us from considering the Science, State, Justice, Commerce appropriations bill under the open rule, but a no vote will allow Members to vote on the Obey amendment to help our State and local governments with law enforcement and economic development. A yes vote will cancel the consideration of this amendment. I urge a no vote on the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise again in support of this rule and in recognition of the importance of the underlying bill in funding and providing for the necessary tools for our law enforcement that defends the American people against crime and terror from sources both foreign and domestic.

H.R. 2862 funds our law enforcement needs, and it funds them responsibly. While some on the other side have called out for more funding of this program or that program, they fail to realize the limited funds available in the Federal budget. Again, H.R. 2862 supports and provides for the operations of the Department of Justice with $5.8 billion for the FBI, $1.7 billion for the DEA, and $800 million for the United States Marshal Service. Without question, this bill funds those who put their lives on the line every day to make sure the American people are secure and safe as they go about their daily activities.

Mr. Speaker, this appropriation also provides the necessary funding for the Department of Commerce to strengthen economic growth and protect the intellectual property rights so essential to technical and societal development, and because of the importance of technological strength, this bill also includes a responsible level of funding for NASA and the National Science Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2862 not only supports our law enforcement agencies here at home, but it also supports the State Department and our needs abroad. From funding to reinforce our vulnerable embassies to funding for improved training of State Department personnel, this legislation provides $9.5 billion to strengthen our relationships overseas and wage the diplomatic war on terror.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF), the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), and I would also like to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), for all of their labor and time on this bill.

□ 1100

I want to encourage all of my colleagues to support both the rule and the underlying bill.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

PREVIOUS QUESTION ON H. RES. 314, H.R. 2862, THE SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS FOR FY2006

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

''SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amendment printed in section 3 shall be in order without intervention of any point of order and before any other amendment if offered by Representative Obey of Wisconsin or a designee. The amendment is not subject to amendment

except for pro forma amendments to a demand for a division of the question in the committee of the whole or in the House.

SEC. 3 The amendment referred to in section 2 is as follows:

Amendment to H.R. _____, as Reported (Science, State, Justice, and Commerce Appropriations, 2006)

Offered by Mr. Obey of Wisconsin

In title I, in the item relating to ''Office of Justice Programs—State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance'', after the first and second dollar amounts, insert the following: ''(increased by $270,000,000)''.

In title I, in the item relating to ''Office of Justice Programs—Community Oriented Policing Services'', after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $140,000,000)''.

In title II, in the item relating to ''Economic Development Administration—Economic Development Assistance Programs'', after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $53,000,000)''.

At the end of title VI, insert the following:

SEC. ____. In the case of taxpayers with adjusted gross income in excess of $1,000,000, for the calendar year beginning in 2006, the amount of tax reduction resulting from enactment of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 (Pub. L. 107–16) and the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003 (Pub. L. 108–27) shall be reduced by 1.466 percent.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. 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.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting, if ordered, on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 190, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 243]

YEAS—222

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
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
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
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
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
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
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
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
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)

NAYS—190

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
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
Stupak
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

NOT VOTING—21

Boucher
Buyer
Cummings
Everett
Hinojosa
Jones (OH)
Knollenberg
Larson (CT)
Mack
McCrery
Oberstar
Owens
Pascrell
Peterson (PA)
Rothman
Sessions
Stark
Strickland
Sweeney
Thomas
Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1125

Mr. BAIRD, Mrs. MALONEY, and Mrs. CAPPS changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. I was unavoidably detained during rollcall vote No. 243, a motion ordering the previous question on H. Res. 314, a rule providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2862) making appropriations for Science, the Department of State, Justice, and Commerce, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes. Had I been present I would have voted "no" on this motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING QUESTION OF PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I hereby notify the House of my intention to offer a resolution as a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of my resolution is as follows:

Resolution disapproving the manner in which Representative SENSENBRENNER has responded to the minority party's request under rule XI of the House of Representatives for an additional day of oversight hearings on the reauthorization of the USA PATRIOT Act and the manner in which such hearing was conducted.

Whereas Representative SENSENBRENNER willfully and intentionally violated the Rules of the House of Representatives by abusing and exceeding his powers as chairman;

Whereas subsequent to receiving a request for an additional day of hearings by members of the minority party pursuant to rule XI, Representative SENSENBRENNER scheduled such hearing on less than 48 hours notice;

Whereas such hearing occurred on Representative SENSENBRENNER's directive at 8:30 a.m., on Friday, June 10, 2005, a date when the House was not in session session and votes were not scheduled;

Whereas Representative SENSENBRENNER directed his staff to require that the witnesses' written testimony be made available on less than 18 hours notice;

Whereas, during the course of the hearing, Representative SENSENBRENNER made several false and disparaging comments about members of the minority party in violation of rule XVII;

Whereas, Representative SENSENBRENNER failed to allow members of the committee to question each witness for a period of 5 minutes in violation of rule XI;

Whereas Representative SENSENBRENNER refused on numerous and repeated occasions throughout the hearing to recognize members of the minority party attempting to raise points of order;

□ 1130

Whereas when Representative NADLER and Representative JACKSON–Lee sought recognition to raise a point of order, Representative SENSENBRENNER refused to recognize Representative NADLER or Representative JACKSON–Lee, and intentionally and wrongfully adjourned the committee without obtaining or seeking either unanimous consent or a vote of the committee members present in violation of rule XVI;

Whereas subsequent to Representative SENSENBRENNER's improper adjournment of the hearing, his staff turned off the microphones and the electronic transmission of the proceedings and instructed the court reporter to stop taking transcription, even though the committee hearing had not been properly adjourned, and members of the minority party had invited witnesses to continue to speak; and

Whereas Representative SENSENBRENNER willfully trampled the right of the minority to meaningfully hold an additional day of hearings in violation of the Rules of the House of Representatives, and brought discredit upon the House of Representatives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That

(1) the House strongly condemns the manner in which Representative SENSENBRENNER has responded to the minority party's request for an additional day of oversight hearings on the reauthorization of the USA PATRIOT Act, and the manner in which such hearing was conducted; and

(2) the House instructs Representative SENSENBRENNER, in consultation with Representative CONYERS, to schedule a further day of hearings with witnesses requested by members of the minority party concerning the reauthorization of the USA PATRIOT Act.''

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATHAM). Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from New York will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2862, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 314 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2862.

□ 1134

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2862) making appropriations for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to begin consideration of H.R. 2862, making appropriations for fiscal year 2006 for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and related agencies. This bill provides funding for programs whose impact ranges from the safety of people in their homes and communities to the conduct of diplomacy around the world, to the farthest reaches of space exploration.

The bill before the House today reflects a delicate balance of needs and requirements. We have drafted what I consider a responsible bill for fiscal year 2006 spending levels for the departments and agencies under the subcommittee's jurisdiction. We have had to carefully prioritize funding in the bill and make hard choices about how to spend scarce resources.

I want to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) for supporting us with a fair allocation and helping us to move the bill forward. I also would like to thank the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), who has been very effective and a valued partner and colleague on this bill. I appreciate his principled commitment and understanding of the programs in the bill.

Also I wanted to thank all members of the subcommittee for their help and assistance: the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON), the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ALEXANDER), the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO), who used to be the ranking member on the committee, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER), the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), and also the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. Chairman, I also want at the outset to thank the members of the staff who have worked incredibly hard, as I am sure all subcommittee staff on this committee do on appropriations, but particularly want to thank them publicly. Mike Ringler, the clerk of the subcommittee, who has led the subcommittee through the House appropriations process. Also I want to thank Christine Kojac, John Martens, Anne Marie Goldsmith, Joel Kaplan and Celia Aloavado for their tireless efforts. Their work is very much appreciated. They have done an outstanding job.

In my personal office, I want to thank Dan Scandling, Janet Shaffron, J.T. Griffin, Samantha Stockman and Courtney Schlieter for their efforts and work with the subcommittee.

From the minority staff, I want to thank David Pomerantz, Michelle Burkett, Rob Nabors, Sally Moorhead and Julie Aaronson for their insight and input on the bill.

It has been a good bipartisan effort. Sometimes those things are said, but sometimes there is not a lot of reality to them. But this has been a good bipartisan effort. As in past years, we

have worked in a bipartisan manner to draft this legislation, and I look forward to continuing forward in that spirit.

The bill contains $57.45 billion in discretionary spending. At a time of fiscal constraint, we have developed a bill that preserves critical domestic and international programs, while living within our allocation. Program increases are focused on the most critical areas, including counterterrorism, law enforcement, security of government employees overseas, as well as science and space programs.

As we know, the budget resolution upon which our allocation is based actually reduces nondefense discretionary funding from last year's level by 0.8 percent. As a result, we have had to make some difficult choices to focus limited resources on programs that are most critical to the Nation.

The bill continues the progress we have made in the fight against terrorism and crime. We have tried our best to establish strong funding levels for NASA and the National Service Foundation (NSF), the agencies that are new to our jurisdiction. At the same time, the bill also reflects our commitment to responsible stewardship of public funds.

For the Department of Justice, the bill includes $21.45 billion, $1.1 billion above the request, to restore needed funds for State and local crime-fighting to keep our streets safe. The bill also includes significant increases for Federal law enforcement for both terrorism prevention and traditional law enforcement and drug enforcement.

The bill focuses funding on fighting the growth of gangs and reducing gang violence. We have continued and enhanced FBI and ATF antigang programs and restored funding to the gang resistance training programs. In addition, we have created a new $60 million gang program that will allow each U.S. Attorney's office, working with local officials, to fund antigang strategies in cooperation with those in State and local government.

The bill also includes $5.76 billion for the FBI to provide enhanced training and information technology management, and to provide additional agents, analysts and translators to improve counterterrorism and counterintelligence capabilities, while continuing the fight on white-collar crime and gang violence.

We maintained the commitment to fighting illegal drug activities with $1.7 billion for the DEA, slightly above the request, to restore proposed reductions in assistance to State and local law enforcement, Mobile Enforcement Teams and Demand Reduction, and to fully fund the effort to combat heroin production in Afghanistan.

The bill also includes $2.59 billion for improving State and local law enforcement crime-fighting programs, restoring $1 billion above the request to the highest-priority programs. We have restored $1 billion.

I heard the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) talking earlier during debate on the rule, and I agree with what the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) said. Why would the administration have ever zeroed this out? But we have restored $1 billion above the request for the highest-priority programs, including SCAAP, Justice Assistance Grants and Juvenile Justice programs, all which the administration proposed to eliminate or drastically reduce.

For the Department of Commerce and related trade agencies, the bill includes $5.83 billion, a decrease of $831 million below 2005. We have not adopted the President's proposal for a new consolidated community development program, which explains why we are so far below the request for Commerce.

As we did last year, the overall funding levels for the trade agencies, USTR, ITA and ITC, is above the request; it is higher than the administration asked for.

I just cannot understand why this administration is not bringing an intellectual property case with regard to China. We gave them all of the resources last year and are giving them all of the resources this year. If they do not move this year, I do not know what we can do. Hopefully, with Rob Portman down there, they will move.

This will empower them to negotiate, verify and enforce trade agreements that are free and fair, and ensure an even playing field for American businesses.

For NIST, we have provided $19 million above the current year level for the core science programs, focusing on national security standards and nanomanufacturing.

To further bolster our manufacturing sector, the bill includes $106 million for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program, an increase of $59 million. Members from both sides of the aisle spoke to us on numerous occasions about that.

The bill makes some cuts for the NOAA budget, eliminating lower-priority programs and projects. The critical function of the National Weather Service and NOAA's satellite programs are funded above the request, and funding is continued for critical ocean and fisheries programs.

The bill includes $1.7 billion, a 10 percent increase, for the PTO, and equal to the amount they expect to collect in fees. A strong patent and trademark system is essential to protect our intellectual property and maintain innovation in the economy.

Finally under Commerce, we provide an increase of $87 million to support the ramp-up to the 2010 decennial census, including full funding for the American Community Survey.

For NASA, the bill ensures that the President's vision for space exploration is adequately funded at $3.1 billion, while at the same time restoring the aeronautics research program to the enacted level of $906 million, and providing $40 million over the request to partially restore NASA's science programs.

The space shuttle program is funded at the request to ensure that all shuttle safety issues are being fully funded. In coordination with the Committee on Science and the gentleman from New York (Chairman BOEHLERT), new legislative language is included in the bill directing the President to develop a national aeronautics policy to be submitted with the fiscal year 2007 budget.

Boeing is dropped in production and share of the market. Ten years ago they had 65 percent of the market, now they are down to 48 to 49. Frankly, without an aeronautical policy, that will continue to drop. That language, working with the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), is in here.

For the NSF, we are providing an increase of $171 million over last year, $38 million above the request. People say we are falling behind in math, science, physics, chemistry and biology, and we are trying to do everything we can to reverse that. Also I have sent a letter to the administration asking that they triple the funding next year, taking from other areas, but triple the funding on R&D so this country does not lose its competitive edge.

This includes a 3.7 percent increase for basic research funding, $44 million above the request. And for science education we have included $807 million, which is $70 million above the request. Science is the engine of our competitiveness, and I have encouraged the President to substantially increase our investment in basic research and science education in the 2007 budget.

For the State Department and Broadcasting Board of Governors, the bill includes $9.53 billion, a decrease of $1.1 billion below 2005, and $273 million below the request.

Within this total we are providing $1.5 billion, the full request, for worldwide security improvements and replacement of vulnerable facilities and funding to support 55 new positions to support security readiness.

Look at the security that this Capitol Building has. Look at the security that many other Federal buildings have. To say that we are going to send Federal employees abroad and not protect them, we remember the bombing in Tanzania and the bombing in Kenya, so we fully make sure that is funded.

We are providing 100 new positions for high-priority diplomatic requirements, including in the areas of fighting terrorist financing, nonproliferation of WMD and for new critical language needs related to the Global War on Terror.

We continue to strongly support public diplomacy improvements, including significant increases for information programs, international broadcasting and international exchange programs, particularly with the Arab and Muslim world.

□ 1145

We have included the requested funds for international peacekeeping to pay

the assessed costs for missions in Sudan. I think this administration has done a good job in Sudan. More should be done in Darfur, and Under Secretary Zoellick has been to Darfur now twice. But this money for peacekeeping in Sudan will have a major impact on what is taking place in Darfur; also, in Haiti, Liberia and elsewhere.

We have attached to this funding new language requiring notification to the committee that prevention and prosecution measures are in place to ensure zero tolerance of sexual abuse in peacekeeping missions. If you read the report on the peacekeeping abuses, sexual abuse by U.N. peacekeepers in the Congo, it will make you sick. So this language deals with notification to the committee, and prevention and prosecution measures are in place for the zero, zero tolerance of sexual abuse in peacekeeping missions.

We also include new language supporting the maintenance of a flat U.N. budget. We also require the State Department to keep the committee informed of any changes in the U.N. budget.

There is a lot of interest, Mr. Chairman, in the U.N. and, as many of my colleagues know, last year in our bill, we created a United Nations Task Force to make recommendations for U.S. Government action to reform the U.N. and ensure the U.N. fulfills its charter purposes. The task force is cochaired by Senator Mitchell and Speaker Gingrich. Their recommendations are coming to the committee later this week, and we will look closely at their recommendations and do everything we can to advance them, and we would urge the administration and everyone in Congress to do everything that they can to advance their recommendations made by Speaker Gingrich and Majority Leader Mitchell.

The bill again fully funds the Federal Trade Commission Do-Not-Call program, and fully funds the request for the SEC to protect American investors.

For the SBA, the bill provides full requested funding for Small Business Development Centers. We restored $11 million for the Microloan program, which the President proposed to terminate. For business loan programs, the bill allows for $16.5 billion in general business loans, an unprecedented program level, while requiring no appropriation.

In closing, this is a summary of the bill. It provides increases where needed to maintain and strengthen the operations of critical law enforcement and other agencies. It gives no ground in the fight against terrorism, crime, and drugs, and restores desperately needed resources for State and local law enforcement personnel.

It represents our best take on matching needs with scarce resources. We have tried very hard to produce the best bill we could within the resources that we had to work with, and I urge all Members to support the bill.

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 2862)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE					
General Administration					
Salaries and expenses	122,443	161,407	89,906	-32,537	-71,501
Office of Intelligence and Policy Review	---	---	37,050	+37,050	+37,050
Subtotal	122,443	161,407	126,956	+4,513	-34,451
Joint automated booking system	19,915	---	---	-19,915	---
Automated Biometric Identification System-Integrated Identification system integration	4,987	---	---	-4,987	---
Justice information sharing technology	---	181,490	135,000	+135,000	-46,490
Legal activities office automation	39,969	---	---	-39,969	---
Narrowband communications	98,664	128,701	110,000	+11,336	-18,701
Administrative review and appeals	201,241	216,286	215,685	+14,444	-601
Detention trustee	874,160	1,222,000	1,222,000	+347,840	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13)	184,000	---	---	-184,000	---
Office of Inspector General	62,960	67,431	66,801	+3,841	-630
Total, General administration	1,608,339	1,977,315	1,876,442	+268,103	-100,873
United States Parole Commission					
Salaries and expenses	10,496	11,300	11,200	+704	-100
Legal Activities					
General legal activities:					
Direct appropriation	625,722	679,661	665,821	+40,099	-13,840
Vaccine injury compensation trust fund (permanent)	6,249	6,333	6,333	+84	---
Antitrust Division	138,259	144,451	144,451	+6,192	---
Offsetting fee collections - current year	-101,000	-116,000	-116,000	-15,000	---
Direct appropriation	37,259	28,451	28,451	-8,808	---
United States Attorneys					
Salaries and expenses	1,526,849	1,626,146	1,626,146	+99,297	---
United States Trustee System Fund	173,602	185,402	214,402	+40,800	+29,000
Offsetting fee collections	-168,602	-180,402	-209,402	-40,800	-29,000
Interest on U.S. securities	-5,000	-5,000	-5,000	---	---
Direct appropriation	---	---	---	---	---
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	1,203	1,270	1,220	+17	-50
United States Marshals Service:					
Salaries and expenses (non-CSE)	741,941	790,255	800,255	+58,314	+10,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13)	11,935	---	---	-11,935	---
Construction	5,657	---	---	-5,657	---
Total, United States Marshals Service	759,533	790,255	800,255	+40,722	+10,000
Fees and expenses of witnesses	177,585	168,000	168,000	-9,585	---
Community Relations Service	9,535	9,759	9,659	+124	-100
Assets forfeiture fund	21,469	21,468	21,468	-1	---
Payment to radiation exposure compensation trust fund	27,429	---	---	-27,429	---
Total, Legal activities	3,192,833	3,331,343	3,327,353	+134,520	-3,990
Interagency Law Enforcement					
Interagency crime and drug enforcement	553,539	661,940	506,940	-46,599	-155,000

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 2862)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Federal Bureau of Investigation					
Salaries and expenses	4,132,090	4,091,132	3,452,235	-679,855	-638,897
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13)	73,991	---	---	-73,991	---
Counterintelligence and national security	1,003,416	1,600,000	2,288,897	+1,285,481	+688,897
Direct appropriation	5,209,497	5,691,132	5,741,132	+531,635	+50,000
Construction	10,106	10,105	20,105	+9,999	+10,000
Total, Federal Bureau of Investigation	5,219,603	5,701,237	5,761,237	+541,634	+60,000
Drug Enforcement Administration					
Salaries and expenses	1,785,398	1,892,722	1,907,846	+122,448	+15,124
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13)	7,648	---	---	-7,648	---
Diversion control fund	-154,216	-198,566	-201,673	-47,457	-3,107
Total, Drug Enforcement Administration	1,638,830	1,694,156	1,706,173	+67,343	+12,017
Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms					
Salaries and expenses	878,465	803,613	923,613	+45,148	+120,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13)	4,000	---	---	-4,000	---
Legislative proposal	---	120,000	---	---	-120,000
Total, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms	882,465	923,613	923,613	+41,148	---
Federal Prison System					
Salaries and expenses	4,565,884	4,895,649	4,895,649	+329,765	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324)	5,500	---	---	-5,500	---
Buildings and facilities	186,475	170,112	70,112	-116,363	-100,000
Rescission	---	-314,000	---	---	+314,000
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324)	18,600	---	---	-18,600	---
Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated (limitation on administrative expenses)	3,366	3,365	3,365	-1	---
Total, Federal Prison System	4,779,825	4,755,126	4,969,126	+189,301	+214,000
Violence against women office	382,103	362,997	387,497	+5,394	+24,500
Office of Justice Programs					
Justice assistance	224,856	1,234,977	227,466	+2,610	-1,007,511
Rescission	---	-95,500	---	---	+95,500
Public safety officers benefits, death benefits	---	64,000	---	---	-64,000
Total, Justice assistance	224,856	1,203,477	227,466	+2,610	-976,011
State and local law enforcement assistance:					
Justice assistance grants	625,531	---	348,466	-277,065	+348,466
Boys and Girls clubs (earmark)	(83,865)	---	(85,000)	(+1,135)	(+85,000)
National Institute of Justice (earmark)	(9,866)	---	(10,000)	(+134)	(+10,000)
USA FREEDOM corps (earmark)	(2,467)	---	---	(-2,467)	---
Indian assistance	17,760	---	---	-17,760	---
Tribal prison construction	(4,933)	---	---	(-4,933)	---
Indian tribal courts program	(7,893)	---	---	(-7,893)	---
Indian grants	(4,933)	---	---	(-4,933)	---
State criminal alien assistance program	300,926	---	355,000	+54,074	+355,000
Southwest border prosecutors	29,599	---	30,000	+401	+30,000
Byrne grants (discretionary)	167,756	---	110,000	-57,756	+110,000
Drug courts	39,466	---	40,000	+534	+40,000
Other crime control programs	5,903	---	871	-5,032	+871
Assistance for victims of trafficking	9,866	---	10,000	+134	+10,000
Prescription drug monitoring	9,866	---	10,000	+134	+10,000
Prison rape prevention	36,506	---	40,000	+3,494	+40,000
State prison drug treatment	24,666	---	25,000	+334	+25,000
Intelligence sharing	10,359	---	10,359	---	+10,359

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 2862)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Cannabis eradication	---	---	11,600	+11,600	+11,600
Capital litigation	---	---	10,000	+10,000	+10,000
Total, State and local law enforcement	1,278,204	---	1,001,296	-276,908	+1,001,296
Weed and seed program fund	61,172	---	50,000	-11,172	+50,000
Community oriented policing services:					
Hiring	9,866	---	---	-9,866	---
Training and technical assistance	14,800	7,000	---	-14,800	-7,000
Bullet proof vests	24,666	---	30,000	+5,334	+30,000
Tribal law enforcement	19,733	51,600	38,000	+18,267	-13,600
Meth hot spots	51,854	20,000	60,000	+8,146	+40,000
Police corps	14,800	---	---	-14,800	---
COPS technology	136,763	---	120,000	-16,763	+120,000
Interoperable communications	98,664	---	---	-98,664	---
Criminal records upgrade	24,666	---	25,000	+334	+25,000
DNA backlog/crime lab	108,531	---	177,057	+68,526	+177,057
Paul Coverdell forensics science	14,800	---	---	-14,800	---
Crime identification technology	28,070	---	---	-28,070	---
Offender reentry	9,866	---	10,000	+134	+10,000
Safe schools initiative	4,268	---	---	-4,268	---
Police integrity grants	7,400	10,000	---	-7,400	-10,000
Reduce gang violence	---	---	60,000	+60,000	+60,000
Management and administration	29,599	29,181	---	-29,599	-29,181
Rescission	---	-115,500	---	---	+115,500
Total, Community oriented policing services	598,346	2,281	520,057	-78,289	+517,776
Juvenile justice programs	379,045	---	333,712	-45,333	+333,712
Public safety officers benefits:					
Death benefits	63,054	---	64,000	+946	+64,000
Disability and education benefits	6,324	---	8,948	+2,624	+8,948
Total, Public safety officers benefits program	69,378	---	72,948	+3,570	+72,948
Total, Office of Justice Programs	2,611,001	1,205,758	2,205,479	-405,522	+999,721
United States Attorneys (Sec. 107)	14,800	---	---	-14,800	---
Assets forfeiture fund (sec. 109) (rescission)	---	-62,000	---	---	+62,000
Total, title I, Department of Justice	20,893,834	20,562,785	21,675,060	+781,226	+1,112,275
Appropriations	(20,588,160)	(21,149,785)	(21,675,060)	(+1,086,900)	(+525,275)
Rescissions	---	(-587,000)	---	---	(+587,000)
Emergency appropriations	(305,674)	---	---	(-305,674)	---
TITLE II - DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES					
TRADE AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT					
RELATED AGENCIES					
Office of the United States Trade Representative					
Salaries and expenses	40,997	38,779	44,779	+3,782	+6,000
National Intellectual Property Law Enforcement Coordinating Council					
Salaries and expenses	1,973	---	---	-1,973	---
International Trade Commission					
Salaries and expenses	60,876	65,278	62,752	+1,876	-2,526
Total, Related agencies	103,846	104,057	107,531	+3,685	+3,474

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 2862)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE					
International Trade Administration					
Operations and administration	396,257	408,925	406,925	+10,668	-2,000
Offsetting fee collections	-8,000	-13,000	-13,000	-5,000	---
Direct appropriation	388,257	395,925	393,925	+5,668	-2,000
Bureau of Industry and Security					
Operations and administration	60,376	77,000	62,233	+1,857	-14,767
CWC enforcement	7,104	---	14,767	+7,663	+14,767
Total, Bureau of Industry and Security	67,480	77,000	77,000	+9,520	---
Economic Development Administration					
Economic development assistance programs	253,985	---	200,985	-53,000	+200,985
Salaries and expenses	30,075	26,584	26,584	-3,491	---
Total, Economic Development Administration	284,060	26,584	227,569	-56,491	+200,985
Economic Development Challenge					
Strengthening America's Communities grant program (legislative proposal)	---	3,710,000	---	---	-3,710,000
Minority Business Development Agency					
Minority business development	29,500	30,727	30,024	+524	-703
Total, Trade and Infrastructure Development	873,143	4,344,293	836,049	-37,094	-3,508,244
ECONOMIC AND INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE					
Economic and Statistical Analysis					
Salaries and expenses	78,931	85,277	80,304	+1,373	-4,973
Bureau of the Census					
Salaries and expenses	196,110	220,029	208,029	+11,919	-12,000
Periodic censuses and programs	548,688	657,356	624,208	+75,520	-33,148
Total, Bureau of the Census	744,798	877,385	832,237	+87,439	-45,148
National Telecommunications and Information Administration					
Salaries and expenses	17,200	21,450	17,716	+516	-3,734
Public telecommunications facilities, planning and construction	21,478	2,000	2,000	-19,478	---
Total, National Telecommunications and Information Administration	38,678	23,450	19,716	-18,962	-3,734
United States Patent and Trademark Office					
Current year fee funding	1,336,000	1,703,300	1,703,300	+367,300	---
Spending from new fees (proposed legislation)	208,754	---	---	-208,754	---
Total, Patent and Trademark Office	1,544,754	1,703,300	1,703,300	+158,546	---
Offsetting fee collections	-1,336,000	-1,703,300	-1,703,300	-367,300	---
Total, Economic and Information Infrastructure	1,071,161	986,112	932,257	-138,904	-53,855

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 2862)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY					
Technology Administration					
Salaries and expenses	6,460	4,200	6,460	---	+2,260
National Institute of Standards and Technology					
Scientific and technical research and services	378,764	426,267	397,744	+18,980	-28,523
(Transfer out)	---	(-9,000)	(-1,000)	(-1,000)	(+8,000)
Manufacturing extension partnerships	247,943	46,800	106,000	-141,943	+59,200
Construction of research facilities	72,518	58,898	45,000	-27,518	-13,898
Working capital fund (by transfer)	---	(9,000)	(1,000)	(+1,000)	(-8,000)
Total, National Institute of Standards and Technology	699,225	531,965	548,744	-150,481	+16,779
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration					
Operations, research, and facilities	2,766,612	2,528,168	2,444,000	-322,612	-84,168
(By transfer from Promote and Develop Fund)	(65,000)	(77,000)	(77,000)	(+12,000)	---
By transfer from Coastal zone management	2,960	3,000	3,000	+40	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324)	16,900	---	---	-16,900	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13)	7,070	---	---	-7,070	---
Total, Operations, research, and facilities	2,793,542	2,531,168	2,447,000	-346,542	-84,168
Procurement, acquisition and construction	1,039,365	965,051	936,000	-103,365	-29,051
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324)	3,800	---	---	-3,800	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13)	10,170	---	---	-10,170	---
Total, Procurement, acquisition and construction	1,053,335	965,051	936,000	-117,335	-29,051
Pacific coastal salmon recovery	88,798	90,000	50,000	-38,798	-40,000
Coastal zone management fund	-3,000	-3,000	-3,000	---	---
Fishermen's contingency fund	492	---	---	-492	---
Fisheries finance program account	-8,000	-2,000	-1,000	+7,000	+1,000
Total, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	3,925,167	3,581,219	3,429,000	-496,167	-152,219
Total, Science and Technology	4,630,852	4,117,384	3,984,204	-646,648	-133,180
OTHER					
Departmental Management					
Salaries and expenses	47,466	53,532	47,466	---	-6,066
Travel and tourism	9,866	---	---	-9,866	---
HCHB renovation and modernization	---	30,000	---	---	-30,000
Office of Inspector General	21,371	22,758	22,758	+1,387	---
Total, Departmental management	78,703	106,290	70,224	-8,479	-36,066
Florida grouper (sec. 218)	345	---	---	-345	---
Total, Department of Commerce	6,550,358	9,450,022	5,715,203	-835,155	-3,734,819
Total, title II, Department of Commerce and related agencies	6,654,204	9,554,079	5,822,734	-831,470	-3,731,345
Appropriations	(6,616,264)	(9,554,079)	(5,822,734)	(-793,530)	(-3,731,345)
Emergency appropriations	(37,940)	---	---	(-37,940)	---
(By transfer)	(65,000)	(86,000)	(78,000)	(+13,000)	(-8,000)
(Transfer out)	---	(-9,000)	(-1,000)	(-1,000)	(+8,000)

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 2862)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
TITLE III - SCIENCE					
Executive Office of the President					
Office of Science and Technology Policy	6,328	5,564	5,564	-764	---
National Aeronautics and Space Administration					
Science, aeronautics and exploration	9,334,700	9,661,000	9,725,750	+391,050	+64,750
Emergency appropriations (P.L.108-324)	126,000	---	---	-126,000	---
Exploration capabilities	6,704,400	6,763,000	6,712,900	+8,500	-50,100
Office of Inspector General	31,300	32,400	32,400	+1,100	---
Total, NASA	16,196,400	16,456,400	16,471,050	+274,650	+14,650
National Science Foundation					
Research and related activities (non-defense)	4,153,100	4,265,970	4,310,000	+156,900	+44,030
Defense function	67,456	67,520	67,520	+64	---
Major research equipment and facilities construction	173,650	250,010	193,350	+19,700	-56,660
Education and human resources	841,421	737,000	807,000	-34,421	+70,000
Salaries and expenses	223,200	269,000	250,000	+26,800	-19,000
National Science Board	3,968	4,000	4,000	+32	---
Office of Inspector General	10,029	11,500	11,500	+1,471	---
Total, National Science Foundation	5,472,824	5,605,000	5,643,370	+170,546	+38,370
Total, title III, Science	21,675,552	22,066,964	22,119,984	+444,432	+53,020
TITLE IV - DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND RELATED AGENCY					
DEPARTMENT OF STATE					
Administration of Foreign Affairs					
Diplomatic and consular programs	3,522,316	3,783,118	3,747,118	+224,802	-36,000
(Transfer out)	(-4,000)	(-4,000)	(-4,000)	---	---
Worldwide security upgrades	649,904	689,523	689,523	+39,619	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13)	734,000	---	---	-734,000	---
Total, Diplomatic and consular programs	4,906,220	4,472,641	4,436,641	-469,579	-36,000
Capital investment fund	51,452	133,000	128,263	+76,811	-4,737
Centralized IT modernization program	76,812	---	---	-76,812	---
Office of Inspector General	30,029	29,983	29,983	-46	---
Educational and cultural exchange programs	355,932	430,400	410,400	+54,468	-20,000
Representation allowances	8,524	8,281	8,281	-243	---
Protection of foreign missions and officials	9,762	9,390	9,390	-372	---
Embassy security, construction, and maintenance	603,510	615,800	603,510	---	-12,290
Worldwide security upgrades	900,134	910,200	910,200	+10,066	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13)	592,000	---	---	-592,000	---
Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service	987	13,643	10,000	+9,013	-3,643
(By transfer)	(4,000)	(4,000)	(4,000)	---	---
(Transfer out)	---	(-1,000)	(-1,000)	(-1,000)	---
Repatriation Loans Program Account:					
Direct loans subsidy	604	712	712	+108	---
Administrative expenses	599	607	607	+8	---
(By transfer)	---	(1,000)	(1,000)	(+1,000)	---
Total, Repatriation loans program account	1,203	1,319	1,319	+116	---
Payment to the American Institute in Taiwan	19,222	19,751	19,751	+529	---
Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund	132,600	131,700	131,700	-900	---
Total, Administration of Foreign Affairs	7,688,387	6,776,108	6,699,438	-988,949	-76,670

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 2862)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
International Organizations					
Contributions to international organizations, current year assessment	1,166,212	1,296,500	1,166,212	---	-130,288
Contributions for international peacekeeping activities, current year	483,455	1,035,500	1,035,500	+552,045	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13)	680,000	---	---	-680,000	---
Total, International Organizations and Conferences	2,329,667	2,332,000	2,201,712	-127,955	-130,288
International Commissions					
International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:					
Salaries and expenses	26,880	28,700	27,000	+120	-1,700
Construction	5,239	6,600	5,300	+61	-1,300
American sections, international commissions	9,466	9,879	9,500	+34	-379
International fisheries commissions	21,688	25,123	22,000	+312	-3,123
Total, International commissions	63,273	70,302	63,800	+527	-6,502
Other					
Payment to the Asia Foundation	12,827	10,000	10,000	-2,827	---
International Center for Middle Eastern-Western dialogue	6,906	1,000	---	-6,906	-1,000
Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship program	493	500	500	+7	---
Additional funding (Sec. 122 Div. J)	992	---	---	-992	---
Israeli Arab scholarship program	370	375	375	+5	---
East-West Center	19,240	13,024	6,000	-13,240	-7,024
National Endowment for Democracy	59,199	80,000	50,000	-9,199	-30,000
Total, Department of State	10,181,354	9,283,309	9,031,825	-1,149,529	-251,484
RELATED AGENCY					
Broadcasting Board of Governors					
International Broadcasting Operations	583,107	603,394	620,000	+36,893	+16,606
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13)	4,800	---	---	-4,800	---
Broadcasting to Cuba	---	37,656	---	---	-37,656
Broadcasting capital improvements	8,446	10,893	10,893	+2,447	---
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 109-13)	2,500	---	---	-2,500	---
Total, Broadcasting Board of Governors	598,853	651,943	630,893	+32,040	-21,050
Total, title IV, Department of State and Related Agency	10,780,207	9,935,252	9,662,718	-1,117,489	-272,534
Appropriations	(8,766,907)	(9,935,252)	(9,662,718)	(+895,811)	(-272,534)
Emergency appropriations	(2,013,300)	---	---	(-2,013,300)	---
(Transfer out)	(-4,000)	(-5,000)	(-5,000)	(-1,000)	---
(By transfer)	(4,000)	(5,000)	(5,000)	(+1,000)	---
TITLE V - RELATED AGENCIES					
Antitrust Modernization Commission					
Salaries and expenses	1,172	1,620	1,172	---	-448
Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad					
Salaries and expenses	492	499	499	+7	---
Commission on Civil Rights					
Salaries and expenses	8,975	9,096	9,096	+121	---

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 2862)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Commission on International Religious Freedom					
Salaries and expenses	2,960	3,000	3,200	+240	+200
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe					
Salaries and expenses	1,806	2,030	2,030	+224	---
Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China					
Salaries and expenses	1,875	1,900	1,900	+25	---
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission					
Salaries and expenses	326,803	331,228	331,228	+4,425	---
Federal Communications Commission					
Salaries and expenses	281,085	304,057	289,771	+8,686	-14,286
Offsetting fee collections - current year	-280,098	-299,234	-288,771	-8,673	+10,463
Direct appropriation	987	4,823	1,000	+13	-3,823
Federal Trade Commission					
Salaries and expenses	204,327	211,000	211,000	+6,673	---
Offsetting fee collections - current year	-101,000	-116,000	-116,000	-15,000	---
Offsetting fee collections, telephone database	-21,901	-23,000	-23,000	-1,099	---
Direct appropriation	81,426	72,000	72,000	-9,426	---
HELP Commission					
Salaries and expenses	987	1,000	1,000	+13	---
Legal Services Corporation					
Payment to the Legal Services Corporation	330,803	318,250	330,803	---	+12,553
Marine Mammal Commission					
Salaries and expenses	1,865	1,925	1,865	---	-60
National Veterans Business Development Corporation					
National Veterans Business Development Corporation	1,973	---	---	-1,973	---
Securities and Exchange Commission					
Salaries and expenses	913,000	888,117	888,117	-24,883	---
Prior year unobligated balances	-57,000	-25,000	-25,000	+32,000	---
Direct appropriation	856,000	863,117	863,117	+7,117	---
Small Business Administration					
Salaries and expenses	318,029	307,159	318,029	---	+10,870
Office of Inspector General	12,840	14,500	13,500	+660	-1,000
Surety bond guarantees revolving fund	2,861	3,000	2,861	---	-139
Business Loans Program Account:					
Direct loans subsidy	1,435	---	1,000	-435	+1,000
Administrative expenses	124,961	129,000	124,961	---	-4,039
Total, Business loans program account	126,396	129,000	125,961	-435	-3,039

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 2862)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Disaster Loans Program Account:					
Direct loans subsidy	---	83,335	79,538	+79,538	-3,797
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324)	501,000	---	---	-501,000	---
Administrative expenses	111,648	56,000	49,716	-61,932	-6,284
Emergency appropriations (P.L. 108-324)	428,000	---	---	-428,000	---
Total, Disaster loans program account	1,040,648	139,335	129,254	-911,394	-10,081
Total, Small Business Administration	1,500,774	592,994	589,605	-911,169	-3,389
State Justice Institute					
Salaries and expenses	2,578	---	2,000	-578	+2,000
United States - China Economic and Security Review Commission					
Salaries and expenses	2,960	4,000	4,000	+1,040	---
United States Senate-China Interparliamentary Group					
Salaries and expenses	98	---	---	-98	---
United States Institute of Peace					
Operating expenses	22,693	21,850	22,850	+157	+1,000
Additional funding (Sec. 122 Div. J)	99,200	---	---	-99,200	---
Total, United States Institute of Peace	121,893	21,850	22,850	-99,043	+1,000
Total, title V, Related agencies	3,246,427	2,229,332	2,237,365	-1,009,062	+8,033
TITLE VII - RESCISSIONS					
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE					
General Administration					
Working capital fund (rescission)	-60,000	---	---	+60,000	---
Legal Activities					
Assets forfeiture fund (rescission)	-61,800	---	-62,000	-200	-62,000
Rescission (P.L. 109-13)	-40,000	---	---	+40,000	---
Office of Justice Programs					
Justice assistance (rescission)	-1,619	---	---	+1,619	---
State & local law enforcement assistance (rescission)	-29,380	---	-38,500	-9,120	-38,500
Community oriented policing services (rescission)	-99,000	---	-86,500	+12,500	-86,500
Juvenile justice programs (rescission)	-3,500	---	---	+3,500	---
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE					
National Institute of Standards and Technology					
Industrial technology services (rescission)	-3,900	---	---	+3,900	---
Departmental Management					
Emergency steel guaranteed loan program account (rescission)	---	-50,168	-35,000	-35,000	+15,168

SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES, FY 2006 (H.R. 2862)
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2005 Enacted	FY 2006 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
RELATED AGENCIES					
Federal Communications Commission					
Salaries and expenses (rescission)	-12,000	---	---	+12,000	---
U.S. - Canada Alaska Railroad Commission					
Salaries and expenses (rescission)	---	-2,000	-2,000	-2,000	---
Total, title VII, Rescissions	-311,199	-52,168	-224,000	+87,199	-171,832
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority	62,939,025	64,296,244	61,293,861	-1,645,164	-3,002,383
Appropriations	(59,838,310)	(64,935,412)	(61,517,861)	(+1,679,551)	(-3,417,551)
Emergency appropriations	(3,411,914)	---	---	(-3,411,914)	---
Rescissions	(-311,199)	(-639,168)	(-224,000)	(+87,199)	(+415,168)
(Transfer out)	(-4,000)	(-14,000)	(-6,000)	(-2,000)	(+8,000)
(By transfer)	(69,000)	(91,000)	(83,000)	(+14,000)	(-8,000)

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the chairman has put together a good bill for us this year in the face of some really large reductions and legislative proposals that were contained in the President's budget request. He has crafted a bipartisan bill, and, during the process, the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) took into consideration all concerns that the minority expressed. He has been as accommodating in that process as he could be within the allocation that this committee was given, and the minority, Mr. Chairman, are really appreciative of that. He has done an excellent job, and his staff, likewise, has worked cooperatively with the minority genuinely to craft this bill.

Our allocation for the Science, State, Justice and Commerce bill, as the chairman indicated, is $57.45 billion, an increase of 2.1 percent from the fiscal year 2005 enacted level, but a decrease from the President's fiscal year 2005 request. It certainly sounds like a lot of money, but this year's increase does not keep pace with inflation, and it is not adequate to meet the varied needs of the important Federal agencies contained in this bill.

I am concerned that when we look at funding trends for these crucial programs over time, we are systematically reducing the Federal investments in our communities. For example, the chairman has restored about $1 billion over the President's cuts to the State and local law enforcement, but the bill is still about $400 million below last year's level. Now, that is a crucial fact. As we face terrorism, as we continue to fight crime, as we have been successful with it over the last 10 years in large part because of the Federal contribution to State and local levels, this is no time to back off of this support; but this bill is $400 million below last year's level for support to State and local law enforcement.

Mr. Chairman, the ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), went before the Committee on Rules. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) asked to be made in order an amendment to restore some of this funding and to have an offset, that would have been particularly appropriate, to offset just a small part of the tax cut that the most wealthy 1 percent in this country have received over the last 4 and 5 years, to support State and local law enforcement. I cannot think of a worthier program to support, a more important program to support in this time of national emergency and terrorist threats, and I cannot think of a more fair offset from a percentage of our population, the most wealthy, who have enjoyed the benefit of the tax cuts greater than anyone else in our country. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is going to offer an amendment on the floor to address this issue, and I would hope that there would not be an objection against it.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) has also restored $200 million to the Economic Development Administration's grant program. This was eliminated in the President's proposal. However, that restoration of $200 million is approximately two-thirds of last year's enacted amount for an extremely important program, the Economic Development Administration grants. They help the most needy communities in our Nation, and that is an area that did not need to be cut in the President's request, and we appreciate the chairman restoring it partially.

Smaller programs that are important to our States and our local communities were also zeroed out in the President's budget and could not be restored. The Public Telecommunications Facilities and Planning Account, the Advanced Technology program, and the SBA Prime program were not funded.

The President has also proposed zeroing out the Steel Loan Guarantee program. And I very much appreciate the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) restoring $15 million to the Steel Loan Guarantee program so that we can argue in conference for this valuable program, which has been so important to significant steel producers in the past.

For some agencies, this bill is a mix of good news and bad news. In the Department of Commerce, the President's so-called Strengthening America's Communities proposal was rejected, and some funding was restored to EDA, but we were not able to include requested funding for the National Institute of Standards and Technology for construction of new facilities. In the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, funding was increased for the National Environmental Satellite Data and Information Service, but the National Marine Fisheries and the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery program are both reduced.

The National Science Foundation overall fares well. The cuts this agency faced last year have been restored, and this bill provides $170 million more than last year's enacted level. But within the Education and Human Resources Directorate, many of the education programs are flat-funded, including EPSCOR, Informal Science, Advanced Technology Education, and Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

NASA, Mr. Chairman, is funded slightly above the President's request. The Space Shuttle's Return to Flight is fully funded, and the chairman has restored aeronautics funding to last year's level, and has increased the Science Accounts to $40 million. However, I am concerned that crucial science and aeronautics programs are being reduced, deferred, and ultimately will wither. The Science Account, including programs such as Solar System Exploration, Universe Exploration, and the Earth Sun System would receive less than a 1 percent increase over this budget proposal; yet the most recent successes have come from this program.

The clear winner in this bill is Federal law enforcement. The FBI received $50 million above the President's request, including funding for drug agents that the President proposed to transfer into organized crime and drug enforcement task forces. DEA and the Marshal Service are both funded above the President's request.

The bill rejects the President's proposal to tax the explosives industry by adding new fees, and rejects the proposal to transfer the High-Intensity Drug Trafficking Area, the HIDTA program, into the Department of Justice from ONDCP. We certainly can have a discussion on the merits of locating a program in one agency versus another, but, in this instance, when the HIDTA coordination efforts are going well, I think we can all agree that the program should be fully funded wherever it is located. I hope the Subcommittee on Transportation, Treasury, HUD, The Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies is looking at this issue as they prepare their bill.

The bill before us overcomes many deficits in the President's budget, but, over the long term, Mr. Chairman, I am concerned that the constraints placed on the Committee on Appropriations through the budget resolution are continuing the systemic reduction of domestic discretionary programs that are crucial to our State and local communities.

I would, as the chairman did, like to recognize and thank our staffs for doing such an outstanding job. They are dedicated, and they have been very dedicated to efforts on this bill. To Mike Ringler, Christine Kojac, John Martens, Anne Marie Goldsmith, Joel Kaplan, and Clelia Alvarado with the majority, I express thanks; and to David Pomerantz and Michelle Burkett, Dana Polk with the minority staff, and Sally Moorehead and Julie Aaronson on my personal staff, have put in a great deal of time, a great deal of hard work into the bill, and I know that the chairman and I share his deep sense of appreciation for their efforts.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the chairman and ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for bringing this bill to the floor, and I also want to commend the full Committee on Appropriations for doing outstanding work in bringing all of these bills to the floor in a timely manner.

Mr. Chairman, I am here to talk about a potential amendment that may

come to this bill, and I ask the question: How much is life worth? This may seem to be a more philosophical question than one normally hears in a debate about an amendment to an appropriations bill, but I do not mean it philosophically; I mean it literally.

Later today the gentleman from Wisconsin will offer an amendment that would take $200 million away from NASA and spend it instead on the undeniable, useful purpose of local law enforcement. Yet, Mr. Chairman, the amendment in no way alters the fundamental mission or programmatic activities at NASA. That is, under the Obey amendment, the United States would still order our best scientists and engineers to send our bravest astronauts back into space; we just demand that they cut a few corners along the way.

This is scientifically and morally unacceptable, Mr. Chairman. If the gentleman from Wisconsin or anyone else wants to have a debate about the wisdom of the American people's investment in space exploration, we can have that debate.

□ 1200

You can bring out a bunch of flow charts about the deficit and all the noble government aspirations that are currently underfunded. And I could read a list of people around the world whose lives have been saved and whose livelihoods depend on technologies developed over the last 4 decades by America's space program: the MRI machine, the portable x-ray, the automatic insulin pump, rocketry, satellite technology, touch tone phones, cellular telephony.

Which of these innovations, all directly attributable to our decades-long commitment to space exploration, might our society have missed out on over the last 40 years if along the way we asked NASA to cut a few corners here and there?

What future technological breakthroughs will we miss out on in the next 40 years if we start cutting back on NASA now?

That is an important debate, Mr. Chairman, and one that I relish the opportunity to have. But that is not what this amendment is about. This is not about scaling back our space program, but scaling back our commitment to the men and women who risk their lives for it.

If the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) wants us to turn our backs on space and surrender mankind's ancient struggle against ignorance, so be it. But as long as we are sending American citizens into space, we have a moral obligation to provide NASA's engineers every resource they require to bring our astronauts home safe.

If Members do not want our astronauts to return to flight, return to the Moon, complete the international space station or go to Mars, let them say so.

But if we do support our space program, if we do support our NASA community, and if we do support our astronauts and we risk their lives by sending them into the unknown on the cheap, Mr. Chairman, we will never be forgiven.

I would ask Members to pay attention to the amendments that are offered to this bill and most importantly, vote ''no'' on the Obey amendment.

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

The distinguished majority leader must know that the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), went to the Rules Committee to ask for a rule to allow him to offer an amendment to increase the funding for State and local law enforcement, which was dramatically reduced in this bill. It only exists in the bill because the chairman has restored several hundred million dollars to States and locals which the President asked to cut.

So the distinguished majority leader must know that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) went to the Rules Committee and that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is trying to get at the inadequacy of the funding for State and local law enforcement levels from the Federal Government, and the gentleman is not at all interested in cutting NASA.

But the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is left in a position now that his amendment, which proposes to offset the high income tax cut in order to fund additional State and local law enforcement, was denied. The gentleman was not able to offer that amendment, so he is getting at the issue of the inadequacy of the funding of State and local law enforcement by having, in a tight bill where we do not have many offsets, offsets against NASA. That is difficult. That is tough. But it does get at the issue of the inadequacy of State and local law enforcement, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) really has no choice if he wants to raise the issue, but to take a route like this.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished minority ranking member on the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I note the majority leader's reference to morality. It is really interesting indeed to be lectured on morality by the majority leader, almost makes me laugh. But let me simply say one thing. We are here today with a bill brought by a fine Member of Congress, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), who does his dead level best to provide a fair allocation of money within the amount assigned to his subcommittee.

The problem is that because the majority party has already made its basic budget decisions, and it has made as its number one priority providing tax cuts including $140,000-a-year tax cuts for people making more than a million bucks, because of that, there is very little left on the table for any of the domestic programs. And so the majority is now bringing to the floor bills which are inadequate for education, inadequate for science, inadequate for health, inadequate for law enforcement.

Now, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the distinguished majority leader, objects to the amendment that I intend to offer. Let me tell you how we got here. Last year, the gentleman was unhappy because the funding for NASA was scaled back by the VA HUD subcommittee in order to provide more room, in order to provide more money for housing, and to provide more money for veterans care. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) did not like that arrangement, so he abolished that subcommittee because the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is from Houston and he wanted an exception to the rule that required everybody else to have their pet programs squeezed except him. So he abolished the subcommittee.

Instead, he rearranged the jurisdiction of the subcommittee. So now, NASA is in competition, not with housing, not with veterans health care. Now NASA is in competition with local law enforcement. So you have got a $500 million increase in this account for NASA, and it is paid for by a $400 million cut in local law enforcement.

My first choice was to go to the Rules Committee and ask them to allow me to offer an amendment to scale back the size of the tax cut for those making a million dollars or more a year by $2,000. That means those poor devils are going to have to get by with a $138,000 tax cut next year. The majority party denied that. They force me now to look for other sources within the bill. So what I have done is to look at the places where this bill has increased over last year, because local law enforcement, since 2001, has been cut by a billion dollars. And so what the amendment does, it says let us scale back our plans to go to Mars by 2030 and instead make as a higher priority providing better law enforcement for grandma and grandpa back home. That is what we are trying to do. I make no apology for it.

If the majority leader does not like the fact that we had to go to NASA to take the money out in order to fund local law enforcement, he has only himself to blame because he reorganized the subcommittees in the first place to create this jurisdictional trade-off. If the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) does not like the result, he ought to look in the mirror.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill. As we all know, this is a difficult budget year. The American people have expressed, both Democrats and Republicans, strong concern about the budget deficits and are asking Congress to

move in a direction of a balanced budget. That is what this bill does, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) needs to be commended. It has a slight decrease in the State Department and Commerce Department funding, a slight increase in Justice Department funding, and as has been pointed out an increase in the science account.

I specifically rise to speak in support of the NASA accounts. We, in the congressional district that I have the privilege of representing, launch the space shuttle into space, and that space shuttle is America's space shuttle. It is not a Republican or a Democrat space shuttle, and it is poised to return to flight soon. We need to make sure that it completes the remainder of its assigned mission safely and safely brings the crew back to Earth. And this bill funds the shuttle at the needed level. It also has adequate funding for the space station. We have not completed the construction of the space station, and we have engaged in partnerships with European countries and with the Japanese and the Russians; and once the space shuttle is flying again and with the funding level the chairman and the ranking member have put in this bill, we should be well on track to complete construction of the space station.

I would like to also rise and speak in support of the initiative in this bill to increase aeronautics funding. And my colleagues, the United States has dominated the world in aeronautics. We are the home to the Wright brothers. And today we are being eclipsed. Today, Airbus has a greater global market share than Boeing, our sole remaining commercial airline manufacturing company. And this is critical seed corn if we, as a Nation, are going to be able to continue to have our edge in commercial aviation and in the whole field of civil aviation and aeronautics.

I would like to specifically address the issue of the President's space initiative. And one of the things that I have been increasingly concerned about in my position as a legislator is the fact that people in education tell me we just do not have enough American kids going into science, mathematics, and engineering. And those same educators tell me over and over again the thing that motivates kids more than anything else to go into those fields is the space program. And for years, NASA languished because many people criticized it for not having a clear vision. President John Kennedy gave it a clear vision in the 1960s; and, finally, today, we have that vision again. We are talking about going back to the Moon and on to Mars. President Bush gave us that vision, and now is not the time to cut back.

We have a critical situation where, in many of our colleges and universities, the majority of people pursuing graduate degrees in science and engineering fields are foreigners. They are not Americans. We are not graduating enough American citizens in these fields, and there is no better way to motivate our young people, young kids in grammar school, in secondary school.

Let me just say one other thing to close out. A lot of this space exploration is about the spirit of being an American citizen. We are a Nation of explorers, and if we are going to turn our back, or if we are going to delay, and I am very sympathetic to what the ranking member is trying to do with more funding for police, and I would certainly hope we may be able to do that in conference. But if we are going to remain a Nation that is always on the cutting edge of science and exploration, we desperately need NASA and what this bill is about.

I would strongly encourage all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to oppose any initiative to reduce the NASA accounts, to reduce the science accounts, to support the underlying bill. It is the right thing for our kids. It is the right thing for our competitiveness in the future. And it is the right thing to make sure that our space program stays on track.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO).

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill providing appropriations for the science agencies, the Department of State, Justice and Commerce and several related agencies for fiscal year 2006.

As in past years, I wish our 302(b) allocation could have been more generous, but that is not the fault of this committee. However, I am impressed with how much the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) was able to accomplish with the allocation he was given.

I would also like to say what a pleasure it has been to work with the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) and the outstanding majority and minority staff on this bill. On this subcommittee, there is an excellent working relationship among all of the members, and I credit the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for that.

Many important priorities were funded in this bill, and some of the highlights include increases for counterterrorism and counterintelligence activities at the FBI, restored funding for DEA's mobile enforcement teams, and the demand reduction assistance, much more than requested for the MEP program, funding levels for NOAA that I hope we can continue to increase as we move through the process, significant increases for NASA and the National Science Foundation, full funding at the requested level of $1.3 billion for international peacekeeping activities, a wonderful way, in my opinion, for us to use our military and our resources, contributions to international organizations that I hope can be increased to the requested level before the final bill is completed.

I would be remiss, however, if I did not express concern about the burdens on the Legal Services Corporation from restrictions on their use of non-Federal funds. But I am pleased that funding was provided at last year's level and above the administration's request.

Some needs will go unfunded at SBA, and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the ranking member, will speak to that in a short time. But fortunately, the committee was able to provide funding for the microloan program.

□ 1215

Again, Mr. Chairman, I congratulate both the ranking member and the chairman for a good bill, and I will support it.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) for the time.

I want to, at this time, personally thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) of the House Committee on Appropriations for saving VOCA, the Victims of Crime Act funding, by not removing these funds and giving them to other projects.

This was a novel brainchild of the Reagan administration. VOCA constitutes the United States Government's vision to make criminals literally pay for the crimes they have committed. Since the beginning of VOCA in 1984, fees and fines and forfeitures that are collected from criminals in any given year go to VOCA's Crime Victims Fund. The following year, these grants are then issued to States for services that go directly to victims of crime. The money does not come from taxpayers, but criminals pay for the system they have created.

So I want to praise the effort of the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) because they are not only saving VOCA, they have also affirmed that victims of crime should have a high priority, more of a priority than building another bridge someplace or expanding the bloated bureaucracy. Saving these funds is a statement that we as a Congress will not forget the plight of American crime victims.

I also want to thank the effort of fellow members of the Victims Rights Caucus that we have cofounded, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. HARRIS) and my good friend across the aisle, the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

More importantly, there are numerous victims of crimes organizations in the United States that fought to save these funds. They include Justice Solutions, the National Association of VOCA Assistance Administrators, Mothers Against Drunk Driving, the National Alliance to End Sexual Violence, the National Association of

Crime Victim Compensation Boards, the National Children's Alliance, the National Center for Victims of Crime, and the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, and many others.

So I want to commend these organizations for coming on board to make the statement basically: Do not mess with crime victims.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CRAMER), a distinguished member of the subcommittee.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for the time.

I rise in strong support of this subcommittee bill. I am privileged to be a member of this subcommittee, and I think the chairman, the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF), and his staff have crafted an unbelievably good bill under very difficult circumstances.

I particularly, on behalf of the National Children's Alliance, want to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their commitment to funding for this remarkable national network of children's advocacy centers which have been a part of this bill for many years now.

As my colleague from Texas just remarked about the crime victims trust fund funding, my local nonprofits there in north Alabama and around this country are pleased that that trust fund was not rescinded, that money was restored in there. Again, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for those plus-ups.

This is a good bill. It should be supported by the Members.

On the NASA side, on the NASA account, we are fully funding the Shuttle Return to Flight, and the President's space exploration program on behalf of the Marshall Space Flight Center, also there in north Alabama. This is a good bill for NASA, and, again, it is under difficult circumstances.

In my area of the country, we have a problem with the crystal meth issue. There is money available under this bill for the meth hotspots at the level of $60 million. My community sorely needs that kind of funding available for them to attempt to combat this raging and very difficult problem.

The bill restores $40 million for the drug courts. In my opinion, that is related to the crystal meth issues, at least in my area anyway, and we need those moneys restored. I might remind my colleagues that that program, the drug court program, was zeroed out in the President's budget.

This bill fully restores funding for the NEP program, and that is important.

So, all in all, as I have rambled through the various provisions in this bill, this is a good bill, and on behalf of the citizens of the Fifth Congressional District of Alabama, I urge my Members to support this bill.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's willingness to engage in a colloquy, and I thank him very much for yielding time to me.

I wish to express the concern of many of my constituents regarding potential threats to the integrity of the Small Business Administration's loan program.

Under current law, no funding for the Small Business Administration funds may be used to assist individuals who are in the United States illegally. Actually, to date, the best information we have is that SBA has never guaranteed a loan to an individual living illegally in the United States. However, SBA only guarantees the loans, while banks actually provide the funds to applicants. Thus, the burden of ensuring the legal status of loan applicants is actually placed on the financial institutions.

While banks have internal measures designed to specifically prevent fraud, the success of SBA's policy hinges on prompt notification, rather than upfront security.

Unfortunately, the post-9/11 world has highlighted the consequences of fraud. My constituents and those around the United States demand that Congress act aggressively to strengthen and protect the integrity of the SBA loan system rather than passively waiting for the worst.

Can the distinguished gentleman describe what steps have been taken to combat this sort of fraud and to protect America?

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

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to do so for the gentlewoman.

I share her concerns about waste, fraud and abuse, and have also expressed my concerns to the SBA about this issue. In fact, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER) had expressed the same concern, too.

I understand that the SBA is now collecting the information on, and essentially tracking, loan agents. Any potential fraud cases are immediately referred to the Inspector General, and perhaps we ought to put some language in saying they should be referred to the FBI for prosecution.

I will assure the gentlewoman I will work with the SBA Administrator and the Inspector General, and also, if the gentlewoman would agree, the FBI, to assure that no fraud occurs in the small business loan program.

Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his time and consideration and certainly look forward to working with the Chairman on this important matter in the future.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLVER), the distinguished ranking member of the Subcommittee on Transportation, Treasury, HUD, the Judiciary, District of Columbia, and Independent Agencies.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Ranking Member MOLLOHAN) for all their work on this bill.

I particularly commend them for rejecting the administration's proposal to create an umbrella community development program in Commerce, which would have greatly reduced the breadth and creativity of the community development programs as they currently operate.

I appreciate my colleagues' efforts to restore funding for other vital programs within their wholly inadequate allocation. I especially thank them for restoring partial funding for the SBA's microloan program, which the President's budget eliminated.

Through the microloan program, 170 intermediary lenders nationwide provide loans and technical assistance to our smallest businesses, many of which could not secure loans from more restrictive SBA programs or conventional banks. Since its creation 13 years ago, the microloan program has provided over 21,000 microloans totaling $250 million, which averages to fewer than $12,000 per loan. Yet, 60,000 jobs have been created at roughly $3,500 per job.

One microlender in my district, the Western Massachusetts Enterprise Fund, has made 138 loans totaling $2.25 million. One hundred percent of the microloans were made to locally owned businesses, half of which were startups, and all received watchful technical assistance, which is why so few of these loans default.

As we all know, small businesses are the backbone of the American economy, and I thank my colleagues for their support and urge them to work toward restoring the microloan program to last year's funding level.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Ranking Member MOLLOHAN) for putting together a very balanced bill within the available allocation.

As the new chairman of the House Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, we are in the process of drafting a NASA authorization. Our authorization will be the first opportunity for the House of Representatives to endorse a Vision for Space Exploration, a bold initiative that is the cornerstone for investment in both human and robotic exploration.

Space exploration is a technology engine for this country. We need this vision to encourage the next generation

of skilled workers and to drive innovation. Telling kids that they need to study math and science rings hollow unless there is a real reason to do so, like space exploration.

I certainly support State and local law enforcement assistance; however, Congress has a long track record of providing law enforcement with ample resources. Since September 11, 2001, Congress has provided more than $15 million to assist State and local law enforcement, and, in this bill, has generally funded law enforcement above the President's request. Funding to these State and local agencies is also provided through a number of other agencies, such as Homeland Security, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and others.

NASA has a new Administrator, Mike Griffin, who is getting the Agency moving in the right direction to carry out this Vision for Space Exploration most effectively. These cutting-edge technologies will ensure our global technological leadership, our Nation's security and our competitiveness worldwide.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Obey amendment and support the committee bill that we have before us today later in this debate.

I thank the gentleman for his time.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), for purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Virginia.

I would like to thank the gentleman because he has done the Nation a great service by authoring the section of this bill's committee report that deals with aeronautics at NASA. I also note that the report singles out the important role of the individual NASA centers. Again, I applaud the gentleman for his insight and action because I, too, am an advocate of the centers. I am fortunate to have NASA Glenn in my district, which is one of the most decorated centers in the Agency.

I would like to ask the gentleman for a point of clarification. In the committee report for this bill, there is a requirement that NASA provides a plan for how it will allocate aeronautics funds for fiscal year 2006. Would the gentleman agree that the plan should include a definition of work that leads to additional breakthroughs, including rotorcraft, hypersonics, propulsion and vehicle systems?

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

Mr. KUCINICH. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I would, definitely.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Again, I would like to thank the gentleman for his staunch advocacy of such a worthy issue. I know thousands of constituents in Cleveland are equally grateful for his work and his vision.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) for purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I especially thank the chairman of the committee for his wonderful work, with a very tight budget this year and insufficient allocation. Nothing in my comments is to be interpreted as a criticism of the committee or its work.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in order to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and Related Agencies.

Within the Education and Human Resources Directorate of the National Science Foundation, better known as NSF, I am especially concerned about the Math and Science Partnership program. This program connects States and local school districts together with higher education institutions to strengthen pre-K–12 math and science education. The partnerships also aim to increase the number, quality and diversity of math and science teachers.

The Math and Science Partnership program budget has been greatly diminished since 2002, when it was funded at $160 million. This year the committee was able to fund the program at $60 million, which will prevent NSF from starting any new partnerships.

This spring, 76 Members of Congress signed a letter supporting the funding of this program at $200 million for fiscal year 2006. In addition, the National Science Board, the guiding body of the National Science Foundation, has publicly stated, and I quote from a letter I recently received, ''Should funding become available to restore some of the cut programs, clearly, retaining the MSP program in NSF is the highest priority.''

□ 1230

''Large-scale, sustained experiments like the math and science programs are crucial for developing models of excellence in science, technology and math education, linking precollege and college education and providing other links to the community and the workforce.''

And, Mr. Chairman, I will include this entire document for the RECORD.

We know our students need to improve in math and science education. We know that other countries are investing in these areas and that their students are succeeding where ours are not. We know that the United States will not be able to compete with the rest of the world indefinitely if our workforce is not on the cutting edge of these fields.

I would appreciate Chairman WOLF's willingness to consider, in the event that any additional funds may become available in the future, that his committee examine the possibility of devoting such funds to the Math and Science Partnership program. I believe this program must be able to fund some new starts and target the partnerships in this most needed of areas. I recognize that the gentleman's committee has taken steps to help address the educational areas of greatest need to improve in math and science education, and I look forward to working with him on this endeavor.

Mr. Chairman, the document from the National Science Board, which I referred to earlier, is herewith submitted in its entirety for the RECORD:

NATIONAL SCIENCE BOARD,
Arlington, VA, May 26, 2005.

Hon. VERNON J. EHLERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. EHLERS: Thank you for your letter of March 29, 2005 in which you requested that the National Science Board (NSB, the Board) delineate the priority of programs within the Education and Human Resources portion of the National Science Foundation (NSF) Budget, to help Congress to focus any additional funds for NSF back to education, should they become available. The Board appreciates your continuing strong support for the NSF's role in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) education. The Board is, like you, concerned by the decline in funding for education in the NSF budget. We agree with you that such cuts would undermine the NSF's role in education in STEM fields at a time when STEM skills are becoming increasingly vital to the continued security and prosperity of our Nation.

NSF is unique as the only Federal agency with both science research and science education in its charter. The programs in the NSF Education and Human Resources directorate are designed to support and improve U.S. STEM education at all levels and in all settings (both formal and informal). These programs are unique in their capacity to identify and study the most promising ideas for math and science education, to develop new and improve materials and assessments, to explore new uses of technology to enhance K–12 instruction, and to create better teacher training techniques. The results of NSF supported research can then be transferred into practice. NSF's highly-regarded peer review system that enlists leading scientists, mathematicians, engineers,and academicians to improve K–12 STEM education programs is at the center of this education improvement infrastructure.

The proposed NSF FY 2006 budget begins an end to the commitment for large experimental programs in the Math and Science Partnership (MSP) program, which builds on NSF experience in large-scale precollege and preservice experiments. The proposed budget also reduces critical areas of education research and undergraduate education. You have asked for the Board's priorities for education, should funding become available to restore some of the cut programs. Of the three major areas, all of which contain experimental programs to advance STEM learning, clearly, retaining the MSP program in NSF is the highest priority. Large scale, sustained experiments like the MSPs are crucial for developing models of excellence in STEM education, linking precollege and college, and providing other links to the community and the workforce.

NSF has the mandate, depth of experience under its Systemic Initiatives and other large-scale multifaceted education activities, and well-established relationships to build such partnerships for excellence in K–12 STEM education.

In 1983, the NSB Commission on Precollege Education in Science, Mathematics and Technology published its recommendations for U.S. students to become first in the world in science, mathematics and technology. Most of the recommendations of this report are still relevant today. Some progress has been made in precollege STEM education through research and implementation of model programs, but much more is needed. As a workforce with basic STEM skill has become ever more essential to American economic prosperity and national security, it is now critical to our future that our precollege education system is prepared to perform its essential role in U.S. STEM education. Today it clearly is not.

Certainly, world class STEM education is a moving target, as science and technology advances and as other nations raise the bar for STEM education in their own precollege systems. The Board therefore has determined, in response to requests from the Congress and other stakeholders, to undertake an update of the 1983 Commission report.

The Board is hopeful that our Nation is ready to implement an aggressive, research-based program in precollege STEM education. Within the framework of No Child Left Behind legislation, it is critical that U.S. education systems implement research-based strategies to improve STEM learning, with the goal of international leadership in precollege STEM education. It is also critical that we build on and continue the long-term research in K–12 education sponsored by NSF.

We thank you for your efforts on behalf of NSF, and we offer our further assistance in any way that would be helpful.

Sincerely,

WARREN M. WASHINGTON,
Chairman, National Science Board.

ELIZABETH HOFFMAN,
Chair, EHR Committee, NSB.

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

Mr. EHLERS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I also want to thank Chairman WOLF and Ranking Member MOLLOHAN for their hard work on this bill. I believe they have done everything within their power to support the National Science Foundation, given the funds available. To that end, I would like to work with the chairman and his subcommittee to bolster the future allocation for fundamental science. We cannot let our investment stagnate or slip.

I know they understand, and we all need to appreciate, the impact innovation has on jobs in our economy. We need to remain dedicated to investing in innovation; and I want to stand by Chairman WOLF, and once again let me express my deep appreciation and to stand by the chairman and to offer to help in this very important process.

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

Mr. EHLERS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank both the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) for their comments. Frankly, I have learned a lot from them on this issue, and a lot of what they have been pushing for, I now see, if you will. So I want to thank them.

I understand their concerns, and I will be pleased to work with them to explore what might be done to address these concerns in conference. I support the MSP program at the NSF and look forward to working with the gentleman from Michigan and also the gentleman from New York to see if we can address the legitimate concerns they raise.

Furthermore, I am committed to ensuring that our investment in future innovation does not waiver; and I look forward to working with both my colleagues and, hopefully, the President of the United States with additional resources as the budget comes up next year on improving the allocation for science in future budgets.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair advises Members that the time for general debate for the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) has expired. The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) has 8 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL) for purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage the gentleman from Virginia in a colloquy regarding the American Corners Program.

Mr. Chairman, the American Corners Program are partnerships between the Public Affairs sections of U.S. Embassies and host institutions. They provide access to current and reliable information about the U.S. via book collections, the Internet, and through local programming to the general public.

Sponsored jointly by a U.S. Embassy and a host country organization, an American Corner serves as an information outpost, similar to a public library reference service. The multi-media book and periodical collections are open and accessible. Associated reading or meeting rooms are made available to host program events and activities, like author readings, films, speaker programs, workshops, meetings, and exhibits.

Recently, a Pakistani official, Hussain Hakanni, told me about his experience at an American library in Pakistan as a young boy. One day he met the U.S. Ambassador and he beat the Ambassador in a game of Trivial Pursuit. When the Ambassador asked him how long he had been in the United States, he responded, I have never been to your country. I have visited your libraries. Today, he is a strong ally for the United States in a region where we need strong allies.

This program was his first contact with America, and it succeeded in doing what we are today struggling to do with youth in that corner of the world, winning hearts and minds. That is why I support the American Corners program, and I hope to work with Chairman Wolf as this bill progresses to ensure strong support for this important international program.

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

Mr. ISRAEL. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from New York that the State Department's American Corners Program is important for several reasons. It encourages the opening flow of ideas, which we desperately need at this time. It teaches people about America, which we also desperately need. And it increases global literacy.

The fundamental function of the American Corners Program is to make information about our country available to foreign publics at large. Access to the American Corners collection is free and open to all interested citizens of the host country, and I think it is particularly important to countries that are closed.

I am happy to work with the gentleman from New York to ensure strong support for this program going forward.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman WOLF for his bipartisanship.

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

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy with my friend, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and Related Agencies, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

First I want to thank Chairman WOLF as well as Ranking Member MOLLOHAN and the other members of the subcommittee for their hard work in putting together this appropriations bill. Mr. Chairman, last year, the Department of Commerce notified the NOAA and NIST and NTIA research laboratories in Boulder, Colorado, that it had decided to build a security fence around the campus where the labs are located. This has been a matter of concern to Boulder, local residents, and the people who work in the labs. They raised questions about the nature of the unspecified threats that the fence is intended to address and about the effectiveness of a fence.

At my urging, the Department of Commerce and NIST worked with Boulder residents and city officials to determine the most acceptable placement of the fence. However, the Department still has not made clear the nature of the security threat, the proposed timetable for building the fence, or how they propose to pay for it. I understand no funding has been requested for the project.

In my view, it would not be right to reduce funding to research operations or other needed construction work in NIST and NOAA in Boulder in order to pay for the fence. So I would like to ask the chairman whether he agrees that if this fence is to be built, it

should not be done at the expense of ongoing research or capital improvements to these laboratories.

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

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

Mr. WOLF. Yes, I do agree with the gentleman that this funding for ongoing research and capital improvements to these laboratories is important. To date, no new funding has been requested by the administration, and plans for such a fence have not been finalized. The committee understands this project may be considered for future budget requests to the Congress.

Also, I tell the gentleman that I would be glad to set up a meeting with the new director of NIST and others to kind of meet in our offices and see how we can resolve this to the gentleman's satisfaction.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentleman for his willingness to work with me, and I thank the ranking member for his help as well; and I look forward to holding that meeting with the gentleman.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR) for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage Chairman WOLF in a colloquy with me.

I thank the chairman for agreeing to engage in this important discussion with me. As you know, I represent Laredo, Texas, along the U.S.-Mexican border. There has been much violence along the border, including 31 Americans that have been kidnapped on the Mexican side. That is 31 Americans. Twelve of them have been returned, two were killed, and the remaining are unaccounted for.

I have been working to increase cooperation with the law enforcement agencies policing the border. In May, I brought together officials from agencies ranging from the FBI to the State Department along with the local law enforcement to help formulate a plan.

The Mexican Government on the other side has increased police and federal presence along the border, which is good news, but unfortunately they haven't done enough. We need to respond with strong, decisive efforts of our own to help forge a lasting resolution.

I am excited to know, Mr. Chairman, that this bill increases by $23 million the Violent Crime Impact Teams assigned to cities in the United States, and I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), and the members of the subcommittee for the leadership that you have shown. I am also currently working with the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, and the Attorney General, Mr. Albert Gonzales, to get a team permanently assigned to the Laredo area; but unfortunately at this time we need some funding.

I hope the chairman and I can work together to try to get a Violent Crime Impact Team assigned to Laredo. The violence spilling over across the border is great, and I believe this effort can go a long way towards addressing this problem, and so I ask for your assistance in this matter.

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

Mr. CUELLAR. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, we will be glad to work with the gentleman from Texas and Ranking Member MOLLOHAN to see what we can do to help. That sounds like a horrible situation: 31 Americans kidnapped. So if we can help, we will do whatever we can to help you.

Mr. CUELLAR. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank both Chairman WOLF and Ranking Member MOLLOHAN for their help, and I thank the chairman for his bipartisan approach to address this very, very important approach to a violent situation.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire as to the time remaining for our side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) for the purposes of a colloquy.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise to ask the chairman to engage in a colloquy.

While I applaud the appropriation subcommittee's overall efforts to contain the Federal budget, I have some concerns about ocean issues. And when we talk about ocean issues, these are critical issues crucial to the survival of humans on the planet when we consider the extent and the complexity of the oceans and life on the planet.

The over-500-page report of the U.S. Ocean Commission emphasized the need to take action now to invest in ocean and coastal programs to ensure conservation and the sustainable use of resources for future generations. The Ocean Commission report called for doubling the investment in the coastal and ocean science and to provide an additional $500 million to $1 billion in assistance over the next several years to support ocean programs and fisheries management.

In April of this year, I joined over 100 House Members deeply concerned about the health of our oceans and coastal areas to request support for additional funding for key National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration programs, or NOAA. After considering other competing priorities, the subcommittee approved the NOAA budget of $3.43 billion, almost $500 million below last year's level.

Now, I understand the Federal budget constraints, and I understand the constraint of the subcommittee and the appropriations process; but I would ask the chairman to consider looking at these issues as we move this bill through to the conference.

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

Mr. GILCHREST. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. I thank the gentleman for bringing this issue to our attention, Mr. Chairman. As the gentleman said, the budget is very tight this year and difficult decisions had to be made. While I believe that all the programs in the bill are worthy of funding, we had to keep the bill within the subcommittee 302(b) allocation.

I agree with the gentleman that the functions of NOAA are very important and will work to see that the conference funding levels are adequate.

Mr. GILCHREST. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his consideration; I thank the chairman for his effort to balance the budget and to allocate the funds equitably to all the various programs. I look forward to working with the chairman in the future on this issue.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on H.R. 2862, the Science, State, Justice, Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2006. This bill provides funding for a variety of agencies and programs, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, FBI, the U.S. Marshals Service, the Drug Enforcement Administration, DEA, State and local law enforcement grants, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, NASA, and the diplomatic and consular programs at the Department of State to name a few.

This bill marks the halfway point for the House in completing work on Appropriations for fiscal year 2006. I want to commend Chairman LEWIS and my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for their aggressive pace in bringing these bills to the floor for debate and wish them well as we continue on in this process.

As Chairman of the Budget Committee, I am pleased to note that this bill complies with the budget resolution for fiscal year 2006 (H. Con. Res. 95), specifically section 302(f) of the Budget Act, which prohibits consideration of bills in excess of an Appropriations subcommittee's 302(b) allocation of budget authority in the budget resolution.

H.R. 2862 provides $57.5 billion in appropriations for fiscal year 2006. This is an increase of $76 million in BA and $1.3 billion in outlays over the fiscal year 2005 level, and $3.2 billion in BA, and $615 million in outlays below the President's request.

I should point out that in order to stay within the 302(b) allocation the bill derives savings from adjustments to various mandatory accounts and requiring the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to accrue certain retirement benefits. The largest savings results from the annual capping of the Crime Victim's Fund, which is set at $625 million for fiscal year 2006, and delaying the obligation of the remaining $1.2 billion until fiscal year 2007. Additionally, $62 million in savings is derived from a permanent and indefinite appropriation for the expenses of the management and disposal of assets from the Assets Forfeiture

Fund. The accrual provision would technically result in $39 million in savings.

The bill also shifts resources from some lower-priority programs at the Department of Commerce toward more important and higher-priority public safety and crime prevention programs like the FBI and DEA at the Department of Justice.

Personally, looking to the needs of Iowa, I support increased funding for the Byrne Assistance Grants financed through offsetting reductions in other accounts within the bill. As reported by the full Committee, the bill sharply reduces funding for this program below last year's level. These funds are critical to ongoing efforts to fight illegal methamphetamine use in many States across the country.

In conclusion, I express my support for H.R. 2862 and again commend Chairman LEWIS and the Appropriations Committee on their steady work in bringing bills to the floor that comply with H. Con. Res. 95.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this overall measure, H.R. 2862, which appropriates funds for the Department of Commerce, State, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies in FY 2006. I am encouraged that the overall measure provides $57.8 billion or 2% more than the 2005 level of funding.

I am very encouraged by the fact that the Appropriations Committee gives $21.7 billion for Justice Department programs which is 4% more than the current level of funding and 5% more than the administration's request. I also applaud the Committee for providing $334 million for juvenile justice programs which is 44% more than requested by this administration but is still 12% less than the current level.

I am disappointed however, that this bill provides only $520 million for the Community Oriented Policing Services—COPS—program which is a startling 13% less than the current level. This total includes $120 million for COPS technology, and $60 million for a new anti-gang initiative. We are sworn to serve the people of this Nation, and I can not see how reducing spending on such a vital community safety program can serve that honorable goal.

The Committee denied the president's request for $3.7 billion for a new community development block grant, and instead provided $228 million for the existing Economic Development Administration, and I understand that the administration plans to phase this initiative out.

For the first time this Subcommittee's appropriation's bill includes funding for NASA and the National Science Foundation. Until this year, NASA had to compete for funds with veterans and housing programs when it was part of the old VA–HUD–Independent Agencies Appropriations bill. Many believe that pairing NASA with the State and Commerce departments has made it much easier to provide increases for the space agency without offending powerful domestic constituencies.

As a member of the Science Committee's Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, the provision of $16.5 billion for NASA, or 2% over the current level represents a positive step toward reaching our goals in space technology and exploration. In addition, the NASA total includes $9.7 billion for science, aeronautics and exploration, which amounts to 4% more than the current level and about 1% more than the President's request. In this instance I appreciate that the committee did not agree to the administration's request to cut the Aeronautics Research program by $54 million.

This appropriation also provides $5.6 billion for the NSF making it $171 million more than the FY 2005 level and $38 million more than the President's request. This funding provides money for vital research and research equipment that can make the difference between achieving a great discovery and falling short. As well this Appropriation provides funding for education and human resources, which are designed to encourage the entrance of talented students into science and technology careers, to improve the undergraduate science and engineering education environment, to assist in providing all pre-college students with a high level of math and science education, and to extend greater research opportunities, to underrepresented segments of the scientific and engineering communities.

I also want to applaud the Appropriations Committee for directing NASA to include in its FY 2007 budget request detailed information on the prior year, current year, and requested funding levels for each program, project or activity, and on all proposed changes being requested. Clearly, the committee was disappointed with the lack of detail provided in NASA's FY 2006 funding request. In this vein I have asked that language be included that would direct NASA to report the amount of money spent in its budget for safety overall as well as for each major program and initiative for its FY 2007 budget request and for all following years. The need for this information is clear, since the Colombia Space Shuttle safety must be our number one priority. Yet, NASA has no exact figures for safety spending either in the overall spending or for each individual program or initiative. This language about NASA safety will help determine if enough funds are being dispersed for safety procedures. In addition, it will allow Appropriators to determine from year to year whether there has been an increase or decrease in safety spending. I have been assured by the majority staff of the Appropriations Committee that they will work to have this language added to the Conference Report.

However, my only concern with this portion of the legislation is that NASA Exploration Capabilities were funded at $50.1 less than the President's request. This funding would be provided for the Space Operations Missions Directorate, including the International Space Station, the Space Shuttle program, and Space and Flight Support. The funds for NASA Exploration Capabilities are essential to the President's vision for space exploration. This appropriation comes at a watershed moment for NASA and the future of America's space exploration mission. After the tragic Colombia Space Shuttle accident we had to step back and reassess our space shuttle program. Today, NASA is preparing to return to flight, but safety is still at the forefront of our concerns. The funds being addressed here are applicable to safety as well and we must ensure that everything is done to keep our NASA astronauts from possible harm.

I applaud the Subcommittee's prohibition of the funding of measures that implement torture. This is quite important given the recent report by organizations such as Amnesty International and the work that the Democrats of the Committee on the Judiciary have done to bring this issue to light. I wrote a letter to both U.S. Attorney General Gonzales and Secretary Chertoff requesting a full report on the conduct of the detention facilities located at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and I hope that the Committee on the Judiciary will hold at least one hearing on this important matter.

This measure provides $1 million for eight additional criminal division positions to assist U.S. attorney's offices and to coordinate investigations across judicial districts; and $60 million for a new anti-gang state and local law enforcement grant program. However, it is quite troubling to me that it does not provide any dollars for treatment programs to help these troubled juveniles.

As Founder and Chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus, I undoubtedly recognize the need for us to legislate to create protections from the danger and violence produced by gangs. However, before we haphazardly amend the law to add excessive and egregious mandatory minimums and other penalties that apply to groups of people or young groups of people, we just clearly define the acts that we seek to penalize. That is the essence of crafting law that is ''narrowly tailored'' and that does not suffer from over breadth.

In addition, this measure provides funding for Byrne Grant applications from state and local law enforcement agencies. Grants to fund state and local anti-drug task forces come from the ''Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Programs,'' in Title 42 U.S.C., Subchapter V. As a member of the House Law Enforcement Caucus, I am an ardent proponent of initiatives that strengthen and support our law enforcement agencies. Furthermore, as a member of the Committee on Homeland Security, I make it a goal whenever possible to advocate for increased funding, better facilities, training, an equipment, and for improved interoperable communications for these first responders. However, with my amendment, I seek to restore the integrity, honesty , evenhandedness, and judiciousness of our law enforcement agencies.

Similarly, I will offer an amendment that states the following: No funds made available in this Act shall be used to facilitate the issuance of affirmances by single members of the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) without an opinion. An affirmance without opinion just says:

The Board affirms, without opinion, the result of the decision below. The decision below is, therefore, the final agency determination. See 8 CFR 3.1(e)(4).

The reason for this provision in the Regulations is to move apparently meritless cases quickly through the appellate process. I pasted the authorizing regulations to the bottom of this note.

Cases coming to the Board that appear to be easy are separated out and sent to the streamlining panel. These cases are then assigned more or less randomly to staff attorneys without directions or supervision. If the staff attorney who reviews the case decides that affirmance without opinion is appropriate, he will print out a firm decision, and then give the file to a single Board member with a cover sheet that will have an explanation for why such disposition is appropriate. The explanations typically are a few lines.

My amendment would permit this practice but only with cases that more than one Board member has reviewed and that result in the issuance of an opinion with the affirmance.

The proportion of ''affirmances without opinion'' decided by a single Board member had increased from 10% to over 50% of all Board decisions, beginning immediately after the new rules were proposed. At the same time, the proportion of cases that are favorable to the alien decreased. Prior to proposing the ''Procedural Reforms'', one in four cases was decided in favor of the alien. Since then, only one appeal in ten is decided in favor of the alien.

Single-member review creates an incentive to rubber stamp immigration judges' decisions. Affirmance without written decision is much faster and easier than writing a decision and creates an incentive (whether conscious or unconscious) for Board members to meet case processing guidelines by affirming removal orders notwithstanding the merits of the appeal. Moreover, intellectual rigor in decision-making may be diminished because Board members no longer need to articulate the basis for their decisions. They need only decide whether they agree with the result ultimately reached by the immigration judge.

A panel of three Board members is far more likely to catch an error below than a single Board member. In the immigration context, there is only one administrative hearing before the case reaches the Board. Other administrative agencies that employ single-Member review have several layers of administrative process (i.e., interview, hearing, and reconsideration) prior to reaching the administrative appeals level as well as the option of a later de novo hearing in federal district court and court of appeals review.

Single-member review makes it difficult for the Board itself to determine whether its members are making errors. The courts of appeal, when such review is available, similarly lack guidance in reviewing the decisions of the immigration judges and the Board. This issue must be addressed in order to save the federal district court dockets.

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Chairman, my home state of Utah is particularly fortunate to have a number of dedicated individuals working in law enforcement to protect our citizens.

These days, we all tend to focus on the armed forces, which are obviously a critical element of national defense. But it is also important to remember those on the front lines here at home. Local law enforcement officers need Congress' help to ensure that our streets stay safe for law-abiding citizens.

I'm very disappointed that this bill cuts funding for Byrne Grants, COPS grants, Juvenile Justice programs, and Drug Courts.

During my time in Congress, every single person involved with law enforcement has made it a point to share with me exactly how these grants help protect Utah citizens. I don't think we can say enough about the men and women who use this funding to better patrol our streets, decrease the availability of drugs in our schools, and ensure that each and every citizen is safe and protected.

Officer safety and the ability to investigate major crimes are often compromised by a lack of resources. One of the local police chiefs in a small town in my district said to me last year: Jim, I'm not worried about Al Qaeda attacking our little town. I'm worried about dealing with drugs in our middle school down the street.

Every single day, acts of heroism and valor are performed by police officers across our nation. We have made tremendous progress in terms of crime prevention and crime solving, but we need to remember that there are only so many available law enforcement officers at a given time. As our society grows, the demands placed on these individuals have also increased tremendously.

The best way that the federal government can serve local law enforcement is to actually provide the grant money that is best utilized by people on the beat. I strongly urge my colleagues to support the amendments that will be offered later today to increase funding for Byrne grants and COPS grants.

I truly thank the members of law enforcement across this nation for their service and I commit to working in support of both homeland security and domestic security.

Before I close, I also want to add that there are some good things about this bill too. I'm very pleased to see that the bill does not transfer responsibility or reduce funding for the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDTA) Program. This program is very important to police chiefs and sheriffs in Utah and in other western states.

This bill also fully funds the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program, which is another great program that does exactly what we all say federal dollars should do. MEP helps small businesses avail themselves of technological improvements and best practices that allow them to grow. Members of Congress tend to agree that growth in our manufacturing sector is critical and it seems to me that we should support that goal by supporting the MEP program.

In closing, I recognize that we're facing an extremely tight budget. That's exactly why we should prioritize law enforcement and other aspects of our government that best help our citizens and make good use of limited federal dollars.

Mr. FARR. I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their efforts to put together a balanced Science, State, Justice, Commerce bill; especially working with such limited resources. However, I would like to point out the shortfall in funding to the ocean, or wet, side of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) in this bill.

It is distressing to see NOAA, our primary domestic ocean agency, take a $500 million cut from FY 05 levels less than a year after the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy issued its final report calling for an increase of $1.5 billion in ocean funding during the first year after the report. The U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy was established by the Oceans Act of 2000 and appointed by President Bush to study our oceans and make recommendations for a coordinated and comprehensive national ocean policy. The Oceans Commission spent four years studying our oceans and made over 200 recommendations, and it spent $9.5 million figuring out how to better manage our oceans. We are now ignoring the clear, loud message that we need to invest more in our oceans. To put it another way, we are cutting more than a million dollars in ocean programs in our primary ocean agency for each page in the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy final report.

With the atmospheric, or dry, side of NOAA seeing a 9% increase for the National Weather Service and a 7% increase for the National Environmental Satellite, Data and Information Service, the cuts to the wet side of NOAA are even deeper than they first appear. The National Ocean Service will receive a 40% cut and the National Marine Fisheries Service will receive a 20% cut.

To no one's surprise, Americans love the oceans, but what many Americans probably do not know is how much our economy relies on the oceans. The ocean economy—the portion of the economy that relies directly on ocean attributes—contributes well over $100 billion to American prosperity. About one tenth of the nation's annual gross domestic product (GDP) is generated in nearshore areas, the relatively narrow strip of land immediately adjacent to the coast. Coastal watershed counties, representing about one quarter of the nation's land area, contribute about half of the nation's GDP. NOAA funding is not only an investment in the protection, wise management, and productivity of our oceans and coasts; it is an investment in the well being of our coastal cities and communities.

Cuts to NOAA threaten the wise management of our oceans and will have far reaching ramifications such as on the tourism industry in my district and tourism in coastal districts around the nation. Tourism is one of the largest economic drivers of coastal areas, and my district is no exception. Tourists flock to my district for the same reason people want to live there, because of its natural wonders. Not only are the rocky shores dramatic, but people can watch sea otters paddle in the kelp, sea lions lounge on the docks, and whales breach in the bay. The more adventurous dive in the lush fish filled kelp beds, and the less adventurous—well, they go to the Monterey Bay Aquarium.

The Marine Sanctuaries program has been cut by 40% and the Coastal Nonpoint and Community Resource Improvement Grants program has been cut out completely. These two NOAA programs have been instrumental in keeping the coastal waters of my district unpolluted, allowing the waters to teem with life. The Monterey Bay Sanctuary office has been working with farmers in the productive valleys that drain into the Monterey Bay to reduce pollution from pesticides and nutrients. The farmers were skeptical until they realized they were saving money by finding ways to keep their fertilizers and pesticides on the fields and out of our ocean waters. The farmers are now bigger proponents of the program than the Sanctuary office. I don't want the ocean waters off my district to end up as a dead-zone like the waters off Louisiana, where due to nutrient pollution, there is a dead zone the size of Massachusetts. Pollution kills more than marine life; it kills fisheries and it kills tourism—For some reason I just can't quite picture a tourism brochure that reads ''Come visit the country's biggest ocean dead-zone.''

The State Coastal Zone Management Grants program was cut by $2 million. The National Estuarine Research Reserves program was cut by $3.7 million, and the Coastal and Estuarine Land Conservation program was cut by a whopping $38.7 million. These programs have been instrumental in allowing my district and other districts around the country to grow wisely striking a balance between development and preservation. The natural areas, parks and public beach access—besides pleasing the environmentalists—have been a smart tourism investment. Without the

ability for people to access the beach and enjoy the wildlife in these natural areas, people will not bother coming to my district.

When I think about the oceans, fishing is one of the first things that comes to mind. It is an economic and cultural backbone for many coastal communities, and with American consumers eating over 15 pounds of fish per person every year, it is an important food source for people across our nation. Recreational fishing is a boon to coastal tourism as well, with more than 17 million recreational fishers spending approximately $25 billion a year on fishing-related activities. At a time when we know the status of less than a third of our fish stocks and are overfishing or have overfished more than 30% of the stocks we know about, we should be investing heavily in the National Marine Fisheries Service instead of making deeper budget cuts.

At a time when we know clearly from the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy report that we need to be investing in our oceans, making drastic funding cuts to NOAA, the primary agency for managing our coasts and oceans, makes no sense.

I, with my fellow co-chairs of the House Oceans Caucus, sent a letter to the Appropriations Committee asking for adequate funding of key nation wide NOAA programs. We had the support of 84 bipartisan members who felt strongly about these programs. Of the 13 different programs we highlighted in our letter, none of them was funded at our requested levels. Only one program received a small increase over FY 05 enacted levels and only one was level funded. This is especially disappointing given the support of so many members—nearly 20%—of the House.

While I believe the Committee did a good job given the tight budget situation, it is disappointing to see NOAA receive such large cuts when they should be getting large increases. NOAA needs more money to do its job of protecting, managing and keeping our coasts and oceans healthy and productive.

The CHAIRMAN. Time of the gentleman has expired. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2862

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, namely:

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

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, as my colleagues may know, methamphetamine abuse has exploded across the U.S. over the last 15 years. Many States now break up between 500 and 2,500 meth labs per year. Meth is relatively cheap, tremendously addictive, and ofttimes addicts in one exposure. It is available nearly everywhere, particularly in rural areas.

Even though local meth labs are a tremendous problem, most meth comes from the superlabs in Mexico. Mexican superlabs purchase the basic ingredient, either sudafedrine or ephedrine from China, often in amounts of one ton or more. Mexico is currently importing much more ephedrine and sudafedrine than it uses for medical purposes.

The Office of Narcotics and Drug Control Policy released the National Synthetic Drug Action Plan. This plan specifically recommends that the Drug Enforcement Agency and other Federal agencies focus resources on stopping large shipments of sudafedrine from Asia to Mexico which are destined for meth labs.

Law enforcement agencies need to identify and aggressively pursue those responsible for these superlabs, as they now account for more than two-thirds of the meth entering the United States.

□ 1245

I hope that the chairman agrees that Congress needs to work with the administration, Mexico and other countries to reduce pseudoephedrine shipments used to produce meth. I look forward to working with the chairman to address this critical issue.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I agree with the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) and will work with the gentleman to address this issue. If the gentleman can come up with something creative, working with the authorizers, working with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), maybe there is something we could put in our bill at the end, assuming the authorizers agree, that does something special and more direct with regard to the meth issue. I am wide open. I know how meth has impacted the gentleman's State, and he has been a leader with the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) on this issue. I suggest you talk with the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), and maybe we could do something dramatic to deal with this issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the administration of the Department of Justice, $126,956,000, of which not to exceed $3,317,000 is for the Facilities Program 2000, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That not to exceed 45 permanent positions and 46 full-time equivalent workyears and $11,821,000 shall be expended for the Department Leadership Program exclusive of augmentation that occurred in these offices in fiscal year 2005: *Provided further,* That not to exceed 28 permanent positions, 23 full-time equivalent workyears and $3,980,000 shall be expended for the Office of Legislative Affairs: *Provided further,* That not to exceed 17 permanent positions, 22 full-time equivalent workyears and $2,764,000 shall be expended for the Office of Public Affairs: *Provided further,* That the latter two aforementioned offices may utilize non-reimbursable details of career employees within the caps described in the preceding two provisos.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY:

Page 2, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1) (increased by $1)''

Page 22, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $270,000,000)''

Page 23, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $270,000,000)''

Page 26, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $140,000,000)''

Page 38, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $53,000,000)''

At the end of title VI, insert the following:

''SEC.____. In the case of taxpayers with adjusted gross income in excess of $1,000,000, for the calendar year beginning in 2006, the amount of tax reduction resulting from enactment of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 (P.L. 107–16) and the Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2003 (P.L. 108–27) shall be reduced by 1.466 percent.''

Mr. OBEY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the Obey amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is reserved on the amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I believe the House is familiar with this amendment. I have offered similar amendments a number of times. It does go straight to the question of our national priorities.

Let me take a little broader view than just this year. If we look at some of the reductions in this bill, and just look at the 1-year reductions, such as we have here in EDA or such as we have in law enforcement, the 1-year reductions do not look too bad, but if we take a look at what happened to these programs since fiscal year 2001, we see that we still have a deep reduction in some of these activities. For example, the State and local law enforcement grants have been cut by $1 billion over that time. There is no way that we cannot have an effect on local law enforcement by having cuts of that magnitude over that period of time.

The same is true with EDA. There are many urban districts who do not care much about EDA, but my district, I do not have a city over 37,000. Small cities like that cannot hire a bunch of

fancy grant writers. They need all of the help they can get to compete for Federal money for job creation, and the Economic Development Administration, EDA, tries to provide that.

What this amendment would simply do is to try to restore the $410 million cut by the committee for local law enforcement grants and increase funding for EDA by $53 million, restoring that cut, and it would simply pay for that cut by reducing the size of the tax cut this House has previously approved for persons who make over $1 million. It would simply reduce that tax cut by $2,000. So instead of getting on average a $140,000 tax cut, they would get a $138,000 tax cut. It is hardly draconian, but it would help take care of a significant national priority.

I know that taxes are under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, but the fact is that because the Committee on Ways and Means jurisdiction was placed first in terms of a priority by the Committee on the Budget, that means every time we have a tax cut paid for with borrowed money, you wind up putting an additional squeeze on deserving appropriated programs, including local law enforcement.

This amendment tries to correct that imbalance to a very small degree. I would urge support for the amendment.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Obey amendment to the fiscal year 2006 Science, State Justice, Commerce appropriations bill, and to voice my specific concerns about the funding level for the Community Oriented Policing Services, COPS, program.

I was deeply concerned when President Bush earlier this year proposed gutting State and local law enforcement assistance grants by $1.4 billion in his fiscal year 2006 budget—a 46 percent cut from last year. While the Appropriations Committee restored $1 billion from those proposed cuts, the fiscal year 2006 Science, State Justice, Commerce appropriations bill before us today still cuts these grants by $400,000 from last year's funding levels.

That is why I support Ranking Member OBEY'S amendment. This amendment would provide an additional $410 million for State and local law enforcement, including COPS grants, and restore them to the fiscal year 2005 enacted levels. To do this, Representative OBEY reduces the size of the tax cut for millionaires by only $2,053. These millionaires will still get a $138,816 tax rebate. That is all we need to do to restore these cuts. That small tax cut repeal would fully fund these important programs at last year's levels and help keep our streets safe. That is a tradeoff that is worth making, and one, I would suggest, that even the top of all taxpayers would support.

Concerning the COPS program, this bill allocates only $520 million for it. Again, I am glad that the Appropriations Committee has restored a part of the destructive cuts that the President originally proposed. But we should be doing more. The COPS program has been remarkably successful over the last 10 years. According to the Department of Justice, every $1 we spend on COPS grants contributes to a decline of 10 violent crimes and 27 property crimes per 100,000 residents. Yet rather than increasing funding for this effective and important program, this bill actually would cut $80 million from the COPS program. This is the wrong thing to do. It is the additional police officers that the COPS program helps local towns and cities hire, who are on the front lines of reducing crime and also protecting our homeland.

The COPS program has provided law enforcement agencies in my district and across the Nation with critical funding to fight and prevent crime. In my district, communities in Hunterdon, Monmouth, Mercer, Middlesex, and Somerset counties have received more millions of dollars in funding to help put additional police officers on the street. In 2004 alone, four towns in my district—Lawrence Township, Monroe Township, Spotswood Borough, and West Windsor Township—received almost $380,000 to fund various law enforcement programs. This money helped Monroe Township hire three additional police officers, and helped upgrade the law enforcement technology of Spotswood and West Windsor. Overall in 2004, New Jersey communities received COPS grants totaling $9.5 million and were able to hire 40 additional police officers. That is 40 cops on the beat who would not have been there without this important Federal program. Since 1994, the COPS program has helped fund 4,806 additional officers in New Jersey alone. This has made a big difference for the local towns and communities in New Jersey.

The creation of the COPS program was a breakthrough in law enforcement. By funding additional officers, critical technologies, and valuable training, COPS has been a catalyst for the revolutionary shift to community policing. But too many police departments are experiencing increases in the troubling indicators of violent crimes.

At a time when we are asking our cops to do more to reduce crime and protect our homeland from potential terrorist related threats, we are giving them less funding to do so. Just look at the largest 44 metropolitan police departments. Of them 27, yes 27, have actually been forced to reduce the size of their police departments. That means that there are less police officers on the beat and more crime on the street.

COPS and community policing have put us on the right track. Crime is at its lowest levels in more than a quarter of a century. The police chiefs and sheriffs in my district consistently tell me that we could have never achieved this much without the additional officers and technology funded under the COPS program. I just do not understand why we are not supporting this effective program appropriately.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to give up the progress we have achieved in crime reduction over the last 10 years. The COPS program has been vital to our local communities. Our police departments can only do so much with the resources they are given. We should do everything we can to increase, not cut, the funding of the COPS program. I urge my colleagues to support the Obey amendment.

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

POINT OF ORDER

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) insist on his point of order?

Mr. WOLF. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized on his point of order.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, as I understand the rules under which this bill is brought to the floor, this amendment would be in order if no Member of the House chooses to lodge a point of order against it.

My understanding of the rule that the committee reported is that it has waived the rules for numerous provisions that were placed in the bill by the majority party. It is hard for me to imagine that the House would feel comfortable in not providing that same courtesy to this amendment.

I would also suggest that what I am trying to do by this amendment is to do a favor for the majority leader, because he does not want us to have to cut into NASA in order to fund this restoration for law enforcement grants. If he allows this amendment to go forward, if no Member of the majority party lodges a point of order against this amendment, then we can restore the badly needed funds for local law enforcement without having to go after some of the increases in the majority leader's favorite program.

I would urge the House to do a favor for the majority leader by not lodging a point of order against this amendment. If they do that, we could proceed to restore badly needed funds.

I would concede, Mr. Chairman, that if any individual Member does lodge a point of order, I would have to concede the point of order, but I would hope that a point of order would not be offered, or if it has already been offered, I would hope that it would be withdrawn as a special favor to the majority leader.

Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) concedes the point of order. The point of order is conceded and sustained. The amendment is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY:

Page 2, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1) (increased by $1)''

Page 22, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $100,000,000)''

Page 23, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $100,000,000)''

Page 26, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $100,000,000)''

Page 53, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(decreased by $200,000,000)''

Mr. OBEY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and any amendments thereto be limited to 20 minutes to be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and myself, the opponent.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for 10 minutes on his amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I think my admiration for the subcommittee chairman is well known. I think he does a great job for his district and for this House, but we have been placed in a very tough position because of the priorities that were laid out by the budget resolution adopted by this House earlier this year.

Because of those priorities, we are faced today with the necessity for a trade-off. What has happened in this bill over the last 4 years is that State and local law enforcement grants have been cut by almost a billion dollars. They are cut from last year to this year by $410 million in this bill. I am simply trying by this amendment to restore half of that money, restore $200 million. Half would go into the COPS program, half into the Justice Assistance Grant program, and we would pay for that, in contrast to another amendment that I understand a Member may offer, which would pay for it by going after basic science programs in the National Science Foundation. This amendment would not do that. I think we need to put more money in science, not less.

What this amendment would do, and I offer it reluctantly because I would have preferred the first amendment, but the action of the majority party requires me to go to this option.

What this amendment does is to say we should scale back the $500 million increase in the account that contains the Moon and Mars mission by $200 million in order to pay for this law enforcement assistance. Of that $200 million, $160 million would be taken from Project Prometheus. NASA, the agency in charge, still has not been able to identify a relevant mission for the funds in that account. The planning is certainly not ripe, and so what we are saying in essence is since this is a pilot mission which would take place roughly around the year 2020 or 2030, what we are saying instead is for the moment we ought to put more money into law enforcement to help buttress law enforcement in our local communities, and we can on another day decide where we can get the money for Project Prometheus so that sometime 20 or 25 years from now, we can use nuclear-powered craft to go to Mars. I do not think it is even a close choice, and I would ask for an aye vote.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The amendment would reduce funding for one of the President's top priorities, science and space. This represents more than a 6-percent reduction in the President's new Vision for Space Exploration and would significantly jeopardize NASA's ability to implement its new mission.

I would like to read a letter from the Administrator, Michael Griffin.

''Dear Mr. Chairman:

''It has come to my attention that, during House consideration of H.R. 2862, an amendment will be offered by Mr. Obey that proposes to reduce NASA Exploration Systems funding by $200 million, and redirect the NASA funds to State and local law enforcement assistance activities.

''I must respectfully oppose this amendment. I support full funding of the President's fiscal year 2006 request for NASA. Any reduction in NASA's fiscal year 2006 Exploration Systems funding would threaten the ability of this Nation to ensure U.S. human access to space, our efforts to accelerate the availability of the crew exploration vehicle to minimize the gap between the retirement of the space shuttle and the first operational flight of the CEV, and our efforts to maintain a robust civil service workforce at NASA's field centers in support of these efforts.''

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK).

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Obey amendment. This amendment would restore crucial funding for State and local law enforcement back to the fiscal year 2005 enacted level.

This bill cuts the funding for these programs by $410 million from the fiscal year 2005 enacted levels, and the 2005 enacted level was already $226 million less than was provided the year before that. So in 2 years, we have cut $636 million from law enforcement programs. How long are we going to continue on this downward slope of funding for our critical law enforcement programs?

The Obey amendment would restore funding for the Byrne-JAG program and COPS, Community-Oriented Policing Services program. The COPS program has been highly successful and provides funding for our local and State agencies that they need to hire and train new police officers.

According to the Department of Justice, every dollar we invest in the COPS program contributes to a decline in 10 violent crimes and 27 property crimes per 100,000 residents. As a former city police officer and a Michigan State Trooper, as well as cochair of the Congressional Law Enforcement Caucus, I understand how much our local communities need and rely on the Byrne grants and COP grants to keep these successful programs going in their neighborhoods.

The Byrne-JAG grants provide funding for 29 different and vital programs such as antidrug education programs, treatment programs, and alternative sentencing initiatives, giving the States the ability to choose which programs they find most beneficial in their State to do under this Federal funding.

□ 1300

As most of us know and we hear when we go back home to our local districts, the Byrne grants fund the local drug enforcement teams. We have to provide this funding so our drug enforcement officers can do their jobs. We must listen to what our drug enforcement officers are telling us and fully fund the Byrne grant program.

Local drug enforcement teams are crucial to keeping our communities safe and drug free. If Byrne grants are funded at the level currently provided in this bill, our teams will be unable to hire the officers they need to sustain their drug enforcement teams. In my home State of Michigan, we would lose 11 of the 25 teams we have in Michigan. California would lose 26 teams. Texas would lose 21 drug enforcement teams. New York would lose 34 drug enforcement teams.

Losing these drug enforcement teams would have a devastating and far-reaching effect not only in Michigan but throughout this country, especially in our rural communities. Let me be really clear. When it comes to crime and drug abuse and drug dealers, no community, urban or rural, is immune to this problem.

Congress needs to step up to the plate and show their strong commitment to law enforcement and the criminal justice system. Today we have a chance to do that by voting for the Obey amendment and showing our support for law enforcement officers who put their lives on the line each and every day to keep our communities safe and drug free. I urge support of the Obey amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the Obey amendment. The $200 million funding cut to NASA's exploration program proposed in this amendment would jeopardize U.S. jobs and jeopardize space launch capability. These cuts would threaten personnel reductions in existing NASA exploration systems' workforce across the Nation and could impact more than 1,000 employees. This cut will take money directly from work on the new crew exploration vehicle, a much needed vehicle that will replace the space shuttle

in 2010 or after 2010. It contains very likely the most vital addition of a crew escape module making it a safer vehicle for our astronauts. It is a very important thrust.

The gentleman from Wisconsin's amendment proposes to take funds out of NASA and put them toward justice assistance grants. While I am supportive of local law enforcement officials, it is important to point out that Congress has already appropriated billions for State and local law enforcement. On May 17, the House approved the fiscal year 2006 homeland security appropriations bill which provides $3.7 billion for first responders, including grants to State and local law enforcement agencies. Since September 11, $15 billion has been provided to assist State and local officials. Indeed, the bill on the floor today provides $2.6 billion for crime-fighting initiatives, $1 billion more than the President requested.

Mr. Chairman, Congress has and will continue to support our men and women who fight crime in our communities. Of course we are going to do that. The issue today is not whether Congress supports law enforcement. It is whether Congress supports the economic and national security that our space program provides. Since 1969, America has led the world into space, and it is time to renew that vision. Our ventures into space not only keep America at the forefront of exploration and innovation, but they also are vital to our economy and our national security. This new national vision sets America on a course toward the Moon and Mars, and we should embrace this dream and work to make it a reality.

As the preeminent leader in human space flight, we cannot afford to sit idle and let other nations reap the rewards of our hard work, research and sacrifice. We know that the People's Republic of China has developed a human space flight program that encompasses everything from low-Earth orbit to exploring the Moon and Mars. As the new NASA administrator said recently and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) just pointed out, we need to retire the shuttle as quickly as possible and begin flying the new crew exploration vehicle to the international space station and the Moon. These requirements and these funding cuts that the gentleman from Wisconsin proposes will have a direct impact on that momentum and the President's vision for space exploration, a vision that will advance our national economy and prestige internationally.

America's space program continues to be an engine for our national economy. Exploration brings jobs and technological growth to America. Nearly every State in the Union benefits from the development of technologies needed to propel our space mission. At a time when we are all concerned about jobs leaving the United States, supporting NASA makes sense because we are providing good jobs for Americans. We owe it to future generations of Americans and the men and women who have kept the space program alive to oppose this amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Obey amendment. This is a delicately balanced bill and the Obey amendment would destroy that balance. The account that the gentleman from Wisconsin is reducing funds the President's space exploration initiative, and also NASA's Earth science, space science, and aeronautics programs. All of these programs are at a critical point and are struggling for funds. At a time when we are trying to keep important Earth science missions on the drawing board, at a time when we face increased costs for both the Hubble space telescope and its planned successor, the James Webb space telescope, at a time when we are contemplating significant changes in our aeronautics program, at a time when we are trying to create new technologies to return to the Moon, this arbitrary cut proposed in this amendment is simply not appropriate.

I urge opposition to the amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, it is a shame that we are debating this Obey amendment. I just want to reemphasize that we should be debating the Obey amendment that was denied by the Rules Committee, because that would be the amendment with the appropriate offset. Everybody understands, I think, and I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle agree that this cut that we are experiencing to State and local law enforcement, the cuts that we are experiencing in the COPS program, and the cuts that we are experiencing in juvenile justice programs, are lamentable. They are cuts from last year, and they are serious.

State and local law enforcement is funded at 22 percent less than the current level. At a time when State and local law enforcement need resources, we are cutting resources. The COPS program, a tremendous program, as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) pointed out, is provided 13 percent less than the current level funding in this bill. Juvenile justice programs, those programs that are in the forefront of helping our youth, and addressing at-risk youth issues experience a 12 percent cut from the current level.

There is no question that the restoration side of the gentleman from Wisconsin's amendment needs to be addressed. He went to the Rules Committee and tried to get it addressed in an appropriate way by having the perfect offset. The offset is a small cut to those who have earned income of over $1 million, who currently enjoy a tax cut of approximately $140,000. The Obey amendment just reduces that tax cut a little bit, by $2,000. That would have been the appropriate offset. The offset that the ranking member is using in this second amendment, which he is forced to do because the Rules Committee did not give him a rule for the high-income offset, is a lamentable offset.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON).

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in opposition to this amendment. Americans take great pride in the accomplishments of the manned space flight program and NASA going all the way back to its earliest days, Mercury, Gemini, Apollo and beyond. And there always were people who came to the floor of this body proposing cuts to those programs, to NASA, and always shifting dollars to very, very worthwhile, or seemingly very, very worthwhile, entities.

I would just like to point out to my colleagues, do not be misled into believing that local law enforcement is going to be in a crisis if they do not get these additional funds. Better than 99 percent of funding to local law enforcement comes from State and local funding sources, and this amount of money is literally a drop in the bucket.

I would just like to also add that the Bush tax cuts that we passed out of this body and became law are causing a tremendous amount of economic growth and job creation, and there has been actually a surge of revenue into the State and local treasuries. Indeed, I am even told that chronically underfinanced New York City has a $2 billion surplus. My State that I come from in Florida, we are experiencing a surplus because of the robust growth caused by this tax cut package. Those local and State agencies can put more funding into COPS programs and fighting meth labs. They actually have much more resources to take care of the job.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY).

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Virginia has done a marvelous job in balancing a lot of important competing priorities. I will tell you that Americans need to be aware of this. We have been the only leader in manned space flight ever since Apollo XIII. But this amendment guts America's future manned space flight program.

In the year 2010, we are due to retire the shuttle. Unless we move forward with a new vehicle, which is what this amendment guts, the funding to do the exploration, the design and the research for, we will have a huge gap. There are nine other countries waiting to watch what we do. The Chinese, for example, are going to have a manned space flight program any day now. Yes, it is important to have local law enforcement; and, yes, we support that;

and, yes, there is great funding in this bill that Chairman WOLF put together; and, yes, 99 percent of those moneys come from local and State government.

But nothing is more important to the long-term security of the United States than space intelligence, space communications, space capability, including manned space flight. What this program does is to take $200 million out of the proposal that the President has to have a continual manned space flight program after the shuttle is retired. We basically are going to say, we are going to have huge personnel reductions, including some of the most talented engineers and scientists in the world that will go do other things.

We are going to basically lay off up to 1,000 people, talking about the next generation of human space flight, all so that we can give out local good-feeling grants to local law enforcement agencies on top of what they already have. The vehicle the President is talking about will be more flexible, will have more capabilities, will take us ultimately not just back to the Moon but on to Mars and beyond unless we gut it here today.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I think I am hearing a different amendment being debated. The fact is this amendment does not cut our core sciences. The President's budget is the one that squeezed those programs. This amendment does nothing of the kind. This amendment is very simple. This bill before us has increased the account that contains the Moon to Mars mission which is a mission that is going to occur 25 years in the future. This bill raises that account by half a billion dollars, $500 million. It is paid for by cutting $400 million out of local law enforcement. All I am suggesting is that we take $200 million of that back and give it to the local law enforcement agencies so we have a better balance between the two programs.

I do not like the fact that we have to cut these programs. I would have preferred to do it the other way. But the majority party blocked me from doing that. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) took the floor a while earlier crying about the fact that we were trying to cut the NASA budget. We are not trying to cut the NASA budget. The committee has cut the law enforcement budget. It has increased the NASA budget. We are simply trying to modify the increase to some degree in order to save local law enforcement.

□ 1315

If the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) does not like the trade-off, then he ought to look in the mirror because he is the fellow who required it.

Earlier we had a different jurisdiction of this subcommittee, but the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) did not like the fact that last year the subcommittee took money out of NASA in order to fund other programs including housing and veterans' health care. So he rearranged the jurisdiction of the committees; so now it means that NASA is in competition with local law enforcement. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) has given us no place to go.

So the choice is simple. If Members want to pay for a $500 million increase in a mission to Mars that is going to take place 25 years from now, if they want to pay for that by cutting back local law enforcement, then vote against the amendment. If they do not, then vote for it.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. I would point out to the Members of the House that this subcommittee has restored more than $1 billion in proposed cuts to State and local law enforcement. There is a total of $2.6 billion provided for crime-fighting initiatives, and the bill restores programs like the SCAAP program, $355 million to reimburse States for housing and detaining criminal aliens; $334 million for juvenile delinquency prevention; $387 million for Violence against Women.

This bill does a good job of restoring proposed cuts in law enforcement, and the amendment, if it were adopted, would be devastating to our Nation's space program.

America's space program today is still in the age of sailboats. We are using chemical rocket technology that was originally developed by Robert Goddard in the 1920s, and the only research program out there that is developing the next generation of rocket propulsion that will allow us to explore the outer solar system, that will allow us to go on to explore other solar systems around other stars, is Project Prometheus. It is the only research program out there to develop ion or thermal emission propulsion systems. The new Administrator at NASA has directed it to allow us to do research to develop nuclear surface power for our lunar missions.

If this amendment were adopted, it would devastate and damage severely NASA's ability to protect our astronauts from radiation hazards that they are all exposed to in outer space. The majority leader is right about that.

The People's Republic of China, Mr. Chairman, recognizes the importance of investing in outer space. If we adopt this amendment, we are allowing the Chinese to continue to move rapidly ahead in space exploration. The Chinese are not slowing down. They are going to be launching a lunar rover. They are going to be launching a lunar orbiter.

I urge Members to oppose this amendment so we can continue to invest in the future of manned and unmanned space exploration.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired.

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

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TERRY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TERRY:

Page 2, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $568,763)''.

Page 3, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $604,800)''.

Page 3, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $492,800)''.

Page 3, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $966,269)''.

Page 3, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $5,474,560)''.

Page 4, line 7, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $299,268)''.

Page 4, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $50,176)''.

Page 4, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $2,982,878)''.

Page 5, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $28,372)''.

Page 5, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $647,140)''.

Page 6, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $7,285,134)''.

Page 6, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $960,521)''.

Page 7, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $5,466)''.

Page 7, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $3,585,142)''.

Page 8, line 26, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $43,272)''.

Page 9, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $96,177)''.

Page 10, line 1, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $2,271,091)''.

Page 10, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $25,720,271)''.

Page 11, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $90,070)''.

Page 12, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $7,643,655)''.

Page 13, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $4,137,786)''.

Page 16, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $21,932,508)''.

Page 17, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $314,102)''.

Page 18, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $15,075)''.

Page 19, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,735,987)''.

Page 22, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,019,048)''.

Page 22, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $4,485,806)''.

Page 22, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $285,168,840)''.

Page 23, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $285,168,840)''.

Page 25, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $224,000)''.

Page 26, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $2,329,855)''.

Page 28, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,495,030)''.

Page 30, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $21,880)''.

Page 30, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $18,207)''.

Page 34, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $200,610)''.

Page 35, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $281,129)''.

Page 36, line 11, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,823,024)''.

Page 38, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $344,960)''.

Page 38, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $900,413)''.

Page 38, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $119,096)''.

Page 39, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $134,508)''.

Page 39, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $359,762)''.

Page 39, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $931,970)''.

Page 39, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $2,076,910)''.

Page 40, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $719,542)''.

Page 41, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $79,368)''.

Page 42, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $8,960)''.

Page 42, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $7,630,784)''.

Page 44, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $28,941)''.

Page 44, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,781,893)''.

Page 45, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $474,880)''.

Page 45, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $201,600)''.

Page 45, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $10,949,120)''.

Page 47, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $4,193,280)''.

Page 48, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $224,000)''.

Page 50, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $212,648)''.

Page 50, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $101,956)''.

Page 53, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $24,927)''.

Page 53, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $43,571,360)''.

Page 55, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $30,073,792)''.

Page 55, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $145,152)''.

Page 57, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $19,611,290)''.

Page 58, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $866,208)''.

Page 58, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $3,615,360)''.

Page 59, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,120,000)''.

Page 59, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $17,920)''.

Page 60, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $51,520)''.

Page 60, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $16,787,089)''.

Page 62, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $3,089,063)''.

Page 62, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $574,618)''.

Page 63, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $134,324)''.

Page 63, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,838,592)''.

Page 63, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $37,099)''.

Page 63, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $42,067)''.

Page 64, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $2,703,725)''.

Page 64, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $4,077,696)''.

Page 64, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $44,800)''.

Page 64, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $3,190)''.

Page 65, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $2,719)''.

Page 65, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $88,484)''.

Page 65, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $5,224,630)''.

Page 66, line 26, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $4,639,040)''.

Page 68, line 26, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $120,960)''.

Page 69, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $23,744)''.

Page 69, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $42,560)''.

Page 69, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $98,560)''.

Page 69, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $44,800)''.

Page 71, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $26,880)''.

Page 71, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $224,000)''.

Page 71, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $2,777,600)''.

Page 72, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $48,801)''.

Page 76, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $5,251)''.

Page 76, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $2,236)''.

Page 76, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $40,750)''.

Page 77, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $14,336)''.

Page 77, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $9,094)''.

Page 77, line 20, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $8,512)''.

Page 78, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,483,901)''.

Page 79, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,298,174)''.

Page 80, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $945,280)''.

Page 81, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $4,480)''.

Page 81, line 19, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,481,997)''.

Page 82, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $8,355)''.

Page 82, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $3,978,764)''.

Page 84, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $1,424,770)''.

Page 85, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $60,480)''.

Page 85, line 14, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $12,817)''.

Page 85, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $4,480)''.

Page 86, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $559,825)''.

Page 86, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $356,330)''.

Page 86, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $222,728)''.

Page 88, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $8,960)''.

Page 88, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $17,920)''.

Page 88, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $102,368)''.

Mr. TERRY (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment, and any amendments thereto, conclude by 15 minutes, and that the time be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and myself, the opponent.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) each will control 7½ minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I am honored today to offer this amendment to now fully fund Byrne-JAG grants with the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN), the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE). And I also want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and others for their help in this.

I also want to congratulate or show my appreciation to the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF), who certainly has been an advocate in the fight against drugs and methamphetamines in our communities and, from the President's budget that zeroed out the Byrne-JAG grants, was able in his subcommittee to put back $300 million. I am here, with my colleagues that I just read off, to take that back to the $600 million that was in there before.

Let us put this in context. This amendment, unlike the last amendment that went after just one or two areas, this is an across-the-board reduction of .448. So as the subcommittee's report, the bill that comes out, the funding remains at 99.55 percent, in essence, of what the committee has asked.

Just to show that there has been incredible impact in our communities from methamphetamines, and the Byrne-JAG grants go directly to our police departments, our sheriff departments to fight the drug dealers on the ground, they are our front line in the war on drugs, and it just makes no sense to me that we are moving towards a policy of nationalizing our drug crime fight at a time when it is our police officers on the streets that are fighting meth and other drugs.

At least in the Midwest it started off as a drug that was easy and cheap to make. They just needed ammonia, Sudafed, other chemicals to make this. It is highly addictive, and it is highly destructive to our communities and to our families, and I would encourage support for this amendment.

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

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

This amendment takes the worst possible approach to finding offsets with an across-the-board cut. It is a blunt instrument and does tremendous damage. Indiscriminate cuts in this amendment would be irresponsible. Hundreds of people, perhaps thousands, would lose their jobs, and many other negative consequences would occur in virtually every agency in the bill.

For every Federal law enforcement agency in the bill this is a cut. The FBI, working around the clock to protect the country from the next terrorist attack is cut by $26 million. If adopted, a reduction of 161 FBI agents, gone; 45 DEA agents gone, 35 deputy U.S. marshals gone; 22 ATF agents gone; 65 U.S. attorneys gone. In addition, the Bureau of Prisons, $22 million out; State and local law enforcement programs are reduced including a $2 million reduction in COPS and $1.5 million from Juvenile Justice.

This amendment, not that the gentleman meant it to be that way, even cuts education benefits for the survivors of public safety officers killed in the line of duty, as well as disability benefits for officers while injured on duty.

Lastly, NASA is cut by $70 million. Science goes down the tubes and is cut with regard to that. Embassy security, $6.8 million, and remember Americans killed in Tanzania, Americans killed in Nairobi. A $4 million is cut from SEC. Remember Enron, and we would take money from the SEC. Nineteen million dollars cut from the National Science Foundation. At the very time we are falling behind and everyone here is saying put more money into NSF, this takes money out of NSF, as we are falling down behind in engineers and math and science and physics and chemistry, and we just had the colloquy with the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

Lastly, there have been a number of groups opposed to this: the National Taxpayers Union, Citizens Against Government Waste, American Conservative Union, Americans for Tax Reform. If Members find something, if they need something, look at a bill and go through it. To have it equally across the board is the wrong way to go.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE).

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) for yielding me this time.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) for doing an almost impossible job and doing it very well.

Methamphetamine use has increased at an alarming rate in the last 15 years, and these charts illustrate this. This is what meth abuse looked like in 1990. Two States had 20 or more meth labs. In 1998, this is what it looked like, about two-thirds of the country. And this is what it looks like today. Almost the whole country has been inundated by meth.

I would also like to point out what meth does to a human being. It is the most addictive substance known to man. This is a 10-year snapshot of one life. It started out when this young lady was about 30 and ended when she was 40, in the morgue.

We are being inundated by this problem, and we think that we need to reintroduce the Byrne funding and sustain it at $634 million, which was what it was last year. Otherwise, our local law enforcement people will simply be overwhelmed by this problem. We hate to do it in this way. We respect the chairman, but this is about the only course of action that we were given in order to make this in order.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Nebraska and the other supporters of this amendment should be appreciative of the chairman's efforts with regard to law enforcement. They have a focus on methamphetamine and the plague that it represents across our country. They should know that there is hardly a hearing that goes by that the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) does not bemoan the condition that the country and the challenge that the Nation faces with regard to methamphetamine and illegal drug use. He is totally supportive of their efforts in principle.

The problem is we have a tough bill, and when they go to an across-the-board cut, that is an expression of extreme desperation with regard to the appropriation process. When they offer an across-the-board cut as an offset, what they are really saying is that this bill is so incredibly tight that we cannot find offsets anywhere else. It is absolutely the wrong place to go.

I would suggest to the gentlemen that are down to offering across-the-board cuts to reassess their vote on the budget resolution. We need more money in these bills for law enforcement, to provide funds to State and localities which are being cut from last year.

I oppose the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) for his leadership on this. I also want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) for the great work he has done with the very difficult challenge of funding very important programs.

But I just cannot help but continue to think about a young girl named Megan in a beautiful town in Minnesota that started using meth in seventh grade at age 13, and when she first took it, which she got from a friend, she said, This is something I am going to do over and over again. She did. But when she could not afford it, her addiction, she, like too many other female addicts, was exploited into becoming a prostitute to pay for the meth she craved every day. After hitting bottom at age 18, she is now pulling her life back together. But she has too many in her company. One out of five people that are meth addicts in recovery are 17 years or younger in the State of Minnesota.

We need to make sure that we have the resources at the local level to address this. We need to send a signal that this is important to Congress, that we stand with our law enforcement agents as they are trying to rid this country of this scourge. We need to make sure that those that are trying to sell this poison know that we are out to stop them.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT).

□ 1330

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. An appropriations bill is all about balance. All of us have programs in this bill we would like to see funded a little more or a little less. But the question before us is whether the bill strikes the overall balance among programs, given the fiscal constraints that we all face. And I think that with this bill, the appropriators did an outstanding job with their balancing act. We should be very cautious about throwing off that balance.

Let me give you an example from a program under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science. Is the National Science Foundation lavishly funded? Hardly. The appropriation for NSF, for example, is not even enough to bring the agency back to its 2004 funding level. The committee recognized the importance to our Nation's future of funding long-range basic research at our Nation's universities, but the committee could not find the money to

provide anything like the authorized level of funding. That is the kind of balancing act the committee had to pull off throughout the bill.

Now this arbitrary across-the-board amendment comes along that would unravel all of this, and I oppose it.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. LARSEN).

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my support for the Byrne-JAG restoration amendment. Byrne and Justice Assistance Grants are critical to our local law enforcement and in the fight against methamphetamine. As cochair of the Congressional Meth Caucus, I know firsthand the importance of these funds to our local drug task forces as they work to bust meth labs.

I want to thank and recognize the subcommittee chair and ranking member for their great efforts in drafting this bill. Despite those efforts, the level of Byrne grant funding in this bill would cause harm to Washington State's drug task forces. These cuts would eliminate at least three task forces and potentially six others, and small police departments in my district rely on Byrne grants to make communities safer.

This past week there were two clear examples in my district of why Byrne grants are needed. One of those is in Whatcom County, where close to 40 arrests were made of Bandidos motorcycle gang members and their associates in Operation Roadhouse. This effort was a culmination of a 2-year investigation by Federal, State, and local law enforcement agents. The entire Northwest Regional Drug Task Force was closely involved in this investigation, expending literally thousands of dollars in resources and man hours to ensure the success of this operation.

As one sheriff from my district told me, these cuts cannot come at a worse time. So we need to be sure to fund Byrne grants.

I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for his hard work and urge a ''yes'' vote on the Byrne-JAG restoration amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FEENEY).

Mr. FEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, all of us understand the intent of this amendment. We would like to stop the use and abuse and the sale of methamphetamine and other dangerous drugs. As a matter of fact, this bill does a great deal towards that end. But the problem with the amendment is that it robs Peter to pay Paul because you are gutting other long-standing law enforcement programs to start up new programs that traditionally have been established and protected at the local and State levels.

In addition, as I mentioned before, one of the things that we are trying to do is not to lose the next space race. In the year 2010, the United States will, by plan, be out of the manned flight business because we will retire the shuttle. The President has proposed making sure we have a replacement vehicle more flexible and capable for the future.

This has huge ramifications for American security, American intelligence, American communications capabilities. The President's proposal and that of Michael Griffin, the new NASA Administrator, is to move up our manned capabilities to the year 2010 so we will have no gap where we have to rely on the Russians or other foreign powers to get us in a manned way into space. By the way, the Chinese are coming. In 2012, they expect to have a vehicle on the Moon. They will have manned flights after that.

Please, do not gut America's predominance in space when it comes to manned space flight and undermine law enforcement across America.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD).

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Chairman, Edmund Burke put it best when he said the main reason we have government is to keep people safe. That is why the cut made by the committee is extremely disappointing. We need to restore the funding for the important Byrne grant program.

In my home State of Minnesota, I have seen firsthand the importance of Byrne grants to local police in reducing crime and drugs and improving public safety. Byrne grants fund critical overtime pay, task forces, equipment and ''buy'' money. How else are you going to prosecute drug cases if you do not have Byrne grants to provide ''buy'' money? Without this money, Minnesota would lose nearly half of its 20 multijurisdictional drug task forces.

We all know in this body that violent crime is at a 30 year low. Why go backwards? We must never forget our cops are on the front lines in the war on crime, fighting drug dealers and protecting our homeland. I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment to restore funding for the important Byrne grants. Let us restore this program to the 2005 levels.

It is time to honor the sacrifices made each and every day by our Nation's law enforcement community and give our finest the support they deserve.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Chairman, I serve on this subcommittee, and in every single hearing the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) brought up the problem of fighting meth labs. In fact, this committee has tripled the request the President made for fighting meth abuse from $20 million to $60 million.

There is $348 million in this bill for the Byrne-Justice Assistance Grant programs. We cannot through the National Science Foundation even fund two out of five of the many grant requests that NSF receives. We are not making the investment necessary for a great country like the United States to protect our technological edge for the future.

The Chinese recognize the importance of investing in scientific research and in their space program. The Chinese will launch a lunar science orbiter in 2007. They will launch a lunar sample return mission in 2015. They will launch a lunar rover in about 2012. The chief scientist for the Chinese lunar program pointed out that the lunar exploration project will spur high-tech development in China, and I cannot calculate how much return there will be on that investment for the Chinese people.

I urge Members to vote against this amendment and support the bill laid out by the chairman as a wise investment in the future prosperity of the United States in science.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska for yielding me time and for bringing this amendment.

There has been a lot of good work done on this bill overall, but I have heard said on this floor that this bill strikes the right balance. If it does, then the bill last year and the year before and the year before did not strike the right balance, because we are seeing a reduction in these funds that go into the JAG grant.

We have an intense amount of methamphetamine abuse across this country, and particularly in the Midwest. That is why you see Midwesterners down here on this floor. I will see 1,119 fewer adults and juveniles be offered up for treatment or be adjudicated due to violations of methamphetamine if we do not get this amendment passed today.

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

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Chairman, I too commend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) on his efforts to help local law enforcement. I commend the gentleman from Nebraska for his leadership in supporting the Byrne-JAG program. It is an important issue, and I am pleased to see it addressed.

I was the King County sheriff and worked for the sheriff's office for 33 years and spent my life in law enforcement. During my time in law enforcement, I have seen how Byrne and JAG grants have helped local law enforcement fight the war on drugs.

Washington received $9.6 million under the Byrne grant formulas. Without this funding, our State would not have been able to effectively work to reduce violent drug-related crimes.

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

Mr. Chairman, my father was a policeman for 20 years, so I am not going to take any back seat to anybody else.

If you really want to do something, stand up to the drug industry, which this Congress will not do, and do what the State of Oklahoma did: pass the law that makes you go up to the counter and ask for it. If you really want to do something, do that and stand up to the drug industry and deal with it.

This amendment cuts COPS $2 million; U.S. Attorneys, $7 million; Marshals Service, $4 million; the Do Not Call, FEC, $4 million; Small Business Administration, $3 million; NSF, $19 million; NASA, $72 million; DEA, $7 million; public safety officer benefits. Why? If we were looking to have an amendment, we would sort of exempt that out.

That is why these across-the-boards are a bad thing. We would exempt that out. Oceans. We just had a colloquy with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) on oceans. We go down on oceans.

I understand. Meth is coming to my area. We do not want to take away from embassy security so Federal employees get blown up, or reduce the FBI that is fighting that, or DEA. There are other ways to deal with this.

I care about the meth issue as much as anybody else. This is not the way to do it. You cannot go out and explain why we make all these cuts. There must be some focus. If you think this is so important, find out that area, offer an amendment to cut it, and put it back in this. But across the board, this is a bad amendment.

I urge Members to vote ''no.''

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Congressman TERRY for his leadership on this issue. I am pleased to be able to join my colleagues, as a co-sponsor and advocate of our amendment to restore funding to the Byrne-Justice Assistance Grant, JAG, program in the Science-State appropriations bill. If, we, as the House, do not pass the Obey amendment, then we must pass the Terry amendment—even though it may hurt some programs, we all support.

Unfortunately, this program is grossly underfunded in the bill—cutting funding from the $634 million that was provided in fiscal year 2005 to only $348 million in fiscal year 2006—a 45-percent cut. Our amendment restores $286 million to Byrne, which will put the funding back to last year's level.

If we do not restore this funding now, it will only be a matter of time before this program is completely wiped out.

As a former Escanaba city police officer and Michigan State trooper as well as co-chair of the Congressional Law Enforcement Caucus, I understand how much our local communities need and rely on the Byrne grants program monies.

Byrne grants provide funding for 29 vital programs such as anti-drug education programs, treatment programs and alternative sentencing initiatives, giving the States the ability to choose the programs where this Federal funding would be most beneficial to law enforcement issues faced in their State.

Local drug enforcement teams are crucial to keeping our communities drug free. Without our amendment, our teams will not have the funding to hire the officers they need to sustain their drug enforcement teams. In my home State of Michigan, we would lose 11 of our 25 task forces. California will lose 26 of 58, Texas will lose 21 of 46 and New York will lose 34 of 76.

Fighting the war on drugs must be an interjurisdictional, unified effort between local, county, and State police working together. Without the necessary Federal funding, this coordination will not be possible because our local task forces will no longer be in existence.

Losing these task forces is a frightening thought considering that 90 percent of drug arrests nationwide are made by State and local law enforcement agencies.

This would have a devastating and far reaching effect in Michigan—especially on our rural communities. Let me be clear—when it comes to drug abuse, no community—urban or rural—is immune to this problem.

Congress needs to step up to the plate and show their strong commitment to law enforcement and the criminal justice system. They have that chance today by voting for our amendment and showing their support for law enforcement officers who put their lives on the line to keep our communities safe and drug free.

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

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

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY) will be postponed.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOSWELL

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BOSWELL:

Page 2, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $2,500,000)''.

Page 26, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,500,000)''.

Page 28, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,500,000)''.

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Chairman, I first want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) for their great work on this important piece of legislation. They both have done a fine job faced with very, very difficult budget realities. We recognize that. However, we hope that this might be considered.

Mr. Chairman, during the Memorial Day district work period, I traveled my district to announce the introduction of H.R. 2659, the Safe Children Safe Communities Act which we introduced on May 26. This legislation seeks to provide $300 million in grants to States based on their population to implement better and more comprehensive sex offender registries and tracking systems. Now, the amendment I have offered today does not seek $300 million, but I believe it will help provide the States with needed resources to update their records.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment seeks to increase funding for the Criminal Records Update Program by $2.5 million. My amendment offsets this increase in funding by reducing the Department of Justice general administration salaries and expense account by $2.5 million.

The subcommittee has funded the Criminal Records Update Program at $25 million for FY 2006, which is an increase of $334,000 over the previous year. However, this falls drastically short of the administration's request by some $33 million.

Mr. Chairman, the goal of this program is to ensure accurate records are available for use in law enforcement, including sex offender registry requirements. The program helps States build their infrastructure to connect to a national record check system both to supply information and to conduct checks.

Mr. Chairman, during my time traveling my district, I have spoken to countless law enforcement officials; and during our conversations we have agreed on many issues. This is not a Republican issue; this is not a Democratic issue, national, State or local. It is all of it together. It is all of it together to protect our children.

We are in 100 percent agreement: we must work together at the Federal, State, and local levels to ensure the safety of our children.

□ 1345

I realize times are tight when it comes to spending, but if we can spare any additional dollars to ensure communities and our children are safe, then we absolutely must do it.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I think it is a good amendment, and I have no objection. I think it should pass.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Ms. BOSWELL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. ISSA

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. ISSA:

Page 2, line 7, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)'' after the dollar amount.

Page 6, line 12, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)'' after the dollar amount.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia reserves a point of order.

The gentleman from California (Mr. ISSA) is recognized for 5 minutes on his amendment.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, I rise with this amendment today in order to increase the funding to the attorneys general for trafficking in humans that is going on rapidly throughout the country. I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) and his committee for working to bring this legislation to the floor and to highlight these problems here today.

Illegal immigration is the number one issue in my district and in the State of California. One of the greatest reasons that Members of Congress oppose illegal immigration is the dangerous practice of smuggling human beings into the United States by practitioners known as ''coyotes.'' Coyotes care little for the welfare of their cargo, only about the fee they will have, and have killed countless aliens in the process.

Over the past few years, the U.S. Attorney's Office has not prosecuted coyotes by any means to the fullest extent possible. As a matter of fact, in November of 2004, the U.S. Attorney for the Southern District of California, Carol Lamb, set up new guidelines. Under these guidelines, the only prosecution of a coyote for bringing somebody into the United States would include that they would be prosecuted only if they committed three felonies, and two of these crimes occurred in the district in the past 5 years. At least one of these offenses should have had the result of a prison sentence of at least 13 months, and it goes on. Essentially, you have to be a three-time criminal felon who endangered either the Border Patrol or directly the lives of individuals involved in order to even be eligible for prosecution. As a result, people who have been caught and released 20 or more times continue to not be prosecuted in the San Diego district. Throughout the district and throughout the country, the Office of the U.S. Attorney claims that they have to prioritize prosecution of human smugglers because there are insufficient funds. We aim to deal with that here today.

We should not allow smugglers to go free due to the lack of resources. There is no question that we have over 11 million, by the U.S. Census, over 11 million illegals in this country. I, for one, make no claim that tomorrow we could remove them all, but certainly, while we are trying to figure out how to grapple with this vexing problem, we should have a zero tolerance for people who traffic in human beings.

My amendment is intended to begin that process. It is my sincere hope that I can work with the Committee on Appropriations in order to put an emphasis on this area of trafficking.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Virginia Chairman Wolf.

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

Mr. ISSA. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, this is subject to a point of order, and it is unfortunate that it is. I would pledge to the gentleman that we will do everything we can to deal with this problem.

Several weeks ago several of us were down in El Salvador where they made the very case of the people who were involved in violent gangs had gone to coyotes who would take them up. I think the gentleman is right on target, so we will work with him, and I appreciate him bringing this to our attention, so that we can see what we can do.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman's assurances.

I will at this time insert in the RECORD all of my statement and additional relevant materials.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to amend H.R. 2862 in order to increase funding for the prosecution of human smugglers, known as ''coyotes.'' I thank Chairman WOLF for his Committee's work in bringing this legislation before us.

Illegal immigration is the number one issue I hear about from my constituents in California. Illegal immigration not only endangers our nation's security but in many cases the security of those individuals illegally immigrating. Aliens who allow themselves to be smuggled into the United States are at the greatest risk, and it is their smugglers who need to be prosecuted most expeditiously.

The U.S. Attorney's Office has stated in the past that it does not have the resources needed to fully prosecute arrested coyotes. Border Patrol agents who arrest many of the coyotes have compared their detention and prosecution to a catch-and-release program, stating that many are released within hours of arrest and caught again the next day. For example, the Border Patrol was instructed to release known coyote, Antonio Amparo-Lopez, an individual with 21 aliases and 20 arrests. Releasing a criminal such as this due to lack of funds is completely unacceptable, and is demoralizing to the Border Patrol agents who work so hard to make the arrests in the first place.

For this reason I am proposing this amendment to increase the funding for the United States Attorneys by $5,000,000. The amendment redirects funds from the General Administration account of the Department of Justice into the Salaries and Expenses account of the United States Attorneys. I truly hope the U.S. Attorney's Office takes to heart the seriousness of this Congress' commitment to coyote prosecution.

I look forward to working with the Appropriations Committee further in efforts tied to the prosecution of alien smugglers. I also look forward to working with Chairman Sensenbrenner as we continue to address this issue within the Judiciary Committee during the Department of Justice Reauthorization process.

[From the Associated Press State & Local Wire, Nov. 2, 2004.]

FEDERAL PROSECUTORS TO BE MORE SELECTIVE ON IMMIGRATION CASES

(By Elliot Spagat)

Federal prosecutors in San Diego said a burgeoning caseload was forcing them to be more selective about charging illegal immigrants who have committed crimes.

Under proposed guidelines, the government would focus on prosecuting immigrants whose previous crimes occurred only a short time ago and happened nearby, making it easier to get police and court records.

Illegal immigrants with criminal records are often charged with re-entry after deportation, a felony offense. Federal prosecutors in San Diego file more than 2,000 re-entry cases a year.

The guidelines would also be more selective about prosecuting immigrant smugglers, concentrating on cases in which migrants are led through dangerous terrain.

Carol Lam, the U.S. attorney for the Southern District of California, asked the Border Patrol to 'comment on the proposals, and hasn't set a date for them to take effect, said Steve Clark, first assistant U.S. attorney. The changes would apply only to the Southern California district—which encompasses San Diego and Imperial counties.

Clark on Monday declined to discuss specifics, saying that might encourage criminals to alter their behavior in an effort to escape prosecution. But, he said, the changes are a response to ''finite resources'' and a growing caseload.

''(The) number of alien smuggling cases presented to our office has increased significantly over the last year,'' Steven Peak, an assistant U.S. attorney, wrote Paul Blocker Jr., the Border Patrol's acting San Diego sector chief. ''Alien smuggling cases are manpower-intensive and often difficult to prosecute successfully.''

Peak's Aug. 24 letter—first reported by KGTV—TV of San Diego—said many illegal immigrants with criminal histories committed their offenses outside Southern California or haven't been arrested for 10 years, making it difficult to get police and court documents.

Under the new guidelines, offenders with three felony convictions would be prosecuted only if two of those crimes occurred within the district in the last five years. At least one of those offenses should have resulted in a prison sentence of at least 13 months.

The new guidelines for prosecuting immigrant smugglers would require that the suspect ''intentionally or recklessly created a substantial risk of death or serious bodily injury,'' Peak wrote. Examples include guiding migrants through remote areas in extreme weather.

A spokesman for the Border Patrol, Sean Isham, said the agency was working closely with prosecutors on the revisions and emphasized that they are still only proposals.

Shawn Moran, a spokesman for National Border Patrol Council Local 1613, which represents Border Patrol agents in San Diego, was more critical.

''We're not happy about it,'' he said. ''It pretty much just raises the bar on the threshold for prosecution.''

[From the Washington Times, June 8, 2005.]

ILLEGALS AND MURDER

Even hardened cops found it difficult to comprehend the carnage they found at 7000 Park Heights Ave. in Northwest Baltimore on May 27,2004. There lay the bodies of Ricardo Solis Quezada Jr. and his sister, Lucero Solis Quezada, both 9 years old, and their cousin, Alexis Espejo Quezada, 10, illegal aliens from Mexico. One of the children

was decapitated, and the other two were all but beheaded with a fillet knife. The trial of the alleged ''Baltimore Butchers'' begins today.

Two relatives of the children—Adan Espinoza Canela, 17, who worked at a Baltimore slaughterhouse, and Policarpio Espinoza, 22, who sold food from a truck—were arrested and charged with the slayings. Both suspects are illegal aliens. Police suspect that the killings were in retaliation for the failure of the children's parents to pay off their debts to ''coyotes'' who smuggled the family into the country. Family members claim the defendants are innocent, and have refused to cooperate with prosecutors and police.

There are two separate issues here. The first is that three innocent children were brutally murdered. Whoever committed this crime must be severely punished. The second is the matter of illegal immigration and crime—a subject that has serious implications for people across the United States and Marylanders in particular.

To begin with, anyone who crosses the border illegally, as the defendants did, has committed a crime by doing so. But a significant minority of illegal aliens go on to perpetrate more disturbing crimes after arriving in the United States. They include such persons as Angel Maturino Resendiz, the so-called Railroad Killer, who murdered at least nine people as he traveled the country by train, and the Mexican drug dealers who killed ranger Kris Eggle, 28, at Organ Pipe National Monument in Arizona on Aug. 9, 2002. In 2003, the Federal Bureau of Prisons estimated that criminal aliens—noncitizens who commit crimes—comprise more than 29 percent of federal prison inmates.

One of the first people to arrive at the murder scene on that horrible afternoon last May was Baltimore Mayor Martin O'Malley, who denounced the crimes and vowed to bring those responsible to justice. But there is no getting around the fact that politicians like Mr. O'Malley, a Democrat, bear a measure of responsibility for the fact that illegal aliens are finding Maryland an increasingly attractive place to reside. Their number has more than doubled since 2000, a period during which the mayor, Montgomery County Executive Doug Duncan and other Democrats have fought to ensure that illegals will not be barred from obtaining driver's licenses and immigration status. Mr. O'Malley also has lobbied aggressively against legislation that would encourage better federal-state cooperation to apprehend illegal aliens. If Mr. O'Malley and the Democratic establishment get their way, Maryland will continue to be an attractive place to people like the Baltimore Butchers and the Railroad Killer.

[From the San Diego Union-Tribune, Nov. 25, 2003]

THREE MEN FOUND SLAIN IN ARIZONA DESERT

(By New York Times News Service)

Three men, believed to have been illegal immigrants from Mexico, were found slain execution-style in the Arizona desert over the weekend, the Maricopa County sheriff said yesterday.

Sheriff Joe Arpaio said the men had been kidnapped, tied up and shot. There have been nine similar killings in the county since March 2002.

All 12 bodies were found within 25 to 30 miles of remote, rural desert areas surrounding Phoenix.

Authorities blame the killings on organized gangs of ''coyotes,'' who smuggle people across the border.

Sheriff's detectives believe the smuggling gangs are trying to cut into their competitors' business and send a message to those who can't pay their smuggling fees of about $1,000.

''We think they throw them right off the roadway to send a message,'' Arpaio said.

In the latest killings, the three bodies were found Sunday morning by a bicyclist along a dirt road on the Gila Indian Reservation.

Two of the victims appeared to have been in their 20s and the third in his 40s. Autopsies are being conducted.

There are no suspects. The earlier nine victims were immigrants from Mexico.

Local authorities and a federal task force are investigating the killings.

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 5, 2005]

148 IMMIGRANTS FOUND CAPTIVE IN SOUTH L.A. HOMES

TWO ALLEGED SMUGGLERS ARE ARRESTED AFTER POLICE FIND 58 PEOPLE IN ONE HOUSE. NINETY ARE LATER FOUND IN SECOND HOME.

(By Claudia Zequeira and Jill Leovy, Times Staff Writers)

Los Angeles police found 148 immigrants held captive in two South Los Angeles houses Wednesday and arrested two suspected smugglers who were allegedly demanding payment for their release.

The discoveries are just the latest in a string of safe houses authorities have uncovered over the last two years. Officials say Los Angeles has emerged as a center of the human-smuggling business, with immigrants shipped from Latin America, across the border and to houses in Los Angeles. Often, they are eventually put on airplanes to other parts of the country.

Fifty-eight immigrants were discovered about 1 p.m. in the 800 block of West 80th Street. Ninety were discovered six hours later, about 20 blocks away in a house in the 100 block of West 59th Place.

Police discovered the first group after one of the prisoners escaped and called 911 from a nearby pay phone, said Los Angeles Police Det. Javier Lozano of LAPD's 77th Street Division.

The caller told authorities people were being held in the house and then fled. Officers arriving at the house found bars on the rear windows and a large awning or canopy screening the back.

Police said they noticed a powerful odor when they entered the house and discovered men and women shoulder to shoulder in two locked bedrooms. The immigrants were from Ecuador and Mexico, officials said.

The house ''was a hot oven, and these people were just crowded in,'' Lozano said.

Two men, including one inside the house, were arrested.

The immigrants described being held for as long as a month as smugglers, called coyotes, demanded payments of $3,000 for their release. Police loaded the immigrants onto a bus for transfer into federal custody. Federal immigration officials have taken over the case, Lozano said. The house was rented.

Authorities declined to say how the second house was discovered, except to say that the circumstances were similar. Immigrants taken into custody at that house were from Guatemala, El Salvador and Mexico.

At the first house, a single-story stucco home, police spent much of Wednesday questioning neighbors and the landlord. Residents said they had noticed nothing unusual at the property and were surprised to learn that so many people had been found inside.

''We thought the house was for rent. We never saw people there,'' said Tyrine Soil, 19. ''We're shocked to hear that there were 60 people living in there.''

Other residents said that they saw only one man entering the house, and said that he sometimes carried bags of groceries.

Landlord Matthew Lux of Downey said he also had no idea that there were so many people in the house. ''There was no noise, no smell,'' Lux said. ''I never saw 50 people until they brought them out.''

Lux said he rented the three-bedroom house in January to a couple with two children. The man and woman told Lux that they worked for a church. They did not have credit but they gave the name of a friend who backed their $1,300-a-month lease.

''They were great tenants,'' Lux said. ''They always paid in cash. They were always on time. I wish I had more tenants like them.''

Federal authorities have struggled to combat human smuggling. They have made arrests but they have found it hard to find those who run the operations. Federal agents have begun patrolling Los Angeles International Airport as part of a crackdown launched last year.

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Illinois:

Page 2, line 7, insert ''(reduced by $5,000,000)'' after the dollar amount.

Page 26, line 25, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)'' after the dollar amount.

Page 28, line 6, insert ''(increased by $5,000,000)'' after the dollar amount.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me commend the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Ranking Member MOLLOHAN) for the outstanding work that they have done in crafting this appropriation.

My amendment is designed, and I actually plan to withdraw it, but my amendment is designed to raise the issue and highlight the fact that 630,000 individuals, roughly 1,700 a day, will be released from prisons to return to their communities. We can expect on an annual basis that this large number of released inmates from prison will continue for the next 5 years. Also, we must be mindful of the fact that local jails are releasing 7 million people each year. Many of these individuals are never able to find a decent place to live, cannot access various entitlement programs such as public housing, financial assistance for college, and, in some instances, food stamps, and are oftentimes denied employment because of their past criminal convictions. Statistics show that nearly 52 percent of these individuals end up back in jail within 3 years.

As these men and women transition from incarceration to freedom, what they need most are comprehensive reentry solutions. Prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation are just as important as incarceration. These men and women and children still have to

live in our communities. Therefore, increasing public safety is a primary concern of communities and neighborhoods all across the country.

Successful reentry is difficult to obtain because of the vast and extreme barriers that ex-offenders encounter every day of their lives. In Illinois, just a year ago, ex-offenders were prohibited from working in 57 occupational categories without some form of waiver. For example, ex-offenders were not allowed to be barbers, nail technicians; they could not be a custodian in a hospital or school. Many of these individuals were convicted of nonviolent offenses, mainly drug convictions. So it is extremely difficult for ex-offenders to find housing and get a job after they have paid their debt to society.

I would hope that as we continue to explore budgetary preparations and appropriations, that we would recognize that if we are to seriously deal with the issue of recidivism reduction, the issue of public safety, the issue of helping individuals become contributing members of society, we must put adequate funding into reentry.

Again, I want to commend the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) for his support of these kinds of programs. I would like to extend a little dialogue, engage in a colloquy with him, and then I would withdraw my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, would the chairman explain the kind of resources that we are putting into reentry programs this year for next year's budget?

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman raising this issue. This is really an important issue. Before I came to Congress, I was involved in a reentry program at Lorton Reformatory, so I think what the gentleman is trying to do is a good idea.

Reentry programs are critical to rehabilitating prisoners. I support the programs and will continue to work with the gentleman. The bill includes a $6 million increase in the Bureau of Prisons and $10 million in OJP for reentry programs. You really cannot put a man or a woman in jail for 15 years and then, at the end, just open up the cell and let them out without having any reentry programs. So what the gentleman is trying to do is exactly right. But that is the status of funding, a $6 million increase within the Bureau of Prisons and $10 million in OJP for reentry programs.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) and the gentleman from West Virginia (Ranking Member MOLLOHAN) for their sensitivity to these issues, and I look forward to working with them throughout the year as we continue to try and strengthen the possibility of reducing recidivism and helping people maintain quality life in this country.

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

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

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

Page 2, line 7, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $50,100,000)''.

Page 55, line 5, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $50,100,000)''.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. THORNBERRY). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me thank the chairman of this subcommittee and the subcommittee ranking member for their hard work on a hard task. This bill, that includes funding for NASA, the Department of Justice, the Department of State, a number of science programs, the Equal Opportunity Commission, is a tough legislative agenda, but certainly the hard work has been evidenced.

I rise today to offer an amendment that would have added $50.1 million to the NASA Exploration Capabilities provision, and to note to my colleagues when I arrived here in this body and was assigned to the Committee on Science, one of the comments I used to make is that science would be the work of the 21st century.

Mr. Chairman, I still maintain that, that out of science will come the opportunities for this country to boost its economic engine. The sad part about it is we find ourselves in 2005 having the least number of young people going into math and sciences, the least number of graduates out of chemistry and physics. So the vision of this Congress and the President and the American people coming together and talking about space exploration is so very important. This bill allows for $9 million to be added to this vision, and I think it is crucial that we stay focused, stay consistent, and stay determined and committed.

I support the Vision of Space Exploration, because I have seen the results on humankind and what it has done in health care in America. In fact, space exploration has generated research and results on HIV/AIDS treatment, stroke, heart attack, and cancer. It has also had the potential to detect tsunamis, as we saw the tragedy that occurred in the winter of 2004 that saw hundreds of thousands of people lose their lives.

Space exploration is real, and it means a lot to America. It is sad to note that America's young people do not find hopes and dreams in the study of science and technology and space exploration. What is known is that they want to see that there is a future, that there is hope, and out of this vision to go to Mars gives us hope. There is nothing more exciting than to see our early astronauts like former Senator John Glenn land or to travel into space, nothing more exciting to be able to note that we can achieve.

So my amendment was to provide extra resources so that we could stay steady on the course. I believe, however, it is important to maintain the already existing funding. I expect to offer an amendment to provide greater funding for training legal officers dealing with child abuse under the Violence Against Women Act, or trained legal professionals such as counselors and lawyers. I would like to see more dollars for the Equal Opportunity Commission for the job that they need to do, and certainly I hope that as we look toward the Vision of Space Exploration, we will focus on safety. I want to thank this subcommittee for focusing with language in their legislation on safety and ensuring that those skilled workers who are trained in safety are not let go.

I conclude by saying there are a number of good points in this bill, and I want to thank both the chairman and the ranking member for their language on torture to ensure that we do not adhere to that, and I would be offering an amendment to suggest that the terrorism dollars that are in this bill not be used to single out one religion over another.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleagues will support this legislation, and particularly the appropriations on the space exploration.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support my Amendment which would fund NASA Exploration Capabilities for an additional $50.1 million, with the funds to be taken from the Department of Justice General Administration funds. This funding would restore the President's full request for NASA Exploration Capabilities. This funding would be provided for the Space Operations Missions Directorate, including the International Space Station, the Space Shuttle program, and Space and Flight Support.

The funds for NASA Exploration Capabilities are essential to the President's vision for space exploration. This appropriation comes at a watershed moment for NASA and the future of America's space exploration mission. After the tragic Columbia Space Shuttle accident we had to step back and reassess our space shuttle program. Today, NASA is preparing to return to flight, but safety is still at the forefront of our concerns. The funds being addressed here are applicable to safety as well and we must ensure that everything is done to keep our NASA astronauts from possible harm.

Under this Amendment, funding for NASA Exploration Capabilities are to be taken from Department of Justice General Administration funds. The reason funds are being taken from this specific department is because they have received a very large increase of 14 percent or $250 million more than they did last year.

Clearly, the Appropriations Committee has worked to make this a tight bill without much excessive spending. Most Departments are funding right at the President's request or even below last year's funding level. While I am in favor of many of the funding initiatives at the Department of Justice, I also feel strongly that NASA needs to be fully funded for space exploration. In addition, this Amendment would take money from General Administration funds instead of taking money from any specific program.

This Amendment has been scored by the CBO, which has stated that my Amendment does not increase the budgetary authority and in fact decreases the outlays by $9 million. This Amendment is important because it strengthens our Nation in ways that will pay large dividends in the future. NASA exploration missions have taught us so much about our world and it would be a shame if we no longer led the world in this great field. I will withdraw this amendment at this time and work towards keeping NASA from being cut.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

□ 1400

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. THORNBERRY). If there are no further amendments at this point, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

JUSTICE INFORMATION SHARING TECHNOLOGY

For necessary expenses for information sharing technology, including planning, development, deployment and Departmental direction, $135,000,000, to remain available until expended.

NARROWBAND COMMUNICATIONS/INTEGRATED WIRELESS NETWORK

For the costs of conversion to narrowband communications, including the cost for operation and maintenance of Land Mobile Radio legacy systems, $110,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2007: *Provided*, That the Attorney General shall transfer to the ''Narrowband Communications'' account all funds made available to the Department of Justice for the purchase of portable and mobile radios: *Provided further*, That any transfer made under the preceding proviso shall be subject to section 605 of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

Page 3, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $39,126,000)''.

Page 62, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $59,142,000)''.

Page 84, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $13,441,000)''.

Page 86, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $79,132,000)''.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment and any amendments thereto, conclude by 15 minutes, and that the time be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and myself, the opponent.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw that and would insert 20 rather than 15.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands, the unanimous consent request is to limit debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto to a total of 20 minutes equally divided between the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and a Member opposed.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) is recognized for 10 minutes on her amendment.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today's small businesses are having a difficult time in accessing affordable capital due to recent changes to the 7(a) program. This amendment will change that by restoring funding to its fiscal year 2004 level.

As you can see from this chart, the cost of the 7(a) program on small business has doubled, translating into an additional $1,500 to $3,000 in upfront costs. And for larger loans, fees are now more than $50,000.

In addition, SBA has proposed even more fees on top of those that were implemented last year, and projections are that these fees will only continue to increase year after year.

Clearly, these actions are having a negative effect. Since the fee increase, the total dollars going into the economy has dropped, small businesses are receiving less capital, and the number of active lenders making a loan has declined by 50 percent. These actions have resulted in a highly unstable program, as you can see from this chart.

History has shown that operating loan programs without a government commitment is a recipe for failure. For proof, look at the SBA venture capital program which has been credited with investing billions of dollars in small businesses. Four years ago, it was taken to a zero subsidy rate. The argument is that it would make the program more stable. Well, today that program is shut down because it simply became too costly. By voting for this amendment, you are ensuring that the 7(a) program does not suffer the same fate.

The offsets for this amendment can come from the IT accounts of the State Department, Justice Department, and SBA. This is a small price to pay for job creation. The 7(a) program is a proven job creator. For every $33,000 in loans, one job is created. With just a minor investment from our government, we can empower this Nation's entrepreneurs to do what they do best, create jobs and build this economy.

This is the same amendment that was offered last year that passed with overwhelming bipartisan support. The only thing that has changed since then is that our Nation's small businesses have now had to endure a year of increased costs, and they have told us that these costs are hurting them. We cannot let this happen again.

Fifteen trade associations, including the National Small Business Association; the Independent Community Bankers of America; the Credit Union National Association; the American Hotel and Lodging Association; and the U.S. Black Chamber of Commerce, representing businesses and lenders from across the country, are supporting this amendment and calling on Congress to restore this funding.

By voting ''yes'' to restore the appropriations to the 7(a) loan program, you are voting to relieve our Nation's 23 million small businesses of these additional costs. This is a vote for continued job creation and economic development, two things, small businesses and our Nation's economy need now more than ever.

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) will control the time in opposition to the amendment. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. If we were to pass this amendment, then you can never write to your constituents and say you really care about the deficit. And I know the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO) is going to speak about this. We dealt with this program last year. We are now at a record level of loans. So if you vote for this, you will never be able to write and say that I am concerned about the deficit.

The 7(a) program has been operating at record levels without subsidy appropriations since the beginning of fiscal year 2005 when the fees on lenders and borrowers reverted to the pre-2003 level. The SBA administrator continues to assure us the program is running strong, does not require a subsidy. Since lending levels are no longer tied to appropriation, the program has been able to meet the demand.

The program is on track, Mr. Chairman, to far exceed the previous lending levels and in fact may come close to the $16 billion authorized level.

Media reports all over the country have touted the recent success of the 7(a) lending. To highlight this, I have articles which we will put in the RECORD, if it is appropriate at this time, from the Chicago Tribune, Cincinnati Press Courier. Here are some of the headlines: ''SBA programs looks

sound.'' ''Stable funding turns banks on to SBA lending.'' In fact, lending to every segment of the population, including women and minorities is up from last year's level.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Dec. 27, 2004]

SBA PROGRAM LOOKS SOUND

(By Rob Kaiser)

Holiday magic isn't the likely reason the U.S. Small Business Administration and its numerous critics appear in harmony for the first time in years.

A more likely explanation is the $16 billion stocking stuffer for the SBA's flagship 7(a) loan program, which will likely keep it from suffering short-falls in 2005 that drew the ire of banks and small-business owners this year.

''The risk of a cap or a shutdown is basically nil,'' said Tony Wilkinson, president of the National Association of Government Guaranteed Lenders and a frequent SBA critic.

Such an outlook is a vast improvement from recent years, when frequent loan limits and speculation about shutdowns sent bankers scurrying to submit loan applications and left many business owners in limbo—often with unpaid bills—when expected loans suddenly evaporated.

To achieve the peace, bankers grudgingly accepted a return to paying higher fees as the Bush administration got its wish to wipe away a nearly $80 million subsidy that had been supporting the 7(a) program. In return, the bankers expect to inherit a more stable program.

Such stability would have saved Julie Valenza a lot of time and money.

Valenza was close to purchasing her second Jimmy John's sandwich franchise in January when the $250,000 loan she expected to secure through the 7(a) program was suddenly stalled when SBA stopped accepting new applications due to a funding short-fall.

To salvage the deal to purchase an existing store in Westmont, Valenza recruited her sister as a investor.

''At least I didn't have to bring in a stranger off the street,'' she said.

Still, the setback delayed the purchase by two months and means Valenza now has to split the store's profits.

Paul Andreotti, an executive vice president at National City Bank in Chicago, said SBA loans exist so such situations are avoided.

Without 7(a) loans, many business owners would have to finance growth on their credit cards or through other expensive means.

''If the SBA wasn't guaranteeing loans, banks couldn't be as aggressive and provide as much capital,'' said Andreotti, whose bank is putting together a 7(a) loan so Valenza can open a third Jimmy John's location in Oak Lawn.

While he's not happy to see the fees climbing, Andreotti said, ''In the long run I think it will positively impact small businesses.''

Fees for the 7(a) program are now 2 percent on loans up to $150,000, up from 1 percent. Loans between $150,001 and $700,000 carry a 3 percent fee, up from 2.5 percent. Loans for more than $700,000 still carry a 3.5 percent fee.

The loan applicant usually pays these fees. Banks have to pay another fee, which has also increased recently.

The SBA guarantees 85 percent of 7(a) loans up to $150,000 and 75 percent of loans for more than $150,000.

Previously, the highest loan guarantee was $1 million, but under the new legislation that figure was raised to $1.5 million. This means the program will now guarantee 75 percent of a $2 million loan, the largest 7(a) loan available.

Still, not everyone in the SBA universe is sold that the recent compromise was the best solution.

''Clearly there were members of Congress that felt this program was worthy of receiving an appropriation,'' said James Ballentine, director of community and economic development at the American Bankers Association.

Balentine said some business owners as well as leaders may be dissuaded from taking part in the program because of the fees.

Early indications, though, are that participation in the 7(a) program is at record levels.

From Oct. 1, the beginning of the fiscal year, through Dec. 10, the program has done more than 18,000 loans, worth nearly $2.8 billion. During the same period last year, the program did fewer than 15,000 loans, worth $2.4 billion.

In all of the last fiscal year, the 7(a) program did nearly 75,000 loans, worth $12.6 billion. The program has $16 billion in loans available for the current fiscal year.

''We think that should be sufficient,'' said Jodi Polonet, senior vice president of Business Loan Express LLC in New York. ''We are satisfied.''

Mr. WOLF. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO), the chairman of the Small Business Committee who last year supported this amendment, is now supportive of the program continuing to operate without a subsidy appropriation. He has written a Dear Colleague letter, and I hope every Member has read that Dear Colleague letter in support of the status quo. This would really hit Justice Department programs and State Department programs.

So in summary, Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary to provide a subsidy appropriation for 7(a) loan programs. With the legislative and appropriation changes made last year, the program is running strong. The offsets are not a good idea.

I urge Members to oppose the amendment.

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, when SBA claims that the program is doing record levels I have to say that they said that they would do $16 billion. Today they are $2 billion behind, and they are clearly not going to achieve a record level.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support the amendment offered by our colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the ranking member of the Small Business Committee.

In my district in northeastern Ohio, locally owned small businesses are the foundation of our communities, from tool and die makers to landscapers to mom and pop corner hardware stores. The Small Business Administration 7(a) program has a proud history of ensuring that these small businesses will continue to have access to affordable financing.

As the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) has noted, changes were made to the 7(a) program last year that dramatically altered its funding structure by eliminating the Federal Government's contribution and making the entire program self-sustaining. I have seen the data from my district on the amount of funding provided to small businesses since the program was altered, and I have heard the arguments that the program is actually more stable and that lending has not dropped off.

And while I have nothing but respect for not only the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) but also the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman MANZULLO), I have to ask myself what could have been. If a furniture maker in Middlefield, Ohio, wanted access to capital to expand his facilities but decided against it because the fees on the 7(a) loan would have been too much of a burden for his business, how many more jobs could we have created if we had continued the Federal participation in the 7(a) program?

And I listened intently and I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) when he spoke against the last amendment, the last couple of amendments on the Byrne issue when across-the-board amendment cuts are not a good idea. And I agree with that. But I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for where we found the offsets. They come from the IT accounts at the Justice Department, the State Department, and the Small Business Administration.

It is my understanding, and if I am wrong in this regard I am sure the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) can correct me, that relative to the Justice Department, it comes from a proposal to sell off and replace computer broadband and replace with narrow band, allowing them to sell the broadband, and money will actually be recouped to finance that.

Secondly, in the State Department they are charging fees on visas which would also allow those upgrades. And relative to the IT account in the Small Business Administration, the upgrade that needs to take place in the country is the small business community. And I would just indicate that, you know, on this side of the aisle we champion all the time that small businesses in this country are the backbone, the drivers of this economy. The 7(a) program needs Federal participation to not only be as good as it is today but to be better tomorrow.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO), the chairman of the SBA committee, such time as he may use.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I would note that as to the gentleman from Ohio's (Mr. LATOURETTE) district, in all of 2004, he had 185 7(a) loans totaling about $30,400,000. For 2005, year

to date, it is 319 loans totaling nearly $29 million in loans. So it just amazes me that the gentleman from Ohio would say that we need to spend $79 million worth of taxpayers' money.

Last year, I led the fight to add in $79 million for the 7(a) program. I was under the assumption that it was absolutely necessary to have the Federal Government subsidize small business people who wanted to get a loan. And I took a look at this, and I said what kind of a message does this send? There is no legal or constitutional right to have loans subsidized by the taxpayers of this country for people to get involved in businesses. And, in fact, that sends the wrong messages. People getting involved in business should realize that it is a free enterprise system that works.

And what we did last year was something epochal; 7(a) loan program last year for the first time did not depend upon a government handout. Small business people do not need government handouts to start businesses.

My dad was in the grocery store business. He was in the restaurant business. He would have never thought about applying for a loan that was subsidized by taxpayers.

And so what happened last year, the subsidy was taken away. Taxpayers saved $80 million that was spent in areas, other areas, as important as it is. And the problem that I have is whenever you have the government subsidy, then the program is subject to shut down. That is what happened 2 years ago when the SBA 7(a) program in December ran out of money. The 7(a) program shut down. Small business people could not plan. The lenders had no idea what was going on and chaos broke loose in the 7(a) industry. We do not need the 7(a) subsidy.

As the chairman of the Small Business Committee, I have spoken to people all over the country thanking me saying, you know, we are paying a little bit more for our loan, but we realize that by the small business people paying a little bit more for their loan and the amount up front gets rolled over to the eventual length of the term of the loan, that makes not only more money available, but it makes the program predictable.

So I would encourage my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Velázquez amendment. Vote ''no'' to spending $80 million in taxpayers' funds.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire as to how much time is left on each side.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 5 minutes remaining.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. BEAN).

Ms. BEAN. Mr. Chairman, as a small business owner and a member of the Small Business Committee, I appreciate the need for entrepreneurs and small business owners to have access to affordable capital. That is why I speak today in support of the Velázquez amendment to restore funding for the SBA 7(a) small business loan program.

□ 1415

Small businesses are the growth engine for our Nation's economy, and it is important for the Federal Government to encourage domestic hiring and expansion. This amendment will help achieve that goal by returning 7(a) loan fees to their previous affordable level.

Access to affordable capital is an important alternative to higher-interest personal credit cards, which, while helpful, have become the number one source of financing for U.S. entrepreneurs for lack of options.

Since October 2004, loan costs have increased by up to $3,000, and program utilization and loan capital have dropped drastically by almost half a million dollars. We have been told today that the SBA is processing more loans than ever before, that is true, but the loans being processed are significantly smaller. After the new fees were put in place, the average amount received by individual small businesses has dropped by approximately $75,000.

The small business community creates up to 80 percent of the new jobs in this country. The SBA estimates that a new job is created for every $33,000 in small business loans. Thus, $79 million in Federal investment has the potential to create 500,000 jobs in this country.

First, let us correct the rhetoric. These are not subsidies or handouts that we are talking about. These are loans at affordable interest rates, and if one is for deficit reduction, then they should support this amendment, which reduces the overall cost to the bill by $32 million per the Congressional Budget Office.

It is time that Congress steps forward to support the small business community through access to affordable capital. The Velazquez amendment will reduce fees to small business owners and lenders and create an environment which will foster critical domestic job growth and the local economic expansion so vital to the Eighth District of Illinois and to communities across the Nation.

I urge my colleagues' support of this amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO).

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, in looking at the figures for the gentlewoman from Illinois' (Ms. BEAN) district, my colleague, for fiscal year 2004, there were 193 loans, that is 7(a) loans, totaling $31 million. So far, to date, in fiscal year 2005, 7 months, there are 177 loans at $26 million. That is almost there.

At this rate, the number of loans in 2005 will greatly exceed the number of loans in 2004, showing that when the subsidy was cut and the taxpayers saved $79 million, more loans were given in the gentlewoman from Illinois' (Ms. BEAN) district than when the subsidy was in effect.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire as to how much time I have left?

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. THORNBERRY). The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I have two additional speakers, and I ask unanimous consent for 2 more additional minutes on each side.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) has 4 minutes remaining.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, the Small Business Administration 7(a) loan program is a proven success. In past years it has provided 30 percent of all long-term small business loans in this country, making it the largest source of public or private financing. So one would assume that such a proven program would be supported by everyone.

However, last year we found out that when there was a choice between more tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans or helping our small businesses, the administration and the Republican leadership were all too willing to change that 7(a) program in conference, so that all expenses and risks would be borne by the small businesses themselves.

The result of this change is exactly what we predicted. Fees for loans of less than $150,000 have nearly doubled. Fees for larger loans have risen by $3,000 to $5,000. Fifty lenders have dropped out of the program. It is much harder for small businesses in rural areas and small towns to get loans. Most significantly, 7(a) lending has decreased every quarter since the new fees were added, and the amount of the average 7(a) loan has dropped by $75,000 since the changes have been put in place.

So we have a problem, and the Velázquez amendment would solve that problem, restoring funding for the 7(a) program, $79 million for loan-loss reserves, which will leverage $18 billion in new loans. Vote for the Velázquez amendment.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO).

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support for the Velazquez amendment to H.R. 2862. This amendment would restore funding for the Small Business Administration's 7(a) loan guarantee program at fiscal year 2004 levels.

Small businesses are the driving force behind job creation and productivity-enhancing technology. The 7(a) loan program has been a worthwhile investment for taxpayers, as statistics demonstrate impressive returns insofar as business growth and job creation, especially, Mr. Chairman, in economically disadvantaged areas like the territory of Guam that I represent.

Perhaps for this reason a similar amendment introduced last year garnered strong support from both sides of the aisle, and therefore, I urge my colleagues to send a strong message that the House continues to value the importance of this program by again voting to restore funding for the 7(a) loan program.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) for a unanimous consent request.

(Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my firm support for the amendment offered by my colleague Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and for continuous and increased funding for the Small Business Administration 7(a) loans programs.

Designed as a public-private partnership, the 7(a) program helps small businesses that otherwise could not obtain a commercial bank loan.

By minimizing the risk to lenders, the SBA's 7(a) loans program secures access for small businesses to the affordable capital they need to start, develop and flourish.

7(a) loans are the most widely used SBA program. These loans provide critical funding for start-ups, real estate acquisition, business expansion, recapitalization, working capital, and machinery and equipment purchase.

The 7(a) loan program has proved to be an insightful and successful initiative.

Just in 2003, these loans benefited more than 70,000 small businesses. And over the last decade, they provided resources for over 424,000 small businesses.

Today, 7(a) loans provide 30 percent of all long-term loans for small business lending.

Unfortunately, the budget under consideration today, fails to provide the resources that small businesses in this country require to continue flourishing.

It fails to restore funding for the SBA's 7(a) loan program and to decrease the harsh conditions that small businesses confront to access affordable capital.

I would remind my colleagues of the critical importance and contribution that small businesses represent for our country.

Small businesses are the most important driving force of our economy. But they require access to capital in order to continue as the catalyst for the U.S. economy.

The rationale behind the 7(a) program is that of investment, cooperation and success.

It is a national partnership for growth, productivity and welfare.

For all these reasons, I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment, which will benefit all Americans.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I am ready to close if the gentleman does not have any other speakers.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I would close when it is appropriate under the rules.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is a vote for helping small businesses. Today the program is more costly, $3,000 more, and half a billion dollars less is going into the economy. We have also seen a 50 percent drop in lenders, which has a particularly negative impact on rural communities. This is not a picture of stability, but the good news is that we can fix this. By voting ''yes'' on the Velazquez amendment, we can return the 7(a) program to a source of affordable capital for our Nation's small business owners.

Almost 20 national groups, from the National Small Business Association and the Hotel and Motel Association to the Independent Community Bankers and the Credit Unions, say that this is a problem, and they want us to fix it.

For the small commitment on the government's part, we can create jobs and create economic growth, two of the most important things we can do right now. That is why I encourage my colleagues to support my amendment, the same amendment that was voted last year overwhelmingly.

Let me just say, Mr. Chairman, that when SBA claims that they are doing record levels, what they do not say is that they are comparing the program's performance to a time last year when it was shut down and operating under a $750,000 cap. When compared to the last quarter before fees were raised, the program actually shows a decline of over $500.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote for the Velazquez amendment.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) has 6½ minutes remaining.

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

The numbers cited by the proponents of this amendment say that SBA's numbers are deceiving. I understand what the gentlewoman is trying to do.

I have information here on the gentlewoman's district, showing that 7(a) demand is up. Last year in the gentlewoman's district, for the entire year, there were 7,849 loans. This year, for the year to date, meaning there are still 3½ months left to the end of the fiscal year, the figure is 9,267 loans, if that trend continues, the number of loans will, almost double. It is one of the few times we have actually made a difference and rolled something back in this body.

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

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct the record.

Mr. Chairman, yes, it might be true they are doing more loans, but they do not say that they are rationing capital in its loan program. The average loan size for the 7(a) loan program today is $170,000. The average for an African American is only $86,000. The average loan for an Hispanic is $128,000, and this is happening because the restrictions that they have imposed on the 7(a) loan program.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments as well.

Hector Barreto, the SBA Administrator, in a letter dated June 3, 2005, that he sent in opposition to the amendment says: ''Through May 20, 2005, SBA guaranteed 60,266 small business loans, a 24 percent increase over the number of loans approved at the same time in 2004.''

That is dramatic, and the cost of this amendment will be upwards of $70-plus million.

I continue to read the letter, ''At this time last year, SBA had guaranteed more than $7 billion in 7(a) loans which was a record-setting figure.''

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

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, well, the numbers that Mr. Barreto is giving my colleague is when the program was shut down, and he does not say to my colleague that they are doing $2 billion below what they said they would be doing at this time.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the gentlewoman.

He goes on to say: ''I am proud to report that as of May 20, 2005, SBA has shattered that record by guaranteeing more than $9.2 billion in loans to America's entrepreneurs.''

Then he goes on to say: ''If you go deeper into these statistics, you can see that 7(a) loan volume has increased for women and minority entrepreneurs in fiscal year 2005, up 52 percent to African Americans, up 49 percent to women, up 15 percent to Hispanics, and up 16 percent to Asian Americans.

''At this pace,'' Mr. Barreto goes on to say, ''SBA will likely surpass the fiscal year 2004 figures for both dollars guaranteed and the number of loans approved; especially if you consider that the fourth quarter of the fiscal year traditionally witnesses the highest volume of loans.''

He closes by saying, ''Mr. Chairman, I believe these number speak for themselves,'' and they do speak for themselves, ''and should serve to reassure supporters that the 7(a) program is running strong without need of a subsidy or a reduction in fees.''

I want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MANZULLO). He was on the other side last year. Not many people in this institution do that. I mean, he got up and said, yes, this is right, and I commend him for that. I think it is the right thing to do.

The thing that I worry about, if anyone is listening to this, is if we roll this

back in this tight budget, where do we find the money? I mean, if there was really a crisis with regard to small business, I would be for this amendment, but the loans are up, and if they are up, and to take all this, if I can just ask the staff how much would this amendment take, $79 million? We just had a debate on meth. If we are going to do anything, let us put $79 million in meth. If we are going to do anything, let us put $79 million in fighting the drug trade.

But we are going to take $79 million when we do not have a problem. Let us give it to the war on terrorism. Let us give it to the first responders, but not to a program that does not even need it, does not even want it, does not even ask for it.

I understand what they are saying, but if this amendment passes, I am going to go home very discouraged tonight. I think the passage of this amendment, in my own mind, if this amendment is passed, it will tell me, and it should be telling the American people, that we will never, ever be able to deal with the deficit again. There is no need for this, they are not asking for it, and the figures show that loans are up by 24 percent. The chairman for the committee who was for this amendment last year is now against it, and there is just no hope. It is a Katie-bar-the-door, we are going to spend whatever we need to spend.

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

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If my colleague is for deficit reduction, with this amendment we will reduce the deficit by $32 million. Then, if we pass this amendment, $78 million we leverage, $15 billion in loans, and create half a million jobs at a time when the economy is struggling to replace the jobs that we have lost.

□ 1430

Mr. WOLF. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I just do not think the American people could ever understand that by spending $79 million of additional money that we will help the deficit. I urge a ''no'' vote on the amendment.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Velázquez amendment amendment and thank the gentlewoman from New York on all her efforts to help small busineses. I am pleased that this amendment will reinstate funding for the 7(a) loan program and ensure that small businesses will once again be able to benefit from its lending power.

As a former small business owner, I know the frustrations and worries small business owners have had as this program has been repeatedly targeted by the Bush administration. Small businesses are one of our Nation's leading employment opportunities but few businesses can afford to startup or expand without the help of loans.

The president likes to talk about an ''ownership society,'' but his budget hurts middle class Americans by denying funding for this program. How can we have a strong middle class if we don't extend opportunities for people to start their own businesses? This just doesn't make sense.

Renewing our commitment to the small business administration 7(a) loan program will not only bolster our Nation's workforce but also the economy as a whole. This program gives people a chance to start a business of their own and make a positive impact on their lives and their communities.

Mr. Chairman, I want to urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this important amendment and our small business owners.

Mr. SALAZAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Velázquez amendment to the Science-State-Justice Appropriations bill. I thank the gentle1ady from New York for her leadership and the opportunity to speak in favor of the Section 7(a) Small Business Loan Program. The 3rd Congressional District of Colorado is a large rural district with many small businesses that have benefited from the SBA's lending programs.

In 2004, the Section 7(a) provided 25.4 million dollars in loans to small businesses within my congressional district. As you know, this program helps provide capital to small business owners who are unable to access traditional financing alternatives. These small businesses provide critical jobs and are the economic engine that help drive the economy in my congressional district.

Small businesses able to take advantage of this program have added new jobs to the economy. The Section 7(a) program has created approximately 742 jobs in my district alone. It is vital that these small businesses have the resources and capital necessary to operate, otherwise rural communities will continue to fall further behind the rest of the country in ecomomic growth.

The Section 7(a) loan program is a proven success; it provides critical assistance to small busineses and I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment. I thank the gentlelady for the opportunity to speak on behalf of this important amendment.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Velázquez Amendment and in support of America's small businesses. It is vital that we as the United States Government do all we can to foster the growth of jobs in our economy. To accomplish this we must provide the businesses with enough affordable capital to start and grow. Mr. Chairman, this will create those jobs. I am sad to say that we have not done enough to help out the small businesses that need it most.

Over the last decade we have drastically reduced the appropriated amount for the Small Business Administration's 7(a) loan program, in 1995 it was funded at nearly $200 million but last year a mere $79 million.

Mr. Chairman, I am from Cleveland, Ohio, which at the moment is the most impoverished city in the Nation. Ninety-five percent of the private sector jobs are provided by small businesses, therefore the creation of jobs and the growth of our small businesses is vital to our economic recovery.

The Small Business Administration's 7(a) lending program is essential for small business owners who cannot access capital through conventional markets. However, the program has been and is being underfunded and the burden has been shifting increasingly onto small business owners. Recent changes in the program have increased the fees to access the 7(a) program, which diminishes access of small business owners.

The 7(a) program was created to provide capital to those businesses that need it most. By making the program more expensive, we are defeating its original purpose.

I stand in support of restoring the FY 2004 appropriated level of $79 million. It is the least we can do to help small businesses grow in our country.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend Ranking Member VELÁZQUEZ for her continued commitment to working on behalf of small businesses and once again bringing legislation to the House floor to save the 7(a) loan program.

Mr. Chairman, this year as in last year, the administration has requested zero funding for the premier lending program for the Small Business Administration. The 7(a) loan program has been systematically dismantled by the Administration. By eliminating funding, the program now runs only on the fees. charged to small businesses and lenders—which make the program inherently unstable. The recent changes have created a less stable program and increased its lending fees. Since the fee increase, small business lending declined every quarter for a total of more than half a billion dollars so far this year.

The 7(a) loan program has been a worthwhile program, particularly to women-owned business. Women-owned businesses are just as financially strong and creditworthy as the average US firm and deserve more options to raise capital. These companies have similar performance on bill payment and several levels of credit risk, and are just as likely to remain in business—yet they still fail to receive the capital needed to grow. In FY 2004, the 7(a) loan program provided more than 15,000 loans to women-owned businesses totaling nearly $2 billion.

A vote for Velázquez amendment would help guarantee that the 7(a) loan program would remain affordable for small businesses. Last year, the House overwhelmingly voted on a similar amendment to provide funding for this program. I urge my colleagues to once again support this amendment to rectify a wrong, and ensure that small businesses can still benefit from the program.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the reinstatement of funding for the Small Business Administration's 7(a) loan program. The 7(a) program provides crucial support for small businesses around the country, and funding should be restored immediately.

Central New Jersey has always worked hard to strengthen its position as a national leader in technological and economic innovation. For decades, the state's small businesses have led this charge, escorting communities toward independence and inspiration.

Without consistent governmental support, though, small businesses will falter and stagnate. And without consistent small business support, local communities and economies will suffer. We owe it to the state's small businesses to restore funding to the SBA's exceptional 7(a) program.

Consider that one new job is created for every $33,000 that SBA's 7(a) program guarantees. And consider that in just the past decade, SBA has approved over four hundred thousand loans, for more than $90 billion. You

can do the math: that's a total of 2.7 million new jobs in just the last ten years. But with the lack of appropriations in FY2005, the average origination fees on small business loans doubled, creating between $1,500 and $3,000 in new costs for the average small business owner. The inevitable result is less small business access to capital, less expansion, less hiring, and less economic development.

In the past decades, we've all seen that many of the country's strongest local economies are sprouting in areas famous worldwide for their technological prowess: California's Silicon Valley; North Carolina's Research Triangle; Boston's Route 128 Corridor. Central New Jersey's growing high-technology community—Einstein's Alley—belongs squarely on that list. Establishing a center of technological innovation in central New Jersey will guarantee New Jersey's continued future as one of the greatest states in the Union. Without support from the state's small businesses, though, such a technological center could never evolve.

Strengthening New Jersey's economy and reinforcing its role as an innovation leader will benefit all New Jersey residents. A research-based economy will require regional improvements in transportation and telecommunications infrastructure, which will help reduce traffic and produce more efficient transportation options for us all. A research-based economy will require a larger tax base, which will drive down individual tax rates. And a research-based economy will demand quality schools and livable communities, in order to attract the best and the brightest entrepreneurs and employees to our region.

Central New Jersey has long lived and thrived on the frontier of scientific and technological innovation. Einstein's Alley will be home to vibrant communities, cutting-edge companies, and productive workers whose unique assets and shared vision attract new, innovative industries and create many more good jobs to add to what we already have. None of that will be possible, however, without extensive small business support. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge every Member of this body to vote to restore the SBA's 7(a) program to its FY2004 funding level.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. THORNBERRY). The time of the gentleman has expired. All time for debate on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

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

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) will be postponed.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. Chairman, I know where I can spend 29 million of those dollars real quick.

I regret today, and I say this because I really truly regret, because I have great respect for the chairman of the subcommittee, but I have to oppose this legislation because it fails to include the funds necessary to implement the Pribilof Islands' environmental cleanup agreement between the State of Alaska and NOAA.

The Pribilof Islands lay in the middle of the Bering Sea. Two of the islands are inhabited today, St. Paul and St. George. Neither was inhabited until the 1780s, when the Russians forcibly relocated residents of the Aleutian Islands to the Pribs to harvest the then-valuable pelts of the North Pacific fur seal and the stellar sea lion.

The Russians retained ownership of the land and the profits from the harvest. After the United States purchased Alaska, the Federal Government treated the Pribilof residents no better. Like the Russians before us, we retained ownership of all the island property and the fur seal profits. The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and its successors were the employer, municipal government, overseer, and landlord of the islands' residents.

The profits from the fur seal trade offset the entire purchase price of Alaska, $7.5 million, in less than 20 years. However, by 1983, profits from the fur seal trade no longer offset the expense of managing the islands, when the decision was made to transfer ownership and responsibility for the islands to the residents.

This was not a humanitarian undertaking. The profits were gone, so the Office of Management and Budget saw no need to continue to own the islands. The framework for this transfer process was laid out in the 1983 amendments to the Fur Seal Act.

Unfortunately, the transition plans have not gone smoothly, quickly, or efficiently. In 2000, Congress adopted further amendments to the Fur Seal Act that were designed to get the process back on track. Since then, significant progress has been made. However, additional environmental cleanup work remains to be done.

Unfortunately, the bill before us provides no meaningful funds for the cleanup, not even the insufficient $7.3 million requested by the President. It includes $3.5 million to be divided between three environmental cleanup projects, one of which is the Pribs. It also allows the agency to reprogram unobligated balances for the project, something NOAA can already do.

I cannot deny that, prior to the year 2000, NOAA's project management was terrible. Right now, though, it has improved. In the year 2000, the agency brought in new project managers; and these managers, especially Dave Kennedy and John Lindsay, have defined the scope of the project, established meaningful cost estimates and timetables. From 1996 through 2000, NOAA cleaned up 11 sites. Since 2000, the agency has cleaned up 75 sites. Nine sites remain.

Of course, these timetables and cost estimates are only meaningful if sufficient funds are provided to carry them out. This year, no cleanup work will be done because of the funding cuts. This means the cleanup will not be finished in 2006 as planned, but will lapse into 2007.

Congressional cuts in the administration's cleanup request in fiscal years 2003, 2004 and 2005 have been devastating. Effectively eliminating funding in fiscal year 2006 means that we are abandoning this project and saying it is okay for Federal agencies to pollute native lands with impunity.

When developing the Fur Seal Act amendments in 2000, Congress undertook a detailed review of the transition scenario established in the 1983 Fur Seal Act amendments. By 1983, the fur seal profit had diminished, and Federal expenditures on the islands had risen to $6.3 million annually. NOAA estimates that 95 percent of those expenditures were for municipal and social services.

In 1982, NOAA proposed a scheme to transfer municipal operations on the islands to local control and end the Federal subsidy. That plan consisted of four parts: the first was a $20 million trust fund. The trust fund was established and fully capitalized.

Second was the construction of useable harbors by the State. The State was very clear in testimony before Congress that it had made no such commitment, and in fact it did not fund harbor construction.

Third, the government would transfer most of its land to the local entities. That transfer is still not complete.

Fourth, the islands would manage and retain the income from the fur seal harvest. The government ended that commercial fur seal harvest the next year.

Given the failure to carry out two of the four pieces of the transition plan, and the complete abrogation of a third piece, Congress decided in 2000 to finish the cleanup and land transfer. Because of the chronic underfunding of the cleanup program, it will take roughly an additional $16 million and two more years to complete the work required by the two-party agreement between NOAA and the State of Alaska. If we put it off further, or underfund the remaining work this year, it will take longer and cost more.

I know and have great respect for the chairman of this subcommittee, and I know that he cares deeply about oppressed people throughout the world. Before finishing this bill, I hope he will look at the embarrassing history of our government in regards to the citizens of the Pribilof Islands and realize the least we can do is remove the environmental contamination which occurred under NOAA.

Mr. Chairman, because of this issue, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on H.R. 2862.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments to this section, the Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW AND APPEALS

For expenses necessary for the administration of pardon and clemency petitions and immigration-related activities, $215,685,000.

DETENTION TRUSTEE

For necessary expenses of the Federal Detention Trustee, $1,222,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Trustee shall be responsible for managing the Justice Prisoner and Alien Transportation System and for overseeing housing related to such detention: *Provided further*, That any unobligated balances available in prior years from the funds appropriated under the heading ''Federal Prisoner Detention'' shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation under the heading ''Detention Trustee'' and shall be available until expended.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General, $66,801,000, including not to exceed $10,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character.

UNITED STATES PAROLE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Parole Commission as authorized, $11,200,000.

LEGAL ACTIVITIES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES

For expenses necessary for the legal activities of the Department of Justice, not otherwise provided for, including not to exceed $20,000 for expenses of collecting evidence, to be expended under the direction of, and to be accounted for solely under the certificate of, the Attorney General; and rent of private or Government-owned space in the District of Columbia, $665,821,000, of which not to exceed $10,000,000 for litigation support contracts shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed $1,000 shall be available to the United States National Central Bureau, INTERPOL, for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 105 of this Act, upon a determination by the Attorney General that emergent circumstances require additional funding for litigation activities of the Civil Division, the Attorney General may transfer such amounts to ''Salaries and Expenses, General Legal Activities'' from available appropriations for the current fiscal year for the Department of Justice, as may be necessary to respond to such circumstances: *Provided further*, That any transfer pursuant to the previous proviso shall be treated as a reprogramming under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

In addition, for reimbursement of expenses of the Department of Justice associated with processing cases under the National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, not to exceed $6,333,000, to be appropriated from the Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

For expenses necessary for the enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws, $144,451,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, not to exceed $116,000,000 of offsetting collections derived from fees collected for premerger notification filings under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976 (15 U.S.C. 18a), regardless of the year of collection, shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2006, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2006 appropriation from the general fund estimated at not more than $28,451,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

For necessary expenses of the Offices of the United States Attorneys, including inter-governmental and cooperative agreements, $1,626,146,000: *Provided*, That of the total amount appropriated, not to exceed $8,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $20,000,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That, in addition to reimbursable full-time equivalent workyears available to the Offices of the United States Attorneys, not to exceed 10,465 positions and 10,451 full-time equivalent workyears shall be supported from the funds appropriated in this Act for the United States Attorneys.

UNITED STATES TRUSTEE SYSTEM FUND

For necessary expenses of the United States Trustee Program, as authorized, $214,402,000, to remain available until expended and to be derived from the United States Trustee System Fund: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, deposits to the Fund shall be available in such amounts as may be necessary to pay refunds due depositors: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, $214,402,000 of offsetting collections pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 589a(b) shall be retained and used for necessary expenses in this appropriation and remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the Fund shall be reduced as such offsetting collections are received during fiscal year 2006, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2006 appropriation from the Fund estimated at $0.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the activities of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, $1,220,000.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the United States Marshals Service, $800,255,000; of which not to exceed $6,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses; and of which $20,000,000 for information technology systems, equipment, and the renovation of United States Marshals Service prisoner holding space in United States courthouses and Federal buildings shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That, in addition to reimbursable full-time equivalent workyears available to the United States Marshals Service, not to exceed 4,729 positions and 4,551 full-time equivalent workyears shall be supported from the funds appropriated in this Act for the United States Marshals Service.

FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES

For fees and expenses of witnesses, for expenses of contracts for the procurement and supervision of expert witnesses, for private counsel expenses, including advances, such sums as are necessary, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed $8,000,000 may be made available for construction of buildings for protected witness safesites: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $1,000,000 may be made available for the purchase and maintenance of armored vehicles for transportation of protected witnesses: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $7,000,000 may be made available for the purchase, installation, maintenance and upgrade of secure telecommunications equipment and a secure automated information network to store and retrieve the identities and locations of protected witnesses.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the Community Relations Service, $9,659,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 105 of this Act, upon a determination by the Attorney General that emergent circumstances require additional funding for conflict resolution and violence prevention activities of the Community Relations Service, the Attorney General may transfer such amounts to the Community Relations Service, from available appropriations for the current fiscal year for the Department of Justice, as may be necessary to respond to such circumstances: *Provided further*, That any transfer pursuant to the previous proviso shall be treated as a reprogramming under section 605 of this Act and shall not be available for obligation or expenditure except in compliance with the procedures set forth in that section.

ASSETS FORFEITURE FUND

For expenses authorized by 28 U.S.C. 524(c)(1)(B), (F), and (G), $21,468,000, to be derived from the Department of Justice Assets Forfeiture Fund.

INTERAGENCY LAW ENFORCEMENT

INTERAGENCY CRIME AND DRUG ENFORCEMENT

For necessary expenses for the identification, investigation, and prosecution of individuals associated with the most significant drug trafficking and affiliated money laundering organizations not otherwise provided for, to include inter-governmental agreements with State and local law enforcement agencies engaged in the investigation and prosecution of individuals involved in organized crime drug trafficking, $506,940,000, of which $50,000,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That any amounts obligated from appropriations under this heading may be used under authorities available to the organizations reimbursed from this appropriation.

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for detection, investigation, and prosecution of crimes against the United States; including purchase for police-type use of not to exceed 3,868 passenger motor vehicles, of which 3,039 will be for replacement only; and not to exceed $70,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 530C, $5,741,132,000; of which not to exceed $150,000,000 shall remain available until expended; of which $2,288,897,000 shall be for counterterrorism investigations, foreign counterintelligence, and other activities related to our national security; and of which not to exceed $25,000,000 is authorized to be made available for making advances for expenses arising out of contractual or reimbursable agreements with State and local law enforcement agencies while engaged in cooperative activities related to violent crime, terrorism, organized crime, gang-related crime, cybercrime, and drug investigations: *Provided*, That not to exceed $205,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That, in addition to reimbursable full-time equivalent workyears available to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, not to exceed 31,668 positions and 30,525 full-time equivalent workyears shall be supported from the funds appropriated in this Act for the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. REICHERT

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. REICHERT:

Page 10, line 15, after the first dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $50,000,000)''.

Page 12, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $11,683,000)''.

Page 26, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $78,289,000)''.

Page 71, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $16,606,000)''.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment, and any amendments thereto, conclude in 15 minutes, and that the remaining time be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and myself, the opponent.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT) will control 7½ minutes and a Member opposed will control 7½ minutes.

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

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume and first of all would like to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for his great work in helping local law enforcement, but I rise today to speak on an issue that is more than something I believe in; it is who I am.

The COPS program is an essential program to our local law enforcement, and I am here today in support of it. I spent 33 years of my life as a cop. I worked my way up the ladder. I served as patrol officer, jail guard, detective, lieutenant, and finally the sheriff in King County in Seattle, Washington. I became a cop because deep in my heart I believed I could make a difference in the community and that I could protect it. The COPS program enforces that ideal.

Since 9/11, we have found our local cops in an unusual dilemma. They are expected to carry out new homeland security duties as first responders, while at the same time maintaining their original responsibilities. I am a member of the Select Committee on Homeland Security, and I believe our country's security is a priority, but I do not think that we should be carrying out this function as an unfunded mandate at the expense of local law enforcement.

We are seeing Federal law enforcement receive an unprecedented amount of funding, while at the same time the scope and the responsibility of first responders on the front lines is increasing without parallel funding. Even in this amendment, restoring COPS funding to its original level of last year still allows for very significant increases to the Federal law enforcement agencies.

In my experience, local and Federal law enforcement are most effective when they are working together. Teamwork is the key. You would not play a football game by sending some of the players out onto the field with pads and helmets and others with no equipment at all. In a team, all players should be valued equally, especially in law enforcement, where our fights have to be balanced, our attacks have to be balanced both local and Federal.

In the war on drugs, in the war on terror, in the national fight against gangs, local police officers and Federal agents are all working together towards the same goal of making our country safer. According to Attorney General John Ashcroft: ''Since law enforcement agencies began partnering with citizens through community policing, we have seen significant drops in crime rates.'' Now that crime has dropped, we are going to cut the funding that has kept our communities safe? That is absurd.

Local cops are the ones on the front lines, they are the men and the women keeping our families safe daily, protecting our children in school, monitoring gang violence, the first responders who are there when you call 911. You do not pay a lesser price for your family's safety than you do for homeland security.

We are in a new era of both family and national security. Both our first responders play a dual role, as the first ones on the scene in the case of a terrorist attack and the first ones on the scene in everyday emergencies as well. One is not worth less than the other. Cops must be well prepared and equipped for any emergency they are sent into.

Mr. Chairman, this program is vital. Across the country it procures equipment, combats domestic violence, puts cops in schools, fights meth gangs, and much, much more. I urge my colleagues to support the COPS program and vote for this amendment today.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and yield myself 5 minutes.

My father, as I said in one of the other amendments, was a policeman. The fact is when I think of the name COPS, my dad used to tell me never to call policemen cops, and I even have a hard time saying the word cops, while I know it is the title of the bill. My father was a Philadelphia policeman for 20-some years.

I rise in strong opposition to the amendment. I understand what the gentleman is trying to do, but perhaps the most important program we fund in this bill is the FBI and its efforts to protect the Nation from terrorist attacks.

Thirty people from my congressional district died in the attack on the Pentagon. The first CIA person killed in Afghanistan was from my congressional district. This amendment cuts the FBI by $50 million while the threat of terrorism and espionage from countries, such as China, and the spread of gangs increases.

And I would tell the gentleman that I met with a group of local law enforcement people around the country, and some were from Washington State, one police chief; and gangs are an important issue. We have a carve-out of $60 million in this bill with regard to gangs.

We must provide the FBI, though, with the sufficient resources to combat these threats. This amendment would go the other way.

The bill funds the FBI at the requested level when you account for the Administration's proposal to reduce the FBI's appropriation by $50 million and move it to OCDETF. The committee rejected this proposed transfer, as members on both sides asked us to do.

If you combine the requested increase for the FBI salaries and expenses and requested reimbursement for the FBI under OCDETF, this bill is equal to the request. A reduction now of $50 million from the FBI will reduce the number of funded FBI agents by 365. Now, why would we want to reduce the FBI by 365 agents?

According to the testimony of Director Mueller, there could be, and probably is, al Qaeda sleeper cells operating in the U.S. The committee heard testimony that Hamas and Hezbollah have operatives in the U.S. In fact, as I said to the Director: ''Are there Hezbollah operators in the United States?'' His answer was: ''Yes, there are Hezbollah.'' And keep in mind, Hezbollah are the ones who blew up the 241 Marines in Beirut.

□ 1445

That group that blew up the American Embassy and the 241 marines in Beirut, that man who put that effort together, still walks the street. We know the dangers of Iran, and the Director says Hezbollah and Hamas are here, and we want to take 365 agents away.

Time Magazine reports that more than 3,000 companies in the U.S. are suspected of collecting information for China. China is spying against our companies in the United States, and I urge all Members to get that FBI briefing.

The Department of Justice estimates there are approximately 30,000 gangs with 800,000 members impacting 2,500 communities. This amendment would basically take away all of the money in the bill for gangs. If you happen to have been one of the Members who voted for the bill fighting gangs from several weeks ago, this money takes out all of the money for last year as well as this year. There is so much to

deal with on the issue of gang and gang violence.

It would also have a very negative impact on DEA. We heard earlier today about meth. This amendment cuts DEA by $12 million. The debate conflicts. It switches back and forth. We are not doing enough to combat drugs, do this, do that. And so now this amendment runs counter to all of the other things we have discussed. We take $12 million from DEA. The bill provides DEA with funding above the budget request in order to restore the proposed reductions to combat meth by fully funding mobile enforcement teams. Members said do not cut those teams because locally this is so important. This literally takes out those teams. They will not be there.

The amendment hurts DEA's effort to combat meth, will result in a destruction of more lives in this deadly game. Members saw the pictures that the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) had.

It also reduces the Broadcasting Board of Governors by $16 million. If we cannot broadcast into the Middle East, and into Afghanistan and into Iran and Iraq, we are in trouble. This is a bad amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) makes some excellent points. Actually, the gentleman makes some of the points I made in my initial statement.

I was the sheriff up until January 3 of this year. I have been on the front lines, as I said, for 33 years. I have kicked in doors; I have arrested drug dealers, prostitutes, pimps, murderers, robbers, and burglars. I have arrested gang members. I have been in meth houses and seen children sitting on the couches of homes where meth is cooked and made.

If the battle for homeland security is taking place across the sea in Iraq, it is also taking place right here in this country. As I partnered in the last 7 or 8 years as sheriff, as I partnered with the FBI, the DEA, the people who lead the charge in the Seattle FBI offices and DEA offices and Federal offices, the word I heard loud and clear over and over: Local law enforcement is important. Local law enforcement is a partner. Local law enforcement is key. Sharing information, working with local law enforcement is our top priority.

But in fact what happens today is we talk about a $588 million increase to the FBI. We are talking about taking away $50 million. They would still see an increase of over half a billion dollars in their budget this year. DEA would still see an increase of over $55 million in their budget this year, still bringing back $78 million to COPS.

To build that partnership, and when I talk about building a football team and some having equipment and some not having equipment, when Congress gives $588 million to the FBI and gives $55-plus million to DEA and other Federal agencies, and yet is taking away $78 million from the rest of the team. It just does not make sense.

This has to be a team effort, and if the Federal Government and Federal agencies mean what they say about team spirit and working together in partnerships, they need to show it by funding COPS fully. Bring back the $78 million that they are suggesting be removed from their budget.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment not because I oppose the COPS program, because I know the chairman does not oppose the Community-Oriented Policing Services program. As he indicated, his family understands how important community policing is. But I rise in opposition to this amendment because of the offsets. As Chairman WOLF has pointed out, the gentleman makes unacceptable offsets here.

I would ask, does the gentleman from Washington really think that a $50 million cut from the FBI, including funding for counterterrorism and counterintelligence programs, is something that the FBI can do without?

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

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

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Chairman, I know that local law enforcement is involved in those same programs as partners with the FBI.

As sheriff in Seattle, one of the projects we were involved in is we had detectives assigned from the sheriff's office to the Washington Joint Analytical Center, which is a center that analyzes incoming intelligence data for homeland security and for other crimes in the county. We also were members as a local law enforcement agency of the Joint Terrorism Task Force, and other task forces, Federal task forces, that existed in King County.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time because I only have 2 minutes, I need a little more efficient answer. Does the gentleman think that the FBI's counterterrorism program can stand a $50 million cut from what we have appropriated and recommend in this bill?

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I do not think the FBI counterterrorism program can afford to lose the local support that they already have.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman think that his amendment, which cuts DE mobile enforcement teams, which go out and help State and local fight methamphetamine, does the gentleman think we can afford to cut those programs?

Mr. REICHERT. Does the gentleman think we can afford to cut local police and firefighters programs?

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I reclaim my time. My point is, Mr. Chairman, the cuts are simply unacceptable. The purpose is laudable. The offsets are unacceptable.

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

I would just restate some of the obvious here. Again, this is a partnership. The FBI is gaining a great deal of money in this budget proposal, $500 million. I think they can work within that framework. Again, local law enforcement is getting cut $78 million. This truly has to be a partnership. Let us bring the COPS program back to its 2005 level, increasing it by the $78 million which is the proposed cut.

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

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

The first telephone call you would make if you found out a loved one was kidnapped would be to the FBI. We want to take $50 million away from that first agency you would call.

Meth—why do Members want to cut the DEA when we are all concerned about meth?

International broadcasting in Afghanistan and Iraq tell the story and do a good job. You do not want to take money from law enforcement to help law enforcement. There is a different way. This is not a good idea. I urge defeat of the amendment so the FBI has the necessary resources so it can do what it wants to do.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. THORNBERRY). All time for debate on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT).

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

Mr. REICHERT. 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 Washington (Mr. REICHERT) will be postponed.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION

For necessary expenses to construct or acquire buildings and sites by purchase, or as otherwise authorized by law (including equipment for such buildings); conversion and extension of Federally-owned buildings; and preliminary planning and design of projects; $20,105,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That $10,000,000 shall be available for equipment and associated costs for a permanent central records complex in Frederick County, Virginia.

DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Drug Enforcement Administration, including not to exceed $70,000 to meet unforeseen emergencies of a confidential character pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 530C; expenses for conducting drug education and training programs, including travel and related expenses for participants in such programs and the distribution of items of token value that promote

the goals of such programs; and purchase of not to exceed 1,043 passenger motor vehicles, of which 937 will be for replacement only, for police-type use, $1,706,173,000; of which not to exceed $75,000,000 shall remain available until expended; and of which not to exceed $100,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That, in addition to reimbursable full-time equivalent workyears available to the Drug Enforcement Administration, not to exceed 8,371 positions and 8,270 full-time equivalent workyears shall be supported from the funds appropriated in this Act for the Drug Enforcement Administration.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BAIRD

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAIRD:

Page 12, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 26, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 39, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 39, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 40, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Mr. BAIRD (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment, and any amendments thereto, conclude by 10 minutes, and that the remaining time be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and myself, the opponent.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) each will control 5 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, it is no coincidence that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. REICHERT), as a former sheriff, spoke earlier about the problem with meth. I rise to address the same problem with a much different, but I think a more appropriate, offset.

Methamphetamine is the leading cause of crime in a number of States. It is the fastest-growing drug. It is responsible for identity theft, murders, domestic violence and horrific disfigurement of its users. We have seen a dramatic growth in methamphetamine over the years, and it is pervasive in the communities. Unfortunately, we are not winning this battle, and we must win this battle.

What I propose is fairly simple. It would provide $10 million to the Community-Oriented Policing Service program to be used for providing training to State and local prosecutors and law enforcement agents for investigation and prosecution of offenses. Of that $10 million, $3 million would be set aside for prosecutors and law enforcement agents in rural communities, and we would also provide $10 million to DEA to combat international trafficking.

Let me explain why we need to do this. Methamphetamine comes from two sources, locally manufactured so-called clan labs where the drug is made from locally available materials, and internationally imported precursors and finished product. We must confront both of these. They are destroying our families and destroying our communities.

The offset we have offered in this bill, I think, is thoroughly appropriate. Here is where it comes from: $20 million would be taken from 2010 census program, $10 million in budget authority from salaries and expenses, and $10 million in budget authority offset would come from the short form of the census.

Since fiscal year 2001, this Congress has approved close to $2.73 billion for the census. Let me say that again: $2.73 billion for the census. This year alone we are proposing to add $832 million in funding for the census. And by comparison, this bill calls for only $520 million for the COPS program.

Ask your average man and woman on the street, your law enforcement agencies, your emergency rooms, treatment centers, schools, where should we spend the money? Billions of dollars for the census, or to intercept international narcotrafficking and bringing in methamphetamine precursors and finished product?

We have a war on terror internationally, but I can tell Members the terror in our communities is being caused by methamphetamine. I used to treat meth addicts. It is a devastating drug. That is why I cofounded the Methamphetamine Caucus, a bipartisan caucus. We must get our hands around this.

This is a reasonable offset. It will provide, frankly, not enough additional funds, but a significant message that we are going to intercept international drugs and methamphetamine, and we are going to help our local law enforcement.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, much for the same reason I rose in opposition to the previous amendment. It is not that the additional funding is not needed in the program, it is that the money that is the funded to the Census Bureau is needed in the Census Bureau.

□ 1500

The chairman and I have worked very hard in trying to balance these accounts. They are delicately balanced because of the bad allocation that we received. The Census Bureau in order to do its job has to prepare early. It looks like a lot of money. It is a big job. It is extremely important that it is done right. While I am totally supportive in increasing these local and State law enforcement assistance programs, the offsets are just untenable, this one included. I rise to oppose the amendment.

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

In the last census, I remember being given paperweights, calendars, buttons, pins, all sorts of stuff. I would wager that every Member of this body received those things. When you talk to local law enforcement, when you visit meth houses, when you treat the addicts of this horrific drug, we have to understand how bad this drug is. It is devastating. And I see the Census Bureau giving glass paperweights. Somewhere our priorities are wrong.

Let me say the numbers again: $2.73 billion already for the census, another $832 million this year, compared to $520 million. I am not asking for additional expenditures of the taxpayers' money. I am asking for us to make some tough and responsible decisions. I frankly would be hard pressed to tell the constituents in my area who see their schools being corrupted, their neighborhoods being corrupted, their children being addicted, people being murdered, their identity being stolen, their financial lives being ruined that we are going to fund paperweights for the census or some awfully expensive revision.

I used to teach research design. I cannot fathom that it costs this much money to modify this census. There were some bureaucrats last time around who spent an awful lot of money buying those paperweights, and if we cut $10 million to get rid of some of those bureaucrats in order to put more cops on the streets, more international investigators to stop the influx of methamphetamine, this Congress will have done at least one good thing today in what is otherwise, I think, a very good bill; but we need to find more funding for meth.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment which would reduce funding for the Bureau of the Census. As chairman of the House Government Reform Subcommittee on Federalism and the Census, I appreciate the important role of the census in providing information about the American people and our economy. It sounds pretty simple, paperweights versus crime fighting, and certainly the statements concerning our needs for crime fighting are compelling. But it is just not that simple.

The census provides information vital to how we as a Nation operate. Every 10 years, each congressional seat

is reapportioned based on census data. The decennial census is the fundamental guarantee of fair representation. Every seat in Congress is apportioned and established according to the decennial census. Also, each year the Federal Government allocates almost $300 billion in funds based in part on census data.

Also, census information is not just used for the decennial census. Annually, the Census Bureau produces information on international trade statistics, demographics, and important economic census information is utilized by businesses as they plan locations in how to grow. Actions taken for our economy are based upon information annually and on a regular basis that is produced by the census.

I ask my colleagues to vote ''no'' on this amendment. An amendment to remove funds from the census budget is an amendment that would reduce the accuracy of congressional reapportionment and redistricting and impair the ability of the Federal Government to allocate funds for important programs that aid communities nationwide. Vote ''no'' on this amendment.

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

Some years ago, I was treating a meth addict. I asked him to tell me what it was like to be hooked on methamphetamine. He said at the time, Doctor, if my children were in a corner of this room and said, Daddy, we need you. He said, I love my children. But if methamphetamine were in the other corner and my body said I want methamphetamine, and this grown man in his 40s who looked to be about 60 because of the ravages of this drug, this grown man burst into tears and he said, Doctor, I would go for the methamphetamine because I cannot help myself.

It is about priorities. We have to stop this drug. It is killing our citizens. I think the census wastes money. I think the money could be better spent on protecting the lives of our citizens and the safety of our communities and schools. I urge a ''yes'' vote on this. It is a reasonable offset and the money will be well spent on interdicting international imports of this drug and on local enforcement and training.

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Taking money away from the census and the American community survey is very shortsighted. I support very much the hard work and intent of the gentleman's amendment, but it truly is shortsighted and inappropriate to take money away from the census. Too many decisions that we make in government have to be based on census data. Federal and State funds for schools, employment services, housing assistance, day care, hospitals, emergency services, programs for seniors, and much more will be distributed based on census data.

In this information age that we live in, we need reliable information in order to make good decisions for this Nation. Without good data, you cannot administer the laws of this country fairly. Without good data, money will flow to communities with powerful allies as opposed to where the need truly is. The census is important for the planning of our government.

I rise in very strong support of this amendment, the work of the committee, and the administration's and OMB's allocation for the census.

I, for one, will continue to do all I can to make sure that the Census Bureau has the capabilities to provide the Congress, and this Nation, with the ability to provide all of us with high quality data needed by the public and its elected representatives to make informed public policy decisions.

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

I rise in opposition to the amendment, but the gentleman makes a good case. On the paperweights, we are going to do a letter to the census saying no paperweights and no gifts and things like that. If that is the case, we ought to deal with it. We ought not, though, take it from the census. I think if the gentleman can work with us, and maybe the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), we really need to do something beyond what we are doing with regard to meth.

This year the bill is $8 million above. I agree with the gentleman. I do not know how this amendment is going to come out. Hopefully, it will fail, because I do not think we want to go after the census as the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) said. But the gentleman is right. Something really has to be done almost beyond what we are doing for meth. So I commit whether you win or lose on this, we will get together and see what we can do, but I would hope that we could vote this amendment down because by helping meth, we do not want to then torpedo the Census Bureau.

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

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. THORNBERRY). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD).

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

Mr. BAIRD. 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 Washington (Mr. BAIRD) will be postponed.

Mrs. MUSGRAVE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

As we were looking at this, it came to my attention through an article in USA Today that the FBI's entertainment office consists of five agents. They are responsible for responding to requests from Hollywood for information. When I was elected to Congress, one of the things that I wanted to be aware of the whole time that I was here is that we have a responsibility to spend taxpayers' dollars wisely. I do not think that the United States taxpayers should be subsidizing Hollywood in any way. I wanted to express to the chairman of the committee, with my gratitude for his good work and to others interested in this issue, that I hope that these agencies can be more fiscally responsible with these taxpayers' dollars, and I do not think that we ought to be subsidizing Hollywood in any way when they want information.

That was what I wanted to make very clear today. The sum total of that amount is $250,000 each year that goes for Hollywood liaisons. I wanted to respectfully make the gentleman aware of this.

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

We will look into this. We were led to believe by the FBI that they do not have this. The gentlewoman may be right. We will look into it and work with her to see that this does not take place.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF ALCOHOL, TOBACCO, FIREARMS AND EXPLOSIVES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, including the purchase of not to exceed 822 vehicles for police-type use, of which 650 shall be for replacement only; not to exceed $25,000 for official reception and representation expenses; for training of State and local law enforcement agencies with or without reimbursement, including training in connection with the training and acquisition of canines for explosives and fire accelerants detection; and for provision of laboratory assistance to State and local law enforcement agencies, with or without reimbursement, $923,613,000, of which not to exceed $1,000,000 shall be available for the payment of attorneys' fees as provided by 18 U.S.C. 924(d)(2); and of which $10,000,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no funds appropriated herein shall be available for salaries or administrative expenses in connection with consolidating or centralizing, within the Department of Justice, the records, or any portion thereof, of acquisition and disposition of firearms maintained by Federal firearms licensees: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated herein shall be used to pay administrative expenses or the compensation of any officer or employee of the United States to implement an amendment or amendments to 27 CFR 178.118 or to change the definition of ''Curios or relics'' in 27 CFR 178.11 or remove any item from ATF Publication 5300.11 as it existed on January 1, 1994: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated herein shall be available to investigate or act upon applications for relief from Federal firearms disabilities

under 18 U.S.C. 925(c): *Provided further,* That such funds shall be available to investigate and act upon applications filed by corporations for relief from Federal firearms disabilities under section 925(c) of title 18, United States Code: *Provided further,* That no funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to transfer the functions, missions, or activities of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives to other agencies or Departments in fiscal year 2006: *Provided further,* That no funds appropriated under this or any other Act with respect to any fiscal year may be used to disclose part or all of the contents of the Firearms Trace System database maintained by the National Trace Center of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives or any information required to be kept by licensees pursuant to section 923(g) of title 18, United States Code, or required to be reported pursuant to paragraphs (3) and (7) of such section 923(g), to anyone other than a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency or a prosecutor solely in connection with and for use in a bona fide criminal investigation or prosecution and then only such information as pertains to the geographic jurisdiction of the law enforcement agency requesting the disclosure and not for use in any civil action or proceeding other than an action or proceeding commenced by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, or a review of such an action or proceeding, to enforce the provisions of chapter 44 of such title, and all such data shall be immune from legal process and shall not be subject to subpoena or other discovery in any civil action in a State or Federal court or in any administrative proceeding other than a proceeding commenced by the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives to enforce the provisions of that chapter, or a review of such an action or proceeding; except that this proviso shall not be construed to prevent the disclosure of statistical information concerning total production, importation, and exportation by each licensed importer (as defined in section 921(a)(9) of such title) and licensed manufacturer (as defined in section 921(a)(10) of such title): *Provided further,* That no funds made available by this or any other Act shall be expended to promulgate or implement any rule requiring a physical inventory of any business licensed under section 923 of title 18, United States Code: *Provided further,* That no funds under this Act may be used to electronically retrieve information gathered pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 923(g)(4) by name or any personal identification code: *Provided further,* That no funds authorized or made available under this or any other Act may be used to deny any application for a license under section 923 of title 18, United States Code, or renewal of such a license due to a lack of business activity, provided that the applicant is otherwise eligible to receive such a license, and is eligible to report business income or to claim an income tax deduction for business expenses under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary of the Federal Prison System for the administration, operation, and maintenance of Federal penal and correctional institutions, including purchase (not to exceed 768, of which 701 are for replacement only) and hire of law enforcement and passenger motor vehicles, and for the provision of technical assistance and advice on corrections related issues to foreign governments, $4,895,649,000: *Provided,* That the Attorney General may transfer to the Health Resources and Services Administration such amounts as may be necessary for direct expenditures by that Administration for medical relief for inmates of Federal penal and correctional institutions: *Provided further,* That the Director of the Federal Prison System, where necessary, may enter into contracts with a fiscal agent/fiscal intermediary claims processor to determine the amounts payable to persons who, on behalf of the Federal Prison System, furnish health services to individuals committed to the custody of the Federal Prison System: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $6,000 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further,* That not to exceed $50,000,000 shall remain available for necessary operations until September 30, 2007: *Provided further,* That, of the amounts provided for Contract Confinement, not to exceed $20,000,000 shall remain available until expended to make payments in advance for grants, contracts and reimbursable agreements, and other expenses authorized by section 501(c) of the Refugee Education Assistance Act of 1980, for the care and security in the United States of Cuban and Haitian entrants: *Provided further,* That the Director of the Federal Prison System may accept donated property and services relating to the operation of the prison card program from a not-for-profit entity which has operated such program in the past notwithstanding the fact that such not-for-profit entity furnishes services under contracts to the Federal Prison System relating to the operation of pre-release services, halfway houses or other custodial facilities.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For planning, acquisition of sites and construction of new facilities; purchase and acquisition of facilities and remodeling, and equipping of such facilities for penal and correctional use, including all necessary expenses incident thereto, by contract or force account; and constructing, remodeling, and equipping necessary buildings and facilities at existing penal and correctional institutions, including all necessary expenses incident thereto, by contract or force account, $70,112,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $14,000,000 shall be available to construct areas for inmate work programs: *Provided,* That labor of United States prisoners may be used for work performed under this appropriation.

FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED

The Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated, is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available, and in accord with the law, and to make such contracts and commitments, without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 9104 of title 31, United States Code, as may be necessary in carrying out the program set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation, including purchase (not to exceed five for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INCORPORATED

Not to exceed $3,365,000 of the funds of the corporation shall be available for its administrative expenses, and for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, to be computed on an accrual basis to be determined in accordance with the corporation's current prescribed accounting system, and such amounts shall be exclusive of depreciation, payment of claims, and expenditures which such accounting system requires to be capitalized or charged to cost of commodities acquired or produced, including selling and shipping expenses, and expenses in connection with acquisition, construction, operation, maintenance, improvement, protection, or disposition of facilities and other property belonging to the corporation or in which it has an interest.

OFFICE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN PREVENTION AND PROSECUTION PROGRAMS

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance for the prevention and prosecution of violence against women as authorized by the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (''the 1968 Act''); the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–322) (''the 1994 Act''); the Victims of Child Abuse Act of 1990 (''the 1990 Act''); the Prosecutorial Remedies and Other Tools to End the Exploitation of Children Today Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–21); the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 (''the 1974 Act''); and the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–386); $387,497,000, including amounts for administrative costs, to remain available until expended: *Provided,* That except as otherwise provided by law, not to exceed three percent of funds made available under this heading may be used for expenses related to evaluation, training and technical assistance: *Provided further,* That of the amount provided—

(1) $11,897,000 for the court-appointed special advocate program, as authorized by section 217 of the 1990 Act;

(2) $1,925,000 for child abuse training programs for judicial personnel and practitioners, as authorized by section 222 of the 1990 Act;

(3) $983,000 for grants for televised testimony, as authorized by Part N of the 1968 Act;

(4) $187,308,000 for grants to combat violence against women, as authorized by part T of the 1968 Act, of which—

(A) $5,000,000 shall be for the National Institute of Justice for research and evaluation of violence against women;

(B) $10,000,000 shall be for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention for the Safe Start Program, as authorized by the 1974 Act; and

(C) $15,000,000 shall be for transitional housing assistance grants for victims of domestic violence, stalking or sexual assault as authorized by Public Law 108–21;

(5) $63,491,000 for grants to encourage arrest policies as authorized by part U of the 1968 Act;

(6) $39,685,000 for rural domestic violence and child abuse enforcement assistance grants, as authorized by section 40295(a) of the 1994 Act;

(7) $4,415,000 for training programs as authorized by section 40152 of the 1994 Act, and for related local demonstration projects;

(8) $2,950,000 for grants to improve the stalking and domestic violence databases, as authorized by section 40602 of the 1994 Act;

(9) $9,175,000 to reduce violent crimes against women on campus, as authorized by section 1108(a) of Public Law 106–386;

(10) $39,740,000 for legal assistance for victims, as authorized by section 1201(c) of Public Law 106–386;

(11) $4,600,000 for enhancing protection for older and disabled women from domestic violence and sexual assault, as authorized by section 40802 of the 1994 Act;

(12) $14,078,000 for the safe havens for children pilot program, as authorized by section 1301(a) of Public Law 106–386; and

(13) $7,250,000 for education and training to end violence against and abuse of women with disabilities, as authorized by section 1402(a) of Public Law 106–386.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

Page 19, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 20, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $2,000,000)''.

Page 22, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $4,000,000)''.

Page 23, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $4,000,000)''.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and any amendments thereto conclude in 10 minutes and that the time be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and myself as the opponent.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, if I may inquire, what was the unanimous consent request stated by the gentleman from Virginia?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state that the unanimous consent request, which has been agreed to, was for 5 minutes for the gentlewoman from Texas and 5 minutes for the gentleman from Virginia as the opponent.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. I just want the gentlewoman to understand it. I do not think she did understand it.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me first of all thank the ranking member for his inquiry and also thank the chairman. I think the time frame was not in agreement, but the issue is so important that I will proceed.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment speaks specifically to what I think is the devastating disease of child violence and child abuse. This is a simple amendment. It takes from the $300 million-plus allotment for the Edward Byrne grants a simple $2 million for child abuse training programs for judicial personnel and practitioners.

In a hearing in the Judiciary Committee just a week ago, a number of us presented bills trying to fight against sexual predators and those who would abuse children. We have discovered that the number one killer of children is now homicides. Even in the backdrop of this debate, we find a troubling set of circumstances in Aruba where a young 18-year-old still goes missing after celebrating her graduation and, of course, expressing great hope and aspiration for her entry as a freshman into college. The plague on children is rampant. This is a simple way of addressing the need for ensuring that we have practitioners as well as those dealing with judicial personnel and practitioners to be able to help children to recount incidences against them.

I have introduced legislation to address the question of child predators as it relates to the DNA, but this particular amendment is important because one of the key aspects of preventing child abuse and child violence, of course, is to make sure that we can make the case, and the case is dependent upon those judicial personnel and practitioners who are sensitive enough to be able to engage a child and to understand.

□ 1515

We are always grateful when a child has been recovered, when they survive violence and abuse, but we note by a number of our States that that has not been the case. We have seen these troubling cases all across America, children that have been kidnapped, children that have been raped and killed, the Jane Does and the John Does of little babies who have suffered.

Just 24 hours ago there was a story noting the abuse of a 4-month-old, a sexual abuse of a 4-month-old. So the importance of this particular funding is to prevent child violence, prevent child abuse, and to be able to provide additional training for the vast number of practitioners and judges to be sensitive in their work dealing with children.

We can do more. I hope that we will pass a number of child predator bills that are making their way through the Committee on the Judiciary and other committees. But, frankly, it is extremely important that we look to making a national statement, we are not going to take it anymore, a national statement in protecting our children and providing them with the kind of legal protection and as well sensitive judges and practitioners who will work with them.

This is not in any way affecting this legislation inasmuch as the moneys for the Byrne grant that deal with drug task forces. That certainly has my support, even as the President zeroed it out, but my support with oversight, an amendment that I will offer at a subsequent time. But I ask my colleagues to consider their commitment to preventing child abuse and child violence, providing them with appropriate counsel and sensitive judiciary to understand their needs and to be on the front lines of saying and suggest that this is an important cause for America and making a statement.

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

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

I want to thank the gentlewoman for the amendment. I accept the amendment. I want the RECORD to show that the committee did the best it could to fund the Violence against Women. The bill provides $5.4 million over last year for these programs, and it is $500,000 over the President's request. I think the gentlewoman's amendment is good, and I accept it. I think we should adopt it. My only concern is where she takes the money from. She takes the money from the Justice Assistance Grant, the very place that we have had Members down here arguing that there is not enough. So if as we move through, I want to do this, if we can maybe look to see a different place, but I accept the amendment, and I want to thank the gentlewoman for it.

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

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman's reasoning, and I agree to accept the amendment.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me wholeheartedly thank the chairman and the ranking member, and I look forward to working with them if we can find an accommodating place as we move forward. But I thank them very much.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. THORNBERRY). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS

JUSTICE ASSISTANCE

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, the Missing Children's Assistance Act, including salaries and expenses in connection therewith, the Prosecutorial Remedies and Other Tools to end the Exploitation of Children Today Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–21), and the Victims of Crime Act of 1984, $227,466,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 16 offered by Mr. STEARNS:

Page 22, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 81, line 19, after both dollar amounts insert the following: ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment, and any amendments thereto, conclude by 10 minutes, and that the remaining time be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and myself, the opponent.

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

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

I do not need a lot of time. This is pretty simple, this amendment. It is basically an amendment to help our local law enforcement community. Mr. Chairman, it basically transfers $10 million from the Legal Services Corporation and gives it instead to the Justice Assistance Grant, or JAG, program.

I would like to thank the chairman for funding this critical program, especially in light that the administration's budget proposed a zero funding. So he is to be commended for funding this program, and I need to compliment him on that matter.

But in my district I have heard from law enforcement officials and across the State of Florida about how much this JAG funding helps them fight crime, and to protect and serve the citizens within their jurisdiction. The JAG program is set to receive about $348 million in funding under this bill. It is my hope that an additional, just simply an additional $10 million will help increase the numerous and substantial benefits under this program.

The Legal Services Corporation would still receive $321 million, which I and many of my colleagues would agree is still a reasonable amount of money to provide for legal services to the poor. In addition to this Federal subsidy, there are thousands of attorneys across the country who provide thousands of hours and hundreds of millions of dollars in service pro bono for these people.

I would be remiss, however, if I did not point out to my colleagues that the Legal Services Corporation has been providing free legal services to quasi-legal immigrants, despite the fact that we passed a restriction in 1996 that barred local legal service groups from using Federal money for these activities. This $10 million reduction in Legal Services Corporation funding would bring it more in line, of course, with the President's request, certainly in spirit.

Mr. Chairman, this is not an anti-legal service amendment, but merely a modest, a simple, modest, amendment to further help our local law enforcement combat drugs and fight crime. So I am not asking the Legal Services to justify its existence. I am just saying let us make a modest attempt here to send a message how important it is to keep the JAG program, and I urge my colleagues to support their local law enforcement and to support my amendment.

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

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

I rise in opposition to the amendment. I understand what the gentleman is trying to do. I just wanted to kind of let people know that last year's level for Legal Services was $330 million. At last year's level, the corporation and its grantees cannot do anything new. The level provided in the bill will not even pay for inflationary costs. The corporation actually requested $364 million, but the committee had only enough to fund the current level.

Eighty percent of the legal needs of people in poverty are not addressed. We tried to strike a balance with regard to the poor. This program helps the poor, and there have been so many good restrictions put on the Legal Services under the former leadership of former Congressman John Erlenborn. So to take more money away to cut the Legal Services Corporation could dramatically impact the ability of low-income Americans to seek and obtain justice. Justice, justice thou shall pursue, and I think this is really an amendment that would hurt the poor, so I would hope that we would not accept it. It is not as much as they wanted, but it is about where it should be. And with that I urge Members to vote "no."

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN).

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

This is awful. Can we not find a more vulnerable group in the country to take money away from? At a time when the country is rewarding wealth by huge high-income tax cuts, surely we can find money for worthy purposes someplace other than Legal Services. The fact is the poor people, if they are going to participate in the American dream, if they are going to participate in the American legal system that we all are so proud of, then they have to be able to have support in that effort. That is recognized. The whole premise of the Legal Services Corporation recognizes that, and its services are totally inadequate.

Fifty percent of the potential clients were turned away from Legal Services and not served at all last year. In West Virginia we are turning away 90 percent of the people requesting services. Legal Services requested more money than we were able to appropriate to them. This is not a place to cut for anything, for law enforcement.

And the other irony here is where the gentleman finds money to support law enforcement, he finds money from folks who are living in the communities that need this additional law enforcement. I would suggest to him that he go to the high income tax people who have received inordinate benefits from the tax cuts we have given them in the last 5 years to find his offsets to support the policing that is needed most in the communities from where the people who are seeking legal services aid in the Legal Services Corporation come from.

This is a bad amendment. It cuts a program that is desperately needed if we expect everybody in the country to participate in the American legal system, and we should expect and want and make sure that everybody participates in the American legal system that we are all so proud of and bragging about.

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

I heard the argument of my distinguished colleague from West Virginia. He is arguing that a 2 percent, 2½, 2.8 percent cut in the Legal Services Corporation is bad, is terrible. Put that in perspective. They are getting $321 million. We are just saying take $10 million out of that and give it to the Justice Assistance Grant program, which provides grants to States. And what do these grants do? They help the local law enforcement so that they can fight crime, fight drugs, and in the end they will not need Legal Services.

So my point, Mr. Chairman, is if we cannot cut the Legal Services by 2.8 percent symbolically and give it to a program like the Justice Assistance Grant, which is going to help these people so they do not need Legal Services, they do not need the government-run legal program, because they will be free of crime, then I think we are making a mistake.

So this is a very simple amendment with great symbolic reference here that one as a Member can say, I believe in my local community, I want to fight crime, I want to give grants to the States so that they can do it so that in the end they do not need these legal services. And good golly, if we cannot cut the Legal Services Corporation by about 2.8 percent, then really, Mr. Chairman, we are really not interested in trying to even look at fiscal responsibility, much less symbolic responsibility for helping our local police sheriffs in all of our congressional districts and all the counties throughout this country.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to consider this amendment. It is both symbolism and plus it helps the local police force. And, goodness gracious, the Legal Services Corporation is going to get roughly 2.7 percent less. I think that is a small amount considering the administration decided to zero out this program. It is only by the grace of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) that this program is back in place. So I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and be on the right side of the angels.

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

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

I rise in opposition to the amendment. Former Congressman John Erlenborn did a great job of restraining and bringing some sense to the Legal

Services. Legal Services had an event years ago when I was running, and they criticized me. I mean, they were very political, very political, and they have changed that now.

The American Bar Association asked for $364 million. We only did $330 million. But I think we really need to in this society make sure that we are representing the poor, too, when the rich can get representation, and it is even difficult for the middle class. And I have never been a great fan of Legal Services.

□ 1530

I have had some serious problems. The fact is, I will try to find the tape where they criticized me. But I think this year it is a good balance, it is a good level; and I think on behalf of making sure that the poor have legal representation, although I understand what the gentleman is trying to do, I would ask that we do not support the amendment.

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the gentleman is saying. Legal Services has been political at times. The gentleman points out cases where they have been. I think it is a commendation to the gentleman, in light of the fact of how they politicize things, he is still here arguing for a complete budget. I am asking for a 2.7 percent reduction, on behalf of the communities.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. THORNBERRY). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS).

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE

For grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and other assistance authorized by the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–322) (''the 1994 Act''); the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (''the 1968 Act''); and the Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–386); and other programs; $1,001,296,000 (including amounts for administrative costs, which shall be transferred to and merged with the ''Justice Assistance'' account): *Provided*, That funding provided under this heading shall remain available until expended, as follows—

(1) $348,466,000 for the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant program pursuant to the amendments made by section 201 of H.R. 3036 of the 108th Congress, as passed by the House of Representatives on March 30, 2004 (except that the special rules for Puerto Rico established pursuant to such amendments shall not apply for purposes of this Act), of which—

(A) $10,000,000 is for the National Institute of Justice in assisting units of local government to identify, select, develop, modernize, and purchase new technologies for use by law enforcement; and

(B) $85,000,000 for Boys and Girls Clubs in public housing facilities and other areas in cooperation with State and local law enforcement, as authorized by section 401 of Public Law 104–294 (42 U.S.C. 13751 note);

(2) $355,000,000 for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, as authorized by section 242(j) of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

(3) $30,000,000 for the Southwest Border Prosecutor Initiative to reimburse State, county, parish, tribal, or municipal governments only for costs associated with the prosecution of criminal cases declined by local United States Attorneys offices;

(4) $110,000,000 for discretionary grants authorized by subpart 2 of part E, of title I of the 1968 Act, notwithstanding the provisions of section 511 of said Act;

(5) $10,000,000 for victim services programs for victims of trafficking, as authorized by section 107(b)(2) of Public Law 106–386;

(6) $871,000 for the Missing Alzheimer's Disease Patient Alert Program, as authorized by section 240001(c) of the 1994 Act;

(7) $40,000,000 for Drug Courts, as authorized by Part EE of the 1968 Act;

(8) $10,000,000 for a prescription drug monitoring program;

(9) $40,000,000 for prison rape prevention and prosecution programs, as authorized by the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003 (Public Law 108–79), of which $2,175,000 shall be transferred to the National Prison Rape Elimination Commission for authorized activities;

(10) $25,000,000 for grants for residential substance abuse treatment for State prisoners, as authorized by part S of the 1968 Act;

(11) $10,359,000 for a program to improve State and local law enforcement intelligence capabilities including antiterrorism training and training to ensure that constitutional rights, civil liberties, civil rights, and privacy interests are protected throughout the intelligence process;

(12) $10,000,000 for a capital litigation improvement grant program; and

(13) $11,600,000 for a cannabis eradication program to be administered by the Drug Enforcement Administration:

Provided, That, if a unit of local government uses any of the funds made available under this title to increase the number of law enforcement officers, the unit of local government will achieve a net gain in the number of law enforcement officers who perform nonadministrative public safety service.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. DREIER

Mr. DREIER. 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. 3 offered by Mr. DREIER:

Page 22, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

Page 23, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $50,000,000)''.

Page 45, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $50,000,000)''.

Page 46, line 10, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $50,000,000)''.

Page 46, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $50,000,000)''.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment, and any amendments thereto, conclude by 10 minutes, and that the time be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) will each control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, securing our borders is clearly the responsibility of the Federal Government. We have had a program that was initiated in 1994 called the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, SCAAP. It has done a very good job of reimbursing the States for the appropriate incarceration of illegal immigrant criminals, people who have come into this country illegally and committed crimes. We have, unfortunately, seen not the kind of increase in that level of reimbursement that we should, so this amendment proposes that we transfer an additional $50 million from the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration to the SCAAP program.

I congratulate the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) and the committee for putting into place funding at the level of $355 million. I do not believe that that is adequate.

I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), and the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), in support of this very important effort to have the Federal Government step up to the plate and ensure that we meet our responsibility.

In my County of Los Angeles alone, it costs $150 million a year for the incarceration of these criminals, and I believe that we need to provide more resources. I hope very much that my colleagues join in support of this important amendment.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I do not oppose the amendment, I support the amendment, so in fairness I ask unanimous consent to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (GILCHREST) and 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the time will be divided as stated.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California has a good point. We were down in El Salvador 2 weeks ago and they told us they were pouring across

the border, members of MS–13 and gang members. We met with gang members who told us they came across, got arrested, got into prison, and went back. It is a tremendous burden not only for my region, but also for California, Texas, Arizona, and the entire country. So I understand the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. WOLF. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to express my appreciation to the distinguished subcommittee chairman and congratulate him on his fine work, not only on this issue but the very important NASA programs about which we spoke earlier.

I think this $50 million amount, which enjoys the support, I know, of the distinguished chairman of the full committee, is the right thing to do. In bringing about this reduction from NOAA, we have seen a 53 percent increase in NOAA's administrative expenses over the last 3 years, and we have seen a constant reduction in the SCAAP funding. So I believe this is the appropriate thing to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I want to compliment the gentleman from California on this amendment and I understand the gravity of the situation. I just wish the money did not come out of NOAA. If we look at NOAA's budget this year, it is millions of dollars below where it was last year.

Let us take a look at what that section of NOAA has to deal with: the effect of oceans on climate; the effect of oceans on the air we breathe; weather patterns that direct where the forests, deserts and agriculture are going to be; the effect on aquaculture and fish farming on the natural environment in the ocean; ocean currents that distribute the heat and the balance of the planet.

The ocean currents right now are beginning to slow down in the North Atlantic because of a redistribution of salt and fresh water in the ocean. The magnitude of the impact on that on the northeastern parts of the United States and Western Europe, if you look at London, on the same latitude as Labrador, the climate is like the State of Maryland. Finally, red tides, poisonous, deadly to humans, but do not impact the shellfish.

The huge magnitude of the research that is lacking now as a result of our lack of understanding of oceans on life on planet Earth is staggering. NOAA should be at the same level of funding and have the same understanding in our educational institutes as NASA.

So I compliment the gentleman in trying to fix this terrible problem with our border crossings and the criminal activity that results all across the United States, but the issue of our oceans I do not think is adequately being addressed.

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

Mr. GILCHREST. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, let me compliment the gentleman on his statement. I totally concur with those goals. The gentleman has never let me forget the importance of keeping oceans as a priority.

The fact of the matter is, as we look at the $5.7 billion budget request for the Department of Commerce, 63 percent of that budget request is for NOAA, which we know is critically important. I do not in any way undermine the importance of it. I do believe, though, if you look at this $50 million in administrative expenses, this is something that clearly could be handled very, very easily within that massive budget of NOAA.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS)

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise only to express my strong support for the Dreier-Kolbe amendment, which recognizes that Congress has a long-standing understanding of the fact that the difficulties of immigration, the challenges of illegal immigration especially, are a Federal responsibility.

What the gentleman is proposing is not creating a grant program, but rather reimbursing for funds already spent to meet the challenge of our borders. Indeed, it is very important that we move forward in terms of funding. This $50 million amount raises the total to $405 million, only about 25 cents on the dollar relative to the national cost. It is a very important change.

Mr. Chairman, I urge everybody to support the Dreier-Kolbe amendment, and I thank the gentlemen for their work.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Dreier amendment, not because I am opposed to the intent of the amendment, but rather opposed because of the source of funding that he has taken. We have already increased in this bill the funding for the cause he is trying to increase, namely, incarcerating undocumented criminal aliens. We have already added $54 million, which is an 18 percent increase over last year. At the same time, NOAA has been cut $500 million.

Let me say that again: NOAA has been cut $500 million below last year's number in this bill, and I fail to understand the logic of stealing more money from NOAA when it has already been cut $500 million.

I appreciate that this comes from administrative expenses, but at a certain point that has got to cut into the science. NOAA, as we know, provides crucial services to this country. Each year we cope with on average 10,000 thunderstorms, 2,500 floods, 1,000 tornadoes, as well as six deadly hurricanes. The National Weather Service alone pays for itself over and over in terms of the protection it gives to people and to property.

So as much as I sympathize with the intent of the gentleman from California, I think it is a poor choice of where to take the money from. Why would one take an additional $54 million away from an entity that has already been cut $500 million in this budget compared to last year?

Mr. Chairman, I urge that we oppose the amendment and that we defeat the amendment. I know I am up against tough company here with the chairman of the Committee on Rules and the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, but I would be happy to help the gentleman try to find some other areas.

Why take it out of science? The National Science Foundation was cut last year, the worst cut in almost 2 decades; and now we are proceeding to cut NASA, another science agency. At some point we have to recognize that the future of this country is directly tied to our research effort, and our research effort is dependent upon funding that we provide here.

I urge opposition to the Dreier amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, the way the time was divided up, the minority got no time in opposition to this amendment. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent for 8 additional minutes, to be divided equally between the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and myself.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. This amendment is not a benign amendment. It is an anti-ocean amendment. Understand, it is really not an amendment fighting immigration on the border; it is a reimbursement amendment. I will be corrected if I am wrong in my interpretation, but it is a reimbursement amendment to States who have expended money on incarceration of illegal aliens. My point is that as it is a reimbursement to States, it is not for fighting on-the-line illegal immigration.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, it is not benign in a very important way: the House mark already cuts the NOAA budget by over $486 million from the 2005 enacted levels and $153 million from the President's request. So NOAA in this bill is already feeling the pain, along with a lot of the other accounts, because of our inadequate allocation.

This amendment is extremely difficult to NOAA for a lot of reasons.

First and foremost, just looking at it overall, this amendment would result in RIFs to NOAA. Over 100 employees, NOAA employees, government employees, would be affected, would be RIF'd by this amendment, and over 200 nongovernmental researchers and staff. This comes from operations, a lot of this money, Mr. Chairman; and it would have a real employee impact.

These are some of the operations it would cut, and they include research: $5 million from the NOAA core and program support; $12 million from the National Marine Fisheries Service. It is certainly a very anti-ocean amendment: $8 million from the National Oceans Service; $3 million from the National Environmental Satellite Data and Information Service; $7 million from the Oceanic, Atmospheric and Research Activities; and, extremely important, and we ought to understand as we deal with this amendment, it would involve a $14.9 million, almost a $15 million, reduction out of operations for the National Weather Service Hurricane and Other Severe Weather Warnings.

As I said in the beginning, Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment. It is not benign. It has a lot of very harmful effects on NOAA, an organization that has already experienced its fair share of pain as we moved this bill to the floor.

Again, this bill has been well balanced. For those agencies, the pain has been spread evenly. For us to go in and start having these kinds of severe cuts in agencies like NOAA is very harmful.

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

□ 1545

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the Chair, I was a little confused by this unanimous consent request propounded by the ranking minority member, and I do not know how much time I have remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) now has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. DREIER. I began with 5 minutes, and now I have 7 minutes. That sounds like a pretty good arrangement from my perspective.

Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE), the coauthor of this amendment and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I do rise in support of this amendment, cognizant as I am of the arguments we have just heard against it and the source of the funding, and on recognizing the importance of science. I do not think there is a more important priority than we have right now than this law enforcement.

My district in southeastern Arizona shares about 100 miles of the U.S.-Mexico border. The communities along this border suffer the brunt of our failed national immigration policies. Last year Border Patrol apprehensions within one county, Cochise County, Arizona, alone, were more than 240,000 persons. The entire county has a population of 124,000 people. It is not difficult to imagine the strain on local resources caused by the incredible traffic of people trying to enter this country illegally through this relatively small section of the border. Local law enforcement must protect communities against increasingly dangerous traffickers; detention facilities must hold criminal aliens that cannot be held in Federal facilities.

The State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, better known as SCAAP, provides reimbursements to State and local governments for part of the cost of incarcerating foreign nationals who are criminal aliens. The amendment offered by my colleague from California and me would increase the amount of funding for this critical program by $50 million. I would point out that every dollar we do not appropriate here is a dollar that is not spent by local law enforcement in the streets on law enforcement because they are having to spend it on prosecutions or incarceration costs.

Border security clearly is a Federal responsibility, and from fiscal year 1996 through 2002, Congress appropriated over $500 million per year for SCAAP. But over the past few years, the funding has dropped dramatically, placing greater burdens on local communities, when the population of the criminal aliens is only increasing.

I appreciate the constraints placed on my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) with the very limited allocation that he has. I strongly believe, however, that Congress has to place a high priority on border security, and we must assist States and communities who are suffering the brunt of this burden.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Dreier-Kolbe amendment and then the underlying bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia has 1 minute remaining; the gentleman from California has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman from West Virginia has the right to close.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, let me just say that it appears that my very good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), is going to oppose this amendment, and I share the concern that has been raised about the issue of the funding for the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration. I think that oceans continue to be a high priority.

We need to look at the funding level that we have at this point. As I was saying in my exchange with the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), if you look at the $5.7 billion request that has been made for the Department of Commerce budget, 63 percent of that budget goes towards NOAA. It seems to me that as we look at a responsible area where we can take funds and deal with this critical priority of having the Federal Government step up to the plate and secure its border, this $50 million from administrative expenses is a minuscule amount juxtaposed to the impact that it could have on this priority.

The gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) and I have had the privilege of cochairing the California congressional delegation. I am very happy to say that since 1994, when the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program funding was put into place, we have been able to come together. Every single Democrat in the House and Senate from California has joined every single Republican in this House to support increased levels of funding for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program. In fact, just last year when we had a request for $750 million, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle requested an additional $100 million. It would be nice if we could provide that support, but as the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS) pointed out, we in this bill, very well crafted by the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF), have $355 million, and our sole request is that we increase that from $355 million to $405 million.

So I urge strong support of this measure.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I am very happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), another coauthor of this amendment.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I thank the gentlemen for bringing this forward, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER). This is very important. That is why in Arizona we will find overwhelming support for this Republican and Democrat amendment. We simply in Arizona are dealing with a porous border, and we are dealing with costs that we can do nothing about in Arizona.

It is the Federal Government's responsibility to secure the border. The Federal Government has not secured the border. Hospitals are incurring costs. Education is incurring costs. Law enforcement, specifically for this, is incurring great cost, and if the Federal Government is failing to secure the border, it is the Federal Government's responsibility to pony up. This represents still just pennies on the dollar of what are spent in Arizona, California, and other border States in particular, but at least it is something. At least it is something.

President Bush, himself a former border Governor, said in 1995, ''If the Federal Government cannot do its job enforcing the borders, then it owes the States monies to pay for its failure.'' That is what we are asking for here.

SCAAP just reimburses States and localities for incurred costs for incarcerating undocumented criminal aliens. That is what we are asking for here, simply a little fairness. We need broader reform.

Myself and my colleagues have offered broader, meaningful immigration reform that will deal with this in the long term, but, in the short term, we need to do something for the border States in particular.

I commend my colleagues for bringing this forward, and I urge support for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) has 1 minute remaining; the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN) has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. DREIER. The gentleman from West Virginia has the right to close?

The CHAIRMAN. He does have the right to close.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to close on our side, but I yield 10 seconds to my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Chairman, just very briefly, I would like to say that the oceans are an important aspect of funding, but I want to say that the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) have a very critical issue that needs to be addressed as well.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, it is very clear, if you take my State of California, the annual cost for the incarceration of those who are here illegally and who have committed crimes is about $750 million. That is for one State alone. This is a nationwide problem, as we all know. All we are proposing is that we increase from $355 million to $405 million the effort to bring about reimbursement so that the resources at the State level, as the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) said, can be expended on the very important problems of dealing with the crime in the streets. We need to make sure the Federal Government secures our borders.

I thank my friends, the gentleman from California (Chairman LEWIS), the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) and the gentleman from Arizona (Chairman KOLBE) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) for joining me as cosponsors of this.

Oceans are a priority, but I believe we can take this minuscule amount and deal with this very, very important societal need.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of our amendment.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, as I yield to another gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) to close, I note that the minuscule amount results in 100 RIFs out of NOAA.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong opposition to this amendment, not because SCAAP is not a good idea to fully fund, and I support that, but not taking it from NOAA. What you are doing here is choosing to cut California to help California, and choosing to cut California results in cutting what is essentially the largest population in the entire United States living on the California coastline. They develop, on all of the issues of the marine sanctuaries, the research that goes on, of the students that go out on the NOAA ships, all of these funds are going to be affected by this cut.

Mr. Chairman, there is a lot of things we can do about SCAAP, and I strongly support more funding, but I think California can do a better job of trying those cases in Mexico where they have been successful in incarcerating and gotten 100 percent conviction in courts in Mexico, which are a lot cheaper than incarcerating them in California. This $50 million cut really wipes out NOAA. The committee already cut half a billion dollars from NOAA, and to add another $50 million, which RIFs 100 people, a lot of those people live in California.

This is a bad amendment because of what it attempts to cut, and I would strongly oppose it and ask my colleagues to defeat the Dreier amendment.

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Dreier/Kolbe amendment that would increase funding for the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP) by $50 million. This is an extremely important issue to the people of California, because now Californians pay a disproportionate amount of the costs of incarcerating criminal aliens. SCAAP reimburses state and local governments for some of these costs.

States do not hold authority over national immigration policy, and they should not shoulder the burden of paying for criminal alien incarceration. It is the responsibility of the Federal government to ensure the security of our borders. Because undocumented aliens pose a great risk to our national security, the Federal government should bear the costs.

I thank Congressmen DAVID DREIER and JIM KOLBE for introducing this amendment, and I urge its adoption.

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

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) will be postponed.

SEQUENTIAL VOTES POSTPONED IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XX, proceedings will now resume on those amendments on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY of Wisconsin; amendment offered by Mr. TERRY of Nebraska; amendment offered by Ms. VELÁZQUEZ of New York; amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. REICHERT of Washington; amendment No. 16 offered by Mr. STEARNS of Florida; and amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. DREIER of California.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

The 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 designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 230, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 244]

AYES—196

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chabot
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gohmert
Green (WI)
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Renzi
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Schakowsky
Schwartz (PA)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shays
Sherman

Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—230

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Beauprez
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boustany
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Castle
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Costa
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutknecht
Hall
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schiff
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Udall (CO)
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Cox
Hinojosa
Oberstar
Peterson (PA)
Rothman
Sessions
Strickland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1622

Messrs. BRADY of Pennsylvania, BARRETT of South Carolina, CONAWAY, BASS, MURPHY, MILLER of North Carolina, COSTA, Ms. WATERS, Mr. BOREN and Mr. ORTIZ changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. HONDA, SIMMONS, FOSSELLA, McCRERY, CUELLAR, RAHALL, DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, FATTAH and LARSON of Connecticut changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TERRY

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment 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 designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 252, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 245]

AYES—175

Ackerman
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Barton (TX)
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Brown (OH)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burton (IN)
Cannon
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Coble
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
Doggett
Doyle
Duncan
Emerson
Engel
Etheridge
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutknecht
Hayworth
Herger
Herseth
Hinchey
Holden
Hooley
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kline
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Leach
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lynch
Marchant
Marshall
Matheson
McCarthy
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McIntyre
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Napolitano
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Ramstad
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (MI)
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Schiff
Scott (GA)
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Skelton
Smith (WA)
Solis
Souder
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Watt
Weiner
Weller
Westmoreland
Wu
Wynn

NOES—252

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Bartlett (MD)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Burgess
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Carter
Castle
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Green, Al
Gutierrez
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Hensarling
Higgins
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Honda
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Keller
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Markey
Matsui
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McKeon
McKinney
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Northup
Nunes
Obey
Olver
Owens
Oxley
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Pickering
Pombo
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Simpson
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Sodrel
Spratt
Stark
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry

Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Turner
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Woolsey
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Cox
Hinojosa
Oberstar
Rothman
Sessions
Strickland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 1632

Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. BEAN, Mr. DINGELL, and Mr. WAXMAN changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. ORTIZ and Mrs. EMERSON changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MS. VELÁZQUEZ

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 234, noes 189, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 246]

AYES—234

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Butterfield
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Chandler
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Edwards
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Gordon
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Harman
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hayes
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kline
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Maloney
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Ney
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Renzi
Reyes
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
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
Stearns
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson (NM)
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NOES—189

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Castle
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Crenshaw
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
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
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Gutknecht
Hall
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
King (IA)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
McCaul (TX)
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Poe
Pombo
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Royce
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Schwarz (MI)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simmons
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Sodrel
Souder
Sullivan
Sweeney
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Upton
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—10

Conyers
Cox
Hinojosa
McCrery
Oberstar
Rothman
Ryan (WI)
Sessions
Strickland
Tancredo

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1640

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. REICHERT

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 130, noes 297, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 247]

AYES—130

Ackerman
Allen
Baca
Bachus
Baldwin
Barrow
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Bishop (UT)
Boucher
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Carnahan
Chandler
Chocola
Clay
Conyers
Costa
Costello
Crowley
Cubin
Davis (KY)
DeGette
Doyle
Duncan
Ehlers
Engel
English (PA)
Etheridge
Evans
Fattah
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Ford
Fortenberry
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Harris
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Holden
Honda
Hooley
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
Larsen (WA)
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Matheson
Matsui
McCrery
McHenry
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Olver
Osborne
Otter
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Rahall
Ramstad
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Ryan (WI)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schakowsky
Schwartz (PA)
Shimkus
Simmons
Slaughter

Smith (WA)
Souder
Stark
Stearns
Tanner
Terry
Tierney
Towns
Upton
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Waters
Watson
Weiner
Wilson (SC)
Woolsey
Young (AK)

NOES—297

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Andrews
Baird
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonner
Bono
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (TX)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Cardoza
Carson
Carter
Case
Castle
Chabot
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Cooper
Cramer
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Edwards
Emanuel
Emerson
Eshoo
Everett
Farr
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holt
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
Jindal
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
Markey
Marshall
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
Menendez
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Obey
Ortiz
Oxley
Pascrell
Pearce
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reyes
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schiff
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shuster
Simpson
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Sodrel
Solis
Spratt
Stupak
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh
Wasserman Schultz
Watt
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—6

Cox
Hinojosa
Oberstar
Rothman
Sessions
Strickland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 1649

Mr. GRAVES and Mr. KUCINICH changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BAIRD

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

The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The Clerk designated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 260, noes 168, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 248]

AYES—260

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Bean
Beauprez
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonner
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Butterfield
Capito
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carson
Case
Castle
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Crowley
Cubin
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle
Drake
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fortenberry
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gordon
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutknecht
Harman
Harris
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hinchey
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hulshof
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Leach
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKinney
McMorris
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Millender-McDonald
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Pallone
Pastor
Paul
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Platts
Poe
Pombo
Pomeroy
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Rogers (AL)
Ross
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanders
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Shimkus
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Stearns
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Wilson (NM)
Woolsey
Wu

NOES—168

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Andrews
Bachus
Baker
Barrett (SC)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Berry
Biggert
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capps
Cardin
Carter
Clay
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Conyers
Cox
Cramer
Crenshaw
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Tom
DeLay
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
English (PA)
Feeney
Flake
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Gutierrez
Hall
Hart
Hayes
Hensarling
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hunter
Hyde
Inglis (SC)
Issa
Istook
Jefferson
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Kelly
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Lewis (CA)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Maloney
Manzullo
Marchant
McHenry
McKeon
Menendez
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Northup
Nunes
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pascrell
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez, Loretta
Saxton
Schakowsky
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shays
Sherwood
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (TX)

Sodrel
Spratt
Stark
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Visclosky
Walsh
Waters
Watt
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Hinojosa
Oberstar
Rothman
Sessions
Strickland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 1658

Mr. SERRANO and Ms. LEE changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. REICHERT and Mr. DENT changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. STEARNS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 112, noes 316, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 249]

AYES—112

Aderholt
Akin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Boehner
Boozman
Boren
Brady (TX)
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Camp
Chabot
Chocola
Coble
Cole (OK)
Cox
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (KY)
Davis (TN)
Davis, Jo Ann
Deal (GA)
DeLay
Doolittle
Drake
Duncan
Everett
Feeney
Flake
Foley
Forbes
Fortenberry
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gibbons
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Graves
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall
Hastings (WA)
Hefley
Hensarling
Herger
Hostettler
Hunter
Hyde
Issa
Istook
Jindal
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
Kline
Kuhl (NY)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Marchant
McCaul (TX)
McHenry
Mica
Miller (FL)
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Otter
Paul
Pence
Petri
Pitts
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Reynolds
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shimkus
Sodrel
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wilson (SC)

NOES—316

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

NOT VOTING—5

Hinojosa
Oberstar
Rothman
Sessions
Strickland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 1707

Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. SODREL changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. DREIER

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) 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 CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 231, noes 195, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 250]

AYES—231

Akin
Baca
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bass
Becerra
Berman
Bishop (UT)
Blackburn
Blunt
Bonilla
Bono
Boozman
Boswell
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Burgess
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carter
Chabot
Chandler
Chocola
Conaway
Costa
Costello
Cox
Crenshaw
Cubin
Cuellar
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (KY)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
DeFazio
DeLay
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doggett
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Evans
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gibbons
Gillmor
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Hall
Harman
Harris
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth
Higgins
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)

Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kline
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Larsen (WA)
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moore (KS)
Murphy
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neugebauer
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nunes
Nussle
Ortiz
Osborne
Otter
Oxley
Pastor
Paul
Pearce
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Poe
Pombo
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sánchez, Linda T.
Schiff
Schwartz (PA)
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solis
Souder
Stark
Stearns
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tancredo
Thomas
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Turner
Udall (NM)
Walden (OR)
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Waxman
Weiner
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wolf
Young (AK)

NOES—195

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Alexander
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baker
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Bean
Beauprez
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonner
Boren
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd
Bradley (NH)
Brady (PA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Case
Castle
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (TN)
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doyle
Edwards
Ehlers
Emanuel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Farr
Feeney
Fitzpatrick (PA)
Foley
Ford
Frank (MA)
Gilchrest
Gordon
Green, Al
Gutknecht
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hinchey
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jindal
Johnson (IL)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick (MI)
Kind
Kirk
Kucinich
Langevin
Lantos
Larson (CT)
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Maloney
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McKinney
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Menendez
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Neal (MA)
Obey
Olver
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Pitts
Platts
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Ross
Rothman
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sabo
Salazar
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanders
Saxton
Schakowsky
Schwarz (MI)
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shays
Simmons
Skelton
Slaughter
Snyder
Sodrel
Spratt
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Watson
Watt
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—7

Bachus
Fattah
Gutierrez
Hinojosa
Oberstar
Sessions
Strickland

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

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

□ 1716

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Chairman, I was briefly absent from this Chamber today and inadvertently missed rollcall vote 250. I would like the RECORD to show that, had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall vote 250.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. THORNBERRY). Are there further amendments to this section of the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARRETT OF NEW JERSEY

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey:

Page 22, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $21,947,600)''.

Page 23, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(increased by $21,947,600)''.

Page 65, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert the following: ''(reduced by $21,947,600)''.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the budget of the United Nations currently stands at $3.7 billion. The contribution from the United States, or actually the contribution from the United States taxpayers, is almost a quarter of that, $439 million. The amendment that is before us deals with just less than 1/10 of 1 percent of that entire U.N. budget.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment seeks to simply take that .6 percent of the U.N. budget from the U.S. assessments towards the U.N. and put those funds into a program that we have talked about earlier, the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Grant Program. As we have talked previously on this floor, this is a law enforcement assistance grant program that works in partnership with Federal, State, and local governments with the objective of creating a safer community for all of us. It does that by awarding grants to States and local communities and counties and local governments to help improve their functioning of their criminal justice systems, and it does it with an emphasis on violent crime and serious offenders.

What can this money be used for? It can go to provide for personnel, equipment, training, technical assistance, and information systems for more widespread apprehension, prosecution, adjudication, detention, and rehab of offenders who violate both State and local laws.

Since September 11 this grant program has been a significant program for law enforcement. As the chairman knows, I represent the Fifth District of New Jersey, an area just outside of Ground Zero in New York City, an area that is all too aware of the need to have increased law enforcement and to deal with the prospects of terrorist attack.

How much money are we talking about? The total sum of this transfer is a little under $22 million. And as I said before, the entire United Nations budget is $3.7 billion. So we are talking about .6 percent, a little less than 1 percent, of the overall U.N. budget to do this. But with that little tiny bit of money, it will translate into a 6.3 percent increase for this purpose, not enough for every law enforcement need throughout the country, but enough to meet the numerous needs that are not being met right now.

Mr. Chairman, later in this week we will be dealing with U.N. reform and pointing out that the U.N. has not lived up to its original charter. That charter sets out that the U.N.'s job is preventing war and maintaining world peace. There have been over 300 wars since 1945, when the U.N. was created. Twenty-two million people have died. Obviously, it is not living up to its full potential. In part it is because of its bloated bureaucracy, its inefficiency, and its bad management in so many different ways, an untold amount of wasted dollars at the U.N. The United Nations cannot even come up with the definition of what terrorism is. But let me tell the Members, Mr. Chairman, after September 11, local law enforcement agents in my district in New Jersey can tell us what terrorism is because they have seen it firsthand.

So I offer this amendment today to make sure that they have all the tools necessary to keep our citizens safe at home.

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

I am going to accept the amendment, but I know there is going to be another amendment later that cuts $200 million out.

Secondly, I think the membership should know that in our bill last year, we had language setting up the Gingrich-Mitchell Reform Task Force, which is making their report, I believe,

tomorrow or the next day, and they had some fairly dramatic recommendations to reform the U.N., and I think that is really the way to go.

Thirdly, while it is true the U.N. has failed in Srebrenica, they failed in Sarajevo, they failed in Rwanda, and they are failing in Darfur, the recommendations of the Gingrich-Mitchell can make a large difference.

Lastly, the peacekeepers that we have in some places, for instance, the peacekeepers in Sudan, keep American men and women, military, from being on the ground. So I would urge Members, where we are going to accept the amendment, to look at the Gingrich-Mitchell recommendations which will be coming out this week which will be dramatically reforming the U.N. on a bipartisan basis.

So having said that, I accept the gentleman's amendment.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have amendment at the desk, and I will offer it and withdraw it.

My amendment designates $1.2 million out of the overall census budget for research on migration to improve demographic analysis and population estimates.

When the 2000 census count was announced, there was a great deal of confusion at Census Bureau. Demographic analysis, which has been the gold standard for measuring error in the census, and which had showed a substantial net undercount in the census for 50 years, showed an overcount. The population estimates, which had been used to distribute funds throughout the decade, missed almost 8 million people. There was a simple explanation for this. The Census Bureau assumptions on net migration into the country were wrong. The Census Bureau is now asking Congress for additional funds to do the research necessary to correct these estimates.

Measuring error in the census and providing population estimates for the distribution of funds are part of the core mission of the Bureau. Improvements in those activities should be funded before anything else. I am disappointed that this research has not been funded. I will, however, withdraw this amendment, and I hope that the chairman and ranking member will work to see that the necessary research gets done before the 2010 census.

The Census Bureau has at times wasted money on gadgets and promotional items instead of basic research. We need to direct their efforts back to basic research, such as the demographic analysis.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk which would increase the funding for investigation and prosecution of consumer identity fraud.

Approximately 10 million people a year are being victimized by identity theft. Last year's business and financial institutions lost about $52 billion, and consumers lost about $5 billion due to identity theft.

Too little is being done to effectively address consumer identity theft and credit card fraud. Presently what happens is the credit card companies just simply wipe out the debt, but the fees are not never appropriately pursued. The problem is that the laws we have on the books are not being adequately enforced due to insufficient investigative and prosecutorial resources. While the Department of Justice devotes some resources towards identity theft, it is not a high priority due to inadequate resources, and so the thieves practice their wares with impunity.

Mr. Chairman, last year we passed legislation which authorized money for consumer identity theft enforcement. We have not properly funded that, and this amendment would go a long way into properly funding it. I understand, however, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Virginia (Chairman WOLF) has expressed some concerns about the offsets and the funding level in the bill already, and I would ask the chairman if he would work with us to make sure that the funding of identity theft is properly done under the bill between now, over in the Senate, and in conference.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, he has my commitment to that. This is a very important issue, and we can work together.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I thank the chairman for his commitment.

And with that, I will not offer the amendment, but will be working to make sure that consumer identity theft investigation and prosecution is properly funded under the bill.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT) having assumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2862) making appropriations for Science, the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

□ 1730

LIMITATION ON AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2862, SCIENCE, STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 2862 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to House Resolution 314, 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 1, 4, 10, 11, 17, 18, 19 and 21;

amendment printed in the RECORD and numbered 2, which shall be debatable for 15 minutes;

amendment printed in the RECORD and numbered 6, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

an amendment by Mr. WOLF, regarding funding levels;

an amendment by Mr. HINCHEY, regarding implementation of laws on medical marijuana, which shall be debatable for 30 minutes;

an amendment by Mr. MARKEY, regarding limitation on funds for torture, which will be debatable for 15 minutes;

an amendment by Mr. NADLER, regarding health insurance records under the PATRIOT Act, which shall be debatable for 15 minutes;

an amendment by Mr. SANDERS, regarding FISA applications under the PATRIOT Act, which shall be debatable for 40 minutes;

an amendment by Mr. SCHIFF, regarding protection of the Federal judiciary;

an amendment by Mr. CARDIN, regarding WTO action against China for currency manipulation;

an amendment by Mr. MICA, regarding U.S. and Commercial Service Funding;

an amendment by Mr. SHIMKUS or Ms. ESHOO, regarding NTIA funding;

an amendment by Mr. INSLEE, regarding NOAA Coastal Zone Management Program;

an amendment by Mr. FOSSELLA or Mr. KING of New York, regarding U.S. fugitives residing in Cuba;

an amendment by Mr. FLAKE, regarding educational cultural exchanges;

an amendment by Mr. FLAKE, regarding goods to Cuba, which shall be debatable for 20 minutes;

an amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, regarding data on racial distribution of convictions;

an amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, regarding affirmances by immigration judges;

an amendment by Mr. MORAN of Virginia, regarding export licenses for firearms;

an amendment by Mrs. MUSGRAVE, regarding NASA Hollywood liaison;

an amendment by Mr. OTTER, regarding delaying notice on search warrants;

an amendment by Mr. KING of Iowa, regarding implementation of section 642 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996;

an amendment by Mr. SCHIFF, regarding DNA collection from convicted felons;

an amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding safety requirements for the Space Shuttle and the International Space Station;

an amendment by Mrs. JONES of Ohio, regarding EEOC;

an amendment by Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, regarding SBA funding;

an amendment by Mr. WEINER, regarding State and local law enforcement funding;

an amendment by Mr. HAYWORTH, regarding U.N. funding;

an amendment by Mr. MCDERMOTT, regarding travel to Cuba;

an amendment by Mr. REYES, regarding torture of human rights activists.

Each 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 that the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations and the Subcommittee on Science, State, Justice, Commerce, and Related Agencies each may offer one pro forma amendment for the purpose of debate; and shall not be subject to the demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

Except as otherwise specified, each amendment shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an 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 SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, but under my reservation I want to simply take note of the fact that as I see the situation, counting the votes we have had today, if every amendment is offered tomorrow, there would have been 22 amendments offered and voted upon that originated from the minority side and 21 that originated from the majority side.

If you count the debate time just for the amendments that are going to be offered tomorrow, it appears that you have at least 7½ hours of debate time; and if you account for slippage and the time consumed in voting, I assume that that means it will take at least 10 hours to finish the bill. I think that makes it very difficult to finish tomorrow, if the schedule holds for tomorrow.

So I would simply note that to me that indicates that there is apparently as much discontent on the majority side with the consequences of the budget resolution on programs in this bill, including especially the squeeze on local law enforcement assistance, there is as much discontent on that side of the aisle as there is on this side of the aisle.

I would note that the membership on both sides of the aisle has been extremely cooperative in reaching time agreements, and yet we have a bill that could very possibly take fully 2 days and perhaps even a portion of the third day to finish. I think that ought to send a message with respect to the inadequacy of funding on the part of a number of these programs because of the budget resolution priorities.

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

Mr. OBEY. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I was told the leadership does plan on finishing the bill tomorrow. But the gentleman's points are well taken.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would point out if that is the case, we are probably going to be here until 8 or 9 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I just want to associate myself with the ranking member's comments and express appreciation for the majority side in working hard on this. The number of amendments we have agreed to reflects the interest in the bill. It is an important bill, and we are certainly going to thoroughly consider it. I just want to express my appreciation for working out this unanimous consent request.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2863, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2006

Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109–127) on the resolution (H. Res. 315) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2863) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GUTKNECHT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ADMINISTRATION MUST LEVEL WITH AMERICAN PEOPLE ABOUT WAR IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, either the Bush administration refuses to see the reality on the ground in Iraq or they are deceiving the American people as to the continued war in Iraq. During a Memorial Day interview on CNN's Larry King, Vice President CHENEY said he believed the insurgency was in its ''last throes.''

Where exactly is the Vice President getting his information? It certainly is not coming from the generals on the ground. According to a report from Knight-Ridder, a growing number of senior American military officers in Iraq have concluded there is no longer a military solution to the insurgency in Iraq, an insurgency that military leaders on the ground say is not running out of recruits. In the news report, Lt. Colonel Frederick Wellman said, ''We can't kill them all. When I kill one I create three.''

That certainly does not sound like we have the insurgency under control, and, as the Vice President suggests, that they are in their ''last throes.''

Things are really getting so bad in Iraq, Mr. Speaker, that we are beginning finally to hear Republican Congressmen step forward and question some of the outrageous claims made by the Bush administration in regard to their policy in Iraq. This past weekend, my Republican friend, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), came forward and said that the Bush administration needs to have a deadline for its war in Iraq.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) and I have been next-door neighbors in the Cannon House Office Building for years. As visitors to our wing of the fourth floor walk down the hallway, they see the faces of the fallen. Since the beginning of the war, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) has been hanging up the pictures of the brave American soldiers who have died in Iraq. It started right outside his door and spread so quickly that the faces are outside each of the Members' doors of our wing of the Cannon Building.

Another one of our Republican colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), criticized the

Bush administration for not leveling with the American people about the real number of Iraqi troops that have been trained to date.

On Sunday's ''Meet the Press,'' the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) said, ''We can't come back to America and have our people be convinced that the Iraqi troops are prepared to take over when they are not.'' WELDON went on to say that the administration needs to come to grips with the rising insurgency, again an insurgency that Vice President CHENEY refuses to acknowledge.

Mr. Speaker, these are the kinds of statements we have heard for the last year from a large group of my Democratic colleagues. We have been calling on House Republican leaders to hold this administration responsible for its faulty intelligence. We have called on the House Republican leadership to hold this administration accountable for the 20-plus billion dollars spent in Iraq. We have called on the House Republican leadership to call the war leaders at the Pentagon up to Capitol Hill to explain their war strategy. And to this date, the House Republican leadership simply refuses to hold the Bush administration responsible for the way it is conducting the war in Iraq.

It is refreshing to finally hear several Republican colleagues questioning the actions of this administration. However, it simply is not enough. At a time when the Army and Marines are having a difficult time reaching their recruitment goals for the military of the future, at a time when the Bush administration is painting a far rosier picture of the number of Iraqi troops that have been trained, at a time when the Bush administration refuses to admit that the insurgency in Iraq is getting bigger and more difficult to deal with by the day, the House Republican leadership cannot continue to ignore a growing number of Members of this Chamber, of both parties, who are demanding that the administration level with the American people about the Iraq war.

FOUR IDEAS TO IMPROVE RETIREMENT SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, in discussing the collapse of his retirement plan and pension plan, United Airlines pilot Klaus Meyer said, ''I call it legalized crime. I lost almost all my United stock value in the bankruptcy, and another part of the retirement I was promised is gone. And now my Social Security is at risk. Where does it all end?''

Mr. Meyer's statement is a stark reminder of what is at stake as we continue to debate the future of Social Security. The sad fact is that for many Americans retirements are less, not more, secure and any debate about Social Security should be about how to secure its future rather than make it more risky. In fact, the head of the GAO announced that the President's plan would in fact exacerbate the financial stability of Social Security, rather than strengthen it.

The whole task is to do two things: strengthen Social Security for future generations and help Americans save for their retirement. Make no mistake, Social Security and the debate about retirement is key to the future of Americans' retirements. For United Airlines employees, and the steel industry that came before the airline industry, and probably the auto industry that will come after them, Social Security is the linchpin of their retirement security.

□ 1745

Our task before us is how to strengthen both aspects as Americans plan to retire and save for their retirement.

As John Pinto, another United States airline employee put it, ''Social Security is the cornerstone of my retirement.'' That is our task here. Every American is asked to plan for their retirement with personal savings, employment-based savings, and Social Security. Those are the three legs to the stool of any retirement plan and any retirement security. The privatization of Social Security would exacerbate the stability that Social Security has created for millions of Americans as they plan for their retirement.

Benefits for United Airlines employees would be cut up to 40 percent, retirement benefits that they have put money away for, they have saved for, they have done everything that we as a country advocate that they do; 120,000 employees have now been cut up to 40 percent. As I always say, go ask a United Airlines employee what they think of Social Security. They are glad that it is there and they can count on it. It is the linchpin, it is the foundation for all of their retirement security.

Two-thirds of seniors and 40 percent of widows rely on Social Security as their entire retirement plan. It may come as a shock to some, but the American people like the security that comes with Social Security.

A few weeks ago, the President said, ''Those who obstruct reform, no matter what party they are in, will pay a political price.'' Ironically, it is the President's insistence on privatization of Social Security that is slowing the reform and progress we could have in our retirement security. He is, in fact, the reason we are not making progress. Privatization has become the poison pill to progress when we discuss retirement security for Americans.

We need to broaden the debate on privatization of Social Security into a discussion on retirement security. I proposed a series of ideas, Republicans have proposed a series of ideas, Democrats have ideas. If we put away privatization, we can make progress.

I would like to remind everybody that in 1983, when we had the commission that developed and planned for the future of Social Security and gave it security for 75 years, President Ronald Reagan took privatization off the table, and you secured Social Security for 75 years. If you take privatization off the table today, you can secure Social Security for another 75 years, and we can make progress on 401(k)s, employer-based retirement, defined benefit pensions, as well as personal savings. We can do it all. But as long as privatization is on the table, it will become the stumbling block to progress, and the President's insistence is stopping the progress we can make.

Here are the four ideas I have introduced, separate pieces of legislation: Automatic enrollment to 401(k)s. Rather than the pressure being on an employee to line up and sign up for a 401(k), have them automatically enroll, and the pressure is, if you do not want to participate, the onus of responsibility is on you to get out, not in. RR Donnelley, a big corporation in Chicago, Fortune 500, set up automatic enrollment. Participation went up to 92 percent of employees, and the participation rate increased dramatically among basically support staff and others who do not have a retirement plan. Also, you would have the automatic step-up so as you were there longer, your pay went up, the participation in your plan increases.

Direct deposits from your tax refunds into your savings plan. About 100 million Americans get a refund on their tax return. The average tax return is $2,000. When you fill out the 1040, you can decide, do I want $1,000, $750, $2,000 to go to my retirement plan? That is the one day we should organize for retirement security rather than just for consumption. And if you have direct deposit, more Americans would participate.

Third, there is the fully refundable credit for people earning $60,000 or less. The government would match 50 percent on every dollar.

Lastly, we have 16 various different vehicles for retirement savings. You could, in fact, unify that to one single, universal pension and get rid of all of the paperwork that comes with 16 different versions of savings.

Those are just four ideas, but when it comes to retirement security, let us remove privatization from the discussion, secure Social Security and, therefore, secure for Americans and generations to come retirement security and the dignity that comes with Social Security and with retirement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take my Special Order at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

SMART SECURITY AND IRAQ WITHDRAWAL PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, our Constitution states that Members of Congress must be chosen by the people of the United States, and Congress must represent the people of the United States. That means that we as Members of Congress need to listen and need to act when the people speak.

Well, the American people have spoken. The last Gallup poll released earlier this week indicates that the American people are ready for our military forces in Iraq to start coming home. Nearly 60 percent of Americans believe that the U.S. should bring home some or all of our troops from Iraq. Just as revealing, the Gallup poll showed that only 36 percent of Americans support maintaining our current troop levels in Iraq. This is the lowest level of support for the war since it began in March of 2003.

The American people have stated loud and clear where they stand, and their numbers are increasing. They know that the only way to keep our sons and daughters from being killed in Iraq, and the only way to end the death and destruction that occur there every single day, is to begin the process of bringing our troops home. Clearly, the American people are way ahead of Congress on this issue.

Unfortunately, the President of the United States is way behind on the issue of Iraq. We have asked the President to come up with a plan for ending the war. He has not, so we will.

Our efforts to come up with a plan began in January when I introduced legislation calling for the President to begin bringing our troops home. Thirty-five Members of Congress support this legislation. We continued our effort on May 25 when I introduced an amendment to the defense authorization bill calling on the President to create a plan for Iraq. Mr. Speaker, 128 Members of Congress, including five Republicans and one Independent, voted in favor of this sensible amendment.

It is clear that the United States must develop a smarter agenda for Iraq than a continued military occupation, because the 2-year war has left us disturbingly weakened against the true security threats that we face here at home. Let us not forget, Osama bin Laden is still at large, and al Qaeda continues to recruit new members in Iraq and elsewhere every single day. So, we ask the President to create a plan and bring it to the Congress that will bring our troops home. Once they are home, we can secure the U.S. and Iraq for the future, and we can use a smarter resolution, which is a Sensible Multilateral American Response to Terrorism for the 21st Century. It will help us address the threats we face as a Nation.

SMART Security will prevent future acts of terrorism by addressing the root conditions which give rise to terrorism in the first place: poverty, despair, resource scarcity, and lack of educational opportunities, to mention just a few. SMART Security encourages the United States to work with other nations to address the most pressing global issues. SMART Security addresses global crises diplomatically instead of by resorting to armed conflict.

Instead of maintaining a long-term military occupation of Iraq, our future efforts to help the Iraqi people must follow the SMART approach: humanitarian assistance, coordinated with our international allies, to rebuild Iraq's war-torn physical and economic infrastructure.

That is what I mean when I talk about SMART Security. We can defend America by relying on the very best of American values: our commitment to peace and freedom, our compassion for the people of the world, and our capacity for multilateral leadership.

Mr. Speaker, we must follow a smarter approach as we work to help the Iraqi people, which means implementing a plan to end the war in Iraq. I invite the President, I invite all Americans and all Members of Congress, to join in this effort.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FOSSELLA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IMMIGRATION REFORM EMPHASIZING FAMILY VALUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to talk about family values and creating an immigration system that better values families, a system that keeps families strong and, most importantly, keeps them together.

I know the issue of family values is a top priority for the President and for many in this Chamber, but when it comes to the issue of immigration, I am afraid our Nation's efforts to protect families, to keep mothers and fathers, parents and children together has fallen far short.

So let me begin this evening by highlighting an example of the tragic consequences of our failed immigration policies and its disastrous and often destructive affects on hard-working families in my district.

Meet the Benitez family. Rodolfo Benitez is a supervisor at the Civic Opera House's Tower Club. He is a U.S. citizen who works extremely hard so his children in the picture, who are also citizens, can get a good education and can realize all that our country has to offer. They are a great family. They are active and well-liked, respected in their community. And if you ever get a chance to meet Rodolfo, Jr., Brenda, Andrea, and their new baby, Eric, you will quickly realize that they are all we could wish for in children.

But, Mr. Speaker, while this story may appear on the surface to have all the makings of the American dream, our Nation's convoluted immigration laws are making life a nightmare for the Benitez family, because about a year ago, Rodolfo's wife Maria was deported without time to even get her life in order. As the Chicago Tribune wrote, ''Her school-age children, who returned home one day with the panicked question: 'Where's mommy?' ''

As parents, can anyone in this body imagine having to answer that question? Can anyone in this body imagine explaining to these beautiful, young children that their 4-month pregnant mother was being deported 2 days before Mother's Day with barely enough time to kiss her children goodbye? Can you imagine telling your children that they will not have the opportunity to see their new baby brother when he is born, because the Government of the United States and its immigration policy says, we are going to deport her? It is simply heart-wrenching.

But in cities and small towns across our country, there are thousands of families facing the exact same situation as the Benitez family, because too often, our immigration system tears families apart, leaving single parents to fend for themselves and leaving children to grow up without a loving mother or father. Too often their stories are never told, and defenseless children and parents are forced to suffer in silence.

In the case of Mrs. Benitez, we were fortunate enough to get her a temporary visa to return from Mexico to the United States so she could receive proper prenatal care and ensure that there were no complications with her pregnancy, but that visa expires this summer, and, after that, our immigration system, our law enforcement system will take Mrs. Benitez back to Mexico and take her away from her American citizen children and her American citizen husband. Who in this body can say that is right?

No family should ever be faced with these questions. No mother or father should be faced with this pain and anguish. No family should be forced to compromise their values.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask the President and this body not to remove Mrs. Benitez, Maria Benitez, from her American citizen husband, her children, and her community. I respectfully ask that we do everything in our power to allow her the opportunity to remain a full and productive member of the United States of America. For the sake of the Benitez family and for the sake of millions of others in similar situations, let us work in a bipartisan fashion toward a much-needed, comprehensive, family-driven immigration policy in this country, because we need a system that allows people to come out of the shadows and work here legally, safely, and humanely. We need a system that regulates the future flow of workers so that it greatly enhances our border security through a combination of cutting-edge technology, improved cooperation, and increased resources.

□ 1800

We need an immigration system that deals directly with the undocumented who are living, working, and contributing to a better and more dynamic America. We need a system that is tough and enforceable. We need a system that would eliminate the exploitation and abuses that are part of our underground economy.

Mr. Speaker, let us work together to create an immigration system that works for families, works for businesses, works for our community and does not take families like the Benitez family, and I want to reiterate, there are ten of thousands in the United States of America, American citizen husbands and American citizen wives being separated from spouses and from their American citizen children. Let us have real family values. Let us have an immigration system that keeps families united and together.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MARCHANT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

U.S. MILITARY RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION, WHAT IS GOING WRONG?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I can remember what it felt like being here in this Congress as we were first debating the invasion of Iraq. And I remember asking the question, if it did not go well, as the President of the United States and Secretary of Defense said it would, who would assume the long-term burden of security and policing in that country? And I can remember some very respected Members of this Chamber saying to me privately, do not worry, MARCY. You can buy your way to victory over there. You can buy anything you want. You can even buy people. You can even buy troops.

Now, 2 years later we witness daily the results of that arrogance. All the money being handed out, the billions of dollars on the streets, the Iraqi policing force cannot even get up three battalions to defend their own country. We ought to think about that. And filling the gap are our troops, God bless them, wanting to give to our Nation, upholding what this President and Congress has asked them to do, an administration that, in my judgment, has been far too careless and reckless with their lives.

Now we are being told that 160,000 Iraqis have now been trained, and yet all the professionals tell us if you can count three battalions over there that are ready to fight, you are doing well.

So tonight, Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss the disturbing state of recruiting for our U.S. Armed Services, particularly in the United States Army, which is bearing the brunt of that conflict.

The newspapers report this week also that the applications for our Nation's service academies are down all over the country. This is not a good sign for regular order in our military.

While the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force met their recruiting goals just for the month of May, the Army fell woefully short. They were able to bring in just 75 percent of their monthly goal. Their target was 6,700, and they managed to recruit 5,039 young Americans. This is fully 1,661 recruits less than they need and that would meet the Army's goal to maintain their end-strength for this year.

Without any public notice, the U.S. Army lowered its recruiting goals in May, by the way, from 8,050 to 6,700; and I calculate that the Army thus fell 38 percent short of their real recruiting goal. And we ask our services how are they going to meet their ultimate goal for this year. They are currently 39,036 recruits away from hitting their ultimate number. And they have not had a monthly target that exceeded 8,000. So how on Earth do we expect that we can meet the goal of having units that are fully recruited?

In terms of year-to-day mission achieved, the Army Reserve, Army National Guard, Naval Reserve and Marine Corps were all nearly 20 percent below the number needed to achieve their yearly goals. So now we hear that the Army wants to offer an additional enlistment bonus of $40,000 per recruit. And Army Times reports that the Army is proposing a pilot program to provide up to $50,000 for home mortgages for those who sign up for active duty.

I have to tell you, being from a family of Marines and infantrymen, I do not think that the people of this country want to be bought either. There is a code in the military of duty, honor, and country. That is priceless. And to see these kinds of numbers being waved around cuts to the quick for a Member like myself. And throwing more and more money at our college students who are indebted, there is something that seems rather coarse and against the military code of honor that we have all come to respect and what we see the current Department of Defense doing.

I do not fault the young men and women of our country when they balk at joining the Armed Forces this year, be it active duty, Guard or Reserve. This is not what they had been led to believe would happen in Iraq. They have seen over 1,700 Americans perish, 12,861 soldiers terribly wounded. And we have seen 70 daily attacks on average now in Iraq.

And 67 percent of our active duty Army troops have been deployed at least twice since 2001, and 30 percent of our National Guard and 24 percent of our Reserve troops were deployed more than once in the same time frame. This has been so hard on families.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue later this week with additional information on what is happening in our beloved Armed Forces in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the disturbing state of recruiting for the U.S. Armed Services, particularly in the United States Army. Post reports today that applications are down at our nation's service academies as well.

On Friday June 10th, the Department of Defense released the May recruiting and retention statistics for the active and reserve components. These numbers display a negative pattern for certain components of our forces—one that is very distressing to this Member of Congress.

While the Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force met their recruiting goals for the month of May, the Army fell woefully short. They were able to bring in just 75 percent of their monthly goal—5,039 of the target 6,700.

This is a full 1,661 recruits less than the Army needs and means that the Army must to maintain their end-strength for FY 2005. And this percentage is mild compared to what it should have been.

Without any public notice, the U.S. Army lowered its recruiting goals for May from 8,050 to 6,700. Using these numbers, I calculate that the Army would have fallen 38 percent short of their recruiting goal. Thirty-eight percent Mr. Speaker. This raises many, many questions. Why was this target goal lowered with no explanation? How does the Army expect to meet their congressionally mandated end-strength totals in the last four months of this fiscal year?

The Army is currently 39,036 recruits away from hitting this number. That is just under 10,000 new recruits per month. Mr. Speaker, the Army has not recruited this many people in a single month all year. They have not had a monthly target that exceeded 8,000. How on earth do they expect to make this happen?

And this shortfall is just for the active duty component. The Army Reserve recruited 82 percent of their May monthly goal, the Marine Corps Reserve just 88 percent of their monthly goal and the Navy Reserve brought aboard 94 percent of their monthly goal.

This is not a new trend. As of March 31st, four of the Reserve components were still falling significantly short of their recruiting objectives. In terms of year-to-date mission achieved, the Army Reserve, Army National Guard, Naval Reserve and Marine Corps Reserve were all nearly 20 percent below the number needed to achieve their yearly goals. This information should be frightening to every Member of Congress. Not only is the shortfall affecting the active duty components, it is tricking down to our Guard and Reserve as well.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this speaks volumes. So what steps have been taken to increase recruiting for the services?

The Army wants to double the enlistment bonus for certain hard to fill jobs to $40,000 (as reported by USA Today on June 10) and the Army Times reports that the "Army is proposing a pilot program to provide up to $50,000 in home mortgage help for those who sign up for active duty." All this on top of having spent nearly $200 million on positive and upbeat television ads and increased their recruiter pool by 1,000. Moreover, the Army National Guard has announced that they will add another 500 recruiters for a total plus-up of 1,900 (to 4,600) in 2005. The Army Reserve is adding 734 for a total of 1,774.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that simply increasing the number of military recruiters and throwing more and more money in the faces of our nation's high-school and college students is going to solve the recruiting shortfall.

No, we need to dig deep to understand the factors that are causing these shortfalls and address the situation there.

A Congressional Research Service report on this very issue notes that the United States has become embroiled in several major military operations overseas "that have dramatically increased the operations tempo of the military services. This has been especially true in the Army, which has shouldered the bulk of the manpower burden associated with the occupation of Iraq. Additionally, more military personnel have been killed or wounded in Iraq than in any other conflict since the Vietnam War. Many observers have expressed concern that the current operations tempo, and the level of casualties in Iraq, might lead to lower recruiting and retention rates, thereby jeopardizing the vitality of today's all volunteer military."

There cannot be any disagreement that the Global War on Terror (specifically operations in Iraq and Afghanistan) has taken its toll on military recruitment and retention. And I'm not sure that anyone over at the Department of Defense is listening.

I don't fault young men and women when they balk at joining the armed forces this year—be it active duty, guard or reserve. This is not what they had been led to believe would happen in Iraq.

Not when we have seen more than 1,700 Americans perish in Iraq since March of 2003.

Not when 12,861 soldiers have been wounded in action.

Not when last month saw approximately 70 daily attacks by insurgents in Iraq.

Not when 67 percent of Active Duty Army troops have been deployed at least twice between 9/01 and 1/05.

Not when 30 percent of National Guard and 24 percent of Reserve troops were also deployed more than once in that same timeframe.

Not when we are sending troops to Iraq without the best armor, vehicles and equipment possible.

And not when this Administration routinely shortchanges the amount of money we should spend on Veterans in this nation all while mismanaging an unpopular war.

Mr. Speaker, our recruiting problems stem directly from the Administration's poor plan for Iraq. The young men and women in this great nation are not opposed to serving our nation in times of need. We know they are quite willing to sacrifice for the greater good. But I think it is undeniable that they do not believe protecting the oil pipelines by Iraq and unilaterally and preemptively attacking a nation that posed no strategic threat to the United States is a part of the greater good.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CUMMINGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EFFECTS OF ACCUTANE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I come here tonight concerned about drug safety and to speak out to protect our children from the acne drug Accutane. As a legislator, I have called for more restrictions on the distribution and use of this drug, which is known to cause severe birth defects and a form of impulsive behavior and depression in patients taking this drug.

This drug has devastated my family with the loss of our son BJ and more than 268 other families who have lost their young son or daughter while he or she was taking Accutane.

News stories persist concerning the safety of our prescription drugs. When an FDA safety reviewer, Dr. David Graham, testified before the Senate Finance Committee this past winter, he stated, "I would argue that the FDA as currently configured is incapable of protecting America against another Vioxx." He went on to tell the Senate Finance Committee that "there are at least five other drugs on the market today that should be looked at seriously to see whether they should remain on the market." He cited the acne drug Accutane.

Why Accutane? Accutane is the poster child for why we need an independent body to approve and review drug safety. Accutane causes horrendous birth defects and may cause psychiatric disorders such as depression and suicide. It is linked to over 268 suicides, according to the FDA.

A recent study here by Dr. J. Douglas Bremner demonstrates how Accutane affects the brain, possibly causing impulsive behavior due to changes in the orbitofrontal cortex. This is the front part of the brain. This is an area known to cause or mediate depression.

As Dr. Bremner showed us in his study of the brain, there is a decrease in the metabolism of the brain. This chart here is of two PET scans of the same person's brain. The PET scan on your left establishes a baseline for the person before they took Accutane.

Now look at the second PET scan of the same person after 4 months on Accutane. Notice in the first scan before the Accutane the color red representing brain activity in the front part of the brain.

Now, on the second PET scan, the post-Accutane one, notice very little red, representing decreased brain activity in the same person after 4 months on Accutane therapy. Accutane decreases the metabolism in the front part of the brain, the area we know that mediates depression.

Dr. Bremner has concluded that this one patient here, there is a 21 percent decrease in brain metabolism in this patient. This change in the brain only occurred in Accutane patients.

Dr. Bremner performed PET scans on other non-Accutane patients who were taking a different oral antibiotic for acne. None of these patients experienced any brain changes.

Dr. Bremner also found that one-half of his Accutane patients in this study experienced a brain change, those who complained of severe headaches. Is it the excessive dosage found in the current formula of Accutane that is the cause of the change in the brain that we see in this PET scan?

The medical evidence is clear that Accutane causes changes in the brain, and this may be what leads some people to take their lives.

Let us join with Dr. Graham, the Centers for Disease Control, and other health care groups that have expressed strong concerns about the safety of this drug and who have called for Accutane to be withdrawn from the market as far back as 1990.

Let us pull Accutane from the market at least until we have all the answers surrounding this powerful drug. At the very least, the FDA should immediately require a large-scale review and study on the drug's effects on the brain.

Is this change of metabolism we see, that we see here, is it reversible? Will the brain repair itself? What amount or what dose of Accutane is safe? What amount or what dose of Accutane can be safely taken so the human brain is not affected? Has the FDA done enough to protect the American people, especially our young people, from the side effects of Accutane? Has the FDA seriously looked at Dr. Bremner's study and similar studies in animal testing, all of which demonstrate Accutane affects the brain?

It is time to protect our children. It is time to withdraw this drug, Accutane, from the market until all of our important safety questions are fully and completely answered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HIDDEN COSTS OF WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, this evening, I would like to address the subject of the hidden cost of war. The cost of war is always more than anticipated. If all the costs were known prior to beginning a war, fewer wars would be fought. At the beginning, optimism prevails; denial and deception override the concern for the pain and penalties yet to come. Jingoistic patriotism and misplaced militarism too easily silence those who are cautious about the unforeseen expenses and hardships brought on by war. Conveniently forgotten are the goals never achieved by armed conflict and the negative consequences that linger for years. Even some who recognize that the coming war will be costly easily rationalize that the cost will be worth it. Others claim it is unmanly or weak to pursue a negotiated settlement of a political dispute which helps drive the march toward armed conflict.

It has been argued by proponents of modern technological warfare in recent decades that sophisticated weapons greatly reduce the human cost by using a smaller number of troops equipped with smart weapons that minimize battle deaths and collateral damage. This belief has led some to be more willing to enter an armed conflict. The challenge will be deciding whether or not modern weapons actually make war more acceptable and less costly.

So far, the use of sanctions, the misjudgments of resistance to occupation, and unintended consequences reveal that fancy weapons do not guarantee fancy and painless outcomes. Some old-fashioned rules relating to armed conflicts cannot be easily repealed despite the optimism of the shock-and-awe crowd.

It seems that primitive explosive weapons can compete quite effectively with modern technology when the determination exists and guerilla tactics are used. The promised efficiency and the reduced casualties cannot yet be estimated.

Costs are measured differently depending on whether or not a war is defensive or offensive in nature. Costs in each situation may be similar, but are tolerated quite differently. The determination of those defending their homeland frequently is underestimated, making it difficult to calculate cost.

□ 1815

Consider how long the Vietnamese fought and suffered before routing all foreign armies. For 85 years the Iraqis steadfastly have resisted all foreign occupation, and even their previous history indicates that meddling by Western and Christian outsiders in their country would not be tolerated.

Those who fight a defensive war see the costs of the conflict differently. Defenders have the goal of surviving and preserving their homeland, religious culture and their way of life, despite the shortcomings of their prior leaders. Foreigners are seen as a threat. This willingness to defend to the last is especially strong if the entity they fight for affords more stability than a war-torn country.

Hardships can be justified in a defensive war, and uses of resources is more easily justified than in an unpopular, far-away conflict. Motivations are stronger, especially when the cause seems to be truly just and the people are willing to sacrifice for the common goal of survival.

Defensive war provides a higher moral goal, and this idealism exceeds material concerns. In all wars, however, there are profiteers and special interests looking after their own selfish interests. Truly defensive wars never need a draft to recruit troops to fight. Large numbers voluntarily join to face the foreign threat. In a truly defensive war, huge costs in terms of money, lives and property are endured because so much is at stake; total loss of one's country the alternative.

The freer a country is, where the love of liberty is alive and well, the greater the resistance. A free society provides greater economic means to fight than a tyrannical society. For this reason, truly free societies are less likely to be attacked by tyrants, but societies that do not enjoy maximum freedom and economic prosperity still pool together to resist invaders.

A spirit of nationalism brings people together when attacked, as do extreme religious beliefs. The cause of liberty or divine emperor or radical Islam can inspire those willing to fight to the death to stop a foreign occupation. These motivations make the costs and risks necessary and justifiable, where a less popular offensive war will not be tolerated for long.

Idealism inspires a strong defense. Cynicism eventually curtails offensive wars. The costs of offensive war over time is viewed quite differently by the people who must pay. Offensive wars include those that are initiated by one country to seek some advantage over another without provocation. This includes needless intervention in the internal affairs of others and efforts at nation-building, even when well-intentioned.

Offensive war never achieves the high moral ground, in spite of proclamations made by the initiators of the hostilities. Offensive wars eventually fail, but, tragically, only after much pain and suffering. The cost is great and not well accepted by the people who suffer and have nothing to gain. The early calls for patriotism and false claims generate initial support, but the people eventually tire.

At the beginning of an offensive war, the people are supportive because of the justifications given by the government authorities who want the war for ulterior reasons, but the demands to sacrifice liberty at home to promote freedom and democracy abroad ring hollow after the costs and policy shortcomings become evident.

Initially, the positive propaganda easily overwhelms the pain of the small number who must fight and suffer injury. Offensive wars are fought without as much determination as defensive wars. They tend to be less efficient and more political, causing them to linger and drift into stalemate or worse.

In almost all wars, governments use deception about the enemy that needs to be vanquished to gain the support of the people. In our recent history, just since 1941, our government has entirely ignored the requirement that war be fought only after a formal congressional declaration, further setting the stage for disenchantment once the war progresses poorly.

Respect for the truth is easily sacrificed in order to rally the people for the war effort. Professional propagandists, by a coalition of the media and the coalition officials, beat the war drums. The people follow out of fear of being labeled unpatriotic and weak in the defense of our Nation, even when there is no national security threat at all.

Joining in support for the war are the special interest groups that have other agenda to pursue: profits, religious beliefs and partisan political obligations. Ideologues use war to pursue personal ambitions unrelated to national defense and convert the hesitant with promises of spreading democracy, freedom and prosperity. The tools they use are unrestrained state power to force their ideals on others, no matter how unjust it seems to the unfortunate recipients of the preemptive war.

For some, the more chaos, the greater the opportunity to jump in and remake a country or an entire region. At times in history, the opening salvo has been deliberately carried out by the ones anxious to get the war under way, while blaming the opposition for the incident. The deceptions must stir passion for the war through an appeal to patriotism, nationalism, machismo and jingoistic manliness of proving one's self in great feats of battle.

This early support before the first costs are felt is easily achieved. Since

total victory may not come quickly, however, support by the people is gradually lost. When the war is questioned, the ill-conceived justifications for getting involved are reexamined and found to have been distorted. Frequently the people discover they were lied to so that politicians could gain support for a war that had nothing to do with national security.

These discoveries and the disenchantments come first to those directly exposed to danger in the front lines where soldiers die or lose their limbs. Military families and friends bear the burden of grief, while the majority of the citizens still hope the war will end or never affect them directly in any way.

But as the casualties grow, the message of suffering spreads, and the questions remain unanswered concerning the real reason an offensive war was necessary in the first place. Just when the human tragedy becomes evident to a majority of the citizens, other costs become noticeable: Taxes are raised, deficits explode, inflation raises its ugly head, and the standard of living for the average citizen is threatened. The funds for the war, even if immediate taxes are not levied, must come from the domestic economy, and everyone suffers. The economic consequences of the Vietnam War were felt throughout the 1970s and even into the early 1980s.

As the problems mount, the falsehood and distortions on which the war was based become less believable and collectively resented, the government and the politicians who pursued the policy lose credibility. The tragedy, however, is that once the majority discovers the truth, much more time is needed to change the course of events. This is the sad part.

Political leaders who needlessly dragged us into the war cannot and will not admit an error in judgment. In fact, they do the opposite to prove they were right all along. Instead of winding down, the war gets a boost to prove the policy was correct and bring the war to a victorious conclusion. This only motivates the resistance of those fighting the defensive side of the war. More money and more troops must be sacrificed before the policy changes.

Using surrogate foreign troops may seem to cut domestic troop losses in the country starting the war, but will only prolong the agony, suffering and the costs and the increase in the need for even more troops. Withdrawing financial support for the effort is seen as being even more unpatriotic than not having supported the war in the first place.

Support for the troops becomes evident to supporting the flawed policy that led to the mess. No matter how unwise the policy and how inevitable the results, changing course becomes almost impossible for those individuals who promoted the war. This fear of being labeled unpatriotic and not supportive of the troops on the battlefield ironically drives a policy that is more harmful to the troops and costly to the folks at home.

Sometimes it requires a new group of politicians, removed from the original decision-makers who initiated the war to bring about a policy shift. Johnson could not do it in Vietnam, and Nixon did it slowly, awkwardly and not without first expanding the war before agreeing enough was enough.

With the seemingly inevitable delays in altering policy, the results are quite predictable. Costs escalate, and the division between the supporters and nonsupporters widens. This adds to economic problems, while further eroding domestic freedoms, as with all wars.

On occasion, as we have seen in our own country, dissent invites harsh social and legal repercussions. Those who speak out in opposition will not only be ostracized, but may feel the full force of the law coming down on them. Errors in foreign affairs leading to war are hard to reverse, but even if deliberate action does not change the course of events, flawed policies eventually will fail as economic laws will assert themselves.

The more people have faith in and depend upon the state, the more difficult it is to keep the state from initiating wars. If the state is seen as primarily responsible for providing personal and economic security, obedience and dependency becomes a pervasive problem. If the state is limited to protecting liberty and encourages self-reliance and personal responsibility, there is a much better chance for limiting pro-war attitudes. The great danger of war, especially unnecessary war, is that it breeds more dependency while threatening liberty, always allowing the state to grow regardless of existing attitudes before the war.

War unfortunately allows the enemies of liberty to justify the sacrifice of personal freedoms, and the people all too often carelessly sacrifice precisely what they are supposed to be fighting for: freedom. Our revolution was a rare exception. It was one war where the people ended up with more freedom, not less.

Almost every war has an economic component, some more odious than others. Our own Civil War dealt with slavery. The tariffs and economic oppression by the North were also major factors. Remember, only a small number of Southern soldiers personally owned slaves; yet, they were enthusiastic in their opposition to the Northern invasion.

The battles fought in the Middle East since World War I have had a lot to do with securing Arab oil fields for the benefit of Western nations. Not only are wars fought for economic reasons, wars have profound economic consequences for the countries involved, even if one side is spared massive property damage.

The economic consequences of war play a major role in bringing hostilities to an end. The consequences are less tolerated by the citizens of countries whose leaders drag them into offensive and unnecessary wars. The determination to fight on cannot compete with those who see their homeland threatened by foreign invaders.

There is essentially no one, not even among the neoconservative crowd, claiming that the Iraqi war is defensive in nature for America. Early on, this was an attempt to do so, and it was successful to a large degree in convincing the American people that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction and was connected to al Qaeda.

Now the justification for the war is completely different and far less impressive. If the current justification had been used to rally the American people and Congress from the beginning, the war would have been rejected. The fact that we are bogged down in an offensive war makes it quite difficult to extricate ourselves from the mess. Without the enthusiasm that a defensive war generates, prolonging the Iraq War will play havoc with our economy.

The insult of paying for the war, in addition to the fact that the war was not truly necessary, makes the hardship less tolerable. This leads to domestic turmoil as proponents become more vocal in demanding patriotic support and opponents become angrier for the burden they must bear.

□ 1830

So far, the American people have not yet felt the true burden of the cost of this war. Even with over 1,700 deaths and 13,000 wounded, only a small percentage of Americans have suffered directly. But their pain and suffering is growing and more noticeable every day. Taxes have not been raised to pay the bills for the current war, so annual deficits and national debt continues to grow. This helps delay the pain of paying the bills, but the consequences of this process are starting to be felt.

Direct tax increases, a more honest way to finance a foreign interventionism, would serve to restrain those who so cavalierly take us to war. The borrowing authority of governments permit wars to be started and prolonged which otherwise would be resisted if the true cost were known to the people from the beginning.

Americans have an especially unique ability to finance our war efforts while minimizing the immediate effect. As the issuer of the world's reserve currency, we are able to finance our extravagance through inflating our dollars. We have the special privilege of printing that which the world accepts as money in lieu of gold. This is an invitation to economic disaster, permitting an ill-founded foreign policy that sets the stage for problems for years to come. A system of money that politicians and central bankers could not manipulate would restrain those with grandiose ideas of empire.

The Federal Reserve was created in 1913, and shortly thereafter the Fed accommodated the Wilsonians bent on

entering World War I by inflating and deficit-financing that ill-begotten involvement. Though it produced the 1921 depression and many other problems since, the process subsequently has become institutionalized in financing our militarism in the 20th century and already in the 21st.

Without the Fed's ability to create money out of thin air, our government would be severely handicapped in waging wars that do not serve our interests. The money issue and the ability of our government to wage war are intricately related. Anyone interested in curtailing war-time spending and our militarism abroad is obligated to study the monetary system through which our government seductively and surreptitiously finances foreign adventurism without the responsibility of informing the public of its cost or collecting the revenues required to finance the effort.

Being the issuer of the world's premier currency allows a lot more abuse than a country would have otherwise. World businesses, governments, and central banks accept our dollars as if they are as good as gold. This is a remnant of a time when the dollar was as good as gold. This is no longer the case. The trust is still there, but it is misplaced. Since the dollar is simply a paper currency without real value, someday confidence will be lost and our goose will no longer be able to lay the golden egg. That is when reality will set in and the real cost of our extravagance, both domestic and foreign, will be felt by all Americans.

We will no longer be able to finance our war machine through willing foreigners, who now gladly take our newly printed dollars for their newly produced goods, then loan them back to us at below-market rates to support our standard of living and our war effort. The payment by American citizens will come as the dollar loses value, interest rates rise, and prices increase. The higher prices become the tax that a more honest government would have levied directly to pay for the war effort.

An unpopular war, especially, needs this deception as a method of payment, hiding the true costs which are dispersed and delayed through this neat little monetary trick. The real tragedy is that this inflation tax is not evenly distributed among all the people, and more than not is borne disproportionately by the poor and the middle class as a truly regressive tax in the worst sense.

Politicians in Washington do not see inflation as an unfair seductive tax. Our monetary policy, unfortunately, is never challenged, even by the proponents of low taxes who care so little about deficits. But eventually it all comes to an end because economic law overrides the politicians' deceit.

Already we are seeing signs on the horizon that this free ride for us is coming to an end. Price inflation is alive and well and much worse than government statistics show. The sluggish economy suggests that the super stimulation of easy credit over the last decades is no longer sufficient to keep the economy strong. Our personal consumption and government spending are dependent on borrowing from foreign lenders. Artificially high standards of living can mask the debt accumulation that it requires while needed savings remain essentially nil.

The ability to print the reserve currency of the world, and the willingness of foreigners to take it, causes gross distortions in our current account deficits and total foreign indebtedness. It plays a major role in the erosion of our manufacturing base and causes the exporting of our jobs along with our dollars. Bashing foreigners, and particularly the Chinese and the Japanese, as the cause of our dwindling manufacturing and job base is misplaced. It prevents the evaluation of our own policies, policies that undermine and increase the price of our own manufacturing goods while distorting the trade balance.

Though we continue to benefit from the current circumstances through cheap imports on borrowed money, the shaky fundamentals make our economy and financial system vulnerable to sudden and severe adjustments. Foreigners will not finance our excessive standard of living and our expensive war overseas indefinitely. It will end. What we do in the meantime to prepare for that day will make all the difference in the world for the future of freedom in this country. It is the future of freedom in this country that is truly the legitimate responsibility of us as Members of Congress.

Centuries ago, the notion of money introduced the world to trade and the principle of division of labor, ushering in for the first time a level of economic existence above mere subsistence. Modern fiat money, with electronic transactions, has given an additional boost to that prosperity. But unlike sound commodity money, fiat money, with easy credit and artificially low interest rates, causes distortions and malinvestments that require corrections.

The modernization of electronic global transfers, which with sound money would be beneficial, has allowed for greater distortions and debt to be accumulated, setting the stage for a much more serious period of adjustment, requiring an economic downturn, liquidation of debt, and reallocation of resources that must eventually come from savings rather than a central bank printing press.

These economic laws will limit our ability to pursue our foreign intervention no matter how well intentioned and successful they may seem. The Soviet system collapsed on its own weakness. I fear an economic collapse here at home much more than an attack by a foreign country.

Above all, the greatest concern should be for the systematic undermining of our personal liberties since 9/11, which will worsen with an ongoing foreign war and the severe economic problems that are coming. Since we are not fighting the war to defend our homeland, and we abuse so many of our professed principles, we face great difficulties in resolving the growing predicament in which we find ourselves.

Our options are few, and admitting errors in judgment is not likely to occur. Moral forces are against us as we find ourselves imposing our will on a people 6,000 miles from our shore. How would the American people respond if a foreign country, with people of a different color, religion, and language, imposed itself on us to make us conform to their notions of justice and goodness? None of us would sit idly by. This is why those who see themselves as defenders of their homeland and their way of life have the upper hand regardless of the shock-and-awe military power available to us.

At this point, our power works perversely. The stronger and more violent we are, the greater the resistance becomes. The conservatives who took us to war under false pretenses either did not know or did not care about the history and traditions of the Iraqi people. Surely they must have heard of an Islamic defensive jihad that is easy to promote when one's country is being attacked by foreign forces.

Family members have religious obligations to avenge all killing by foreign forces, which explains why killing insurgents only causes their numbers to multiply. This family obligation to seek revenge is closely tied to achieving instant eternal martyrdom through vengeful suicide attacks. Parents of martyrs do not weep, as the parents of our soldiers do. They believe the suicide bombers in their families are glorified. These religious beliefs cannot simply be changed during the war.

The only thing we can do is remove the incentives we give to the religious leaders of the jihad by leaving them alone. Without our presence in the Middle East, whether on the Arabian Peninsula or in Iraq, the rallying cry for suicidal jihadists would ring hollow. Was there any fear of our national security from a domestic terrorist attack by Islamists before we put a base in Saudi Arabia?

Our freedoms here at home have served the interests of those who are hell bent on pursuing an American empire, though this, too, will be limited by economic costs and the undermining of our personal liberties. A free society produces more wealth for more people than any other. That wealth, for many years, can be confiscated to pay for the militarism advocated by those who promote preemptive war.

But militarism and its costs undermine the very market system that provided the necessary resources in the first place. As this happens, productivity and wealth are diminished, putting pressure on the authority to ruthlessly extract even more funds from

the people. For what they cannot collect through taxes, they take through currency inflation, eventually leading to an inability to finance unnecessary and questionable warfare and bringing the process to an end.

It happened to the Soviets, and their military machine collapsed. Hitler destroyed Germany's economy, but he financed his aggression for several years by immediately stealing the gold reserves of every country he occupied. That too was self-limited, and he met his military defeat.

For us, it is less difficult, since we can confiscate the wealth of American citizens and the savers of the world merely by printing more dollars to support our militarism. Though different in detail, we too must face the prospect that this system of financing is seriously flawed and our expensive policy of worldwide interventionism will collapse. Only a profound change in attitudes regarding our foreign policy, our fiscal policy, and our monetary policy will save us from ourselves.

If we did make these changes, we would not need to become isolationists, despite what many claim. Isolationism is not the only alternative to intervention in other nations' affairs. Freedom works. Free markets supported by sound money, private properties, and respect for all voluntary contracts can set an example for the world, since the resulting prosperity would be significant and distributed more widely than any socialist system.

Instead of using force to make others do it our way, our influence could be through the example we set that would motivate others to emulate us. Trade, travel, and exchange of ideas and friendly relationships, with all those who seek friendship, are a far cry from a protectionist closed-border Nation that would serve no one's interest. This type of society would be greatly enhanced with a worldwide commodity standard of money. This would prevent the imbalances that are a great burden to today's economy. Our current account deficits and total foreign indebtedness would not occur under an honest, nonpolitical commodity money. Competitive devaluations and abnormally fixed exchange rates would not be possible as tools of protectionism.

We can be certain that the distortions in the trade balance and the WTO trade wars that are multiplying will eventually lead to a serious challenge to worldwide trade. The tragedy of trade wars is that they frequently lead to military wars between nations. And until the wealth is consumed and the young men are no longer available to fight and die, the process will cost plenty.

We must not forget that real peace and prosperity are available to us. America has a grand tradition in this regard, despite her shortcomings. It is just that in the recent decades the excessive unearned wealth available to us to run our welfare warfare state has distracted us from our important traditions: honoring liberty and emphasizing self-reliance and responsibility. Up until the 20th century, we were much less eager to go around the world searching for dragons to slay. That tradition is a good one and one that we must reconsider before the ideal of personal liberty is completely destroyed.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PAUL. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I have come here tonight, first of all, to commend the gentleman from Texas for these remarks and for his leadership role that he has taken in this regard. I also want to commend our colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), because he feels so badly that he voted for this war and now he has seen what has happened. And certainly the most unfortunate thing has been the more than 1,700 young Americans who have been killed there now, and the some 12,000 who have been wounded, many of them severely wounded, maimed for life, in what was a totally unnecessary war.

I told people before this war started that there was nothing conservative about this war; that it was going to mean massive foreign aid, which conservatives have traditionally been against; that it was going to mean huge deficit spending, which conservatives have traditionally been against.

Lawrence Lindsey, who was the President's leading economic adviser, said before the war started that it would cost $100 billion to $200 billion. Now, by the end of this fiscal year, we are going to be at the astounding figure of $300 billion. And I think the only reason more people are not upset about that is that it is humanly impossible to truly comprehend a figure as high as $300 billion.

□ 1845

Of course Lawrence Lindsey lost his job over that. A few days before we voted on this war back in October of 2002, I was called to the White House with five other Members and was given a briefing by Condoleezza Rice; George Tenet, then head of the CIA; and John McLaughlin, the Deputy Director. I asked about the Lindsey prediction and was told by Ms. Rice, oh, no, the war would not cost near as much.

I asked them if you could get by the traditional conservative view against massive foreign aid and get by the traditional conservative position of being against huge deficit spending, and if you could get past the traditional conservative view that the U.S. should not be the policeman of the world, was there any evidence of any imminent threat?

I was told there was no evidence of any imminent threat, and that was later confirmed the day after Mr. Tenet resigned. He gave a speech at Georgetown and he said he told everyone all along there was no evidence of any imminent threat by Saddam Hussein, who was truly an evil man. I asked at that time meeting at the White House how much Saddam Hussein's total military budget was in regard to ours, in relation to ours, and I was told it was a little over 2/10 of 1 percent of ours.

It just amazed me that we would be considering such a drastic action, and what really impressed me later on, I read in Bob Woodward's book, and the briefing I had was in October 2002. Some 2.5 months later on December 21, the President received that same briefing from Mr. Tenet and Mr. McLaughlin and probably received more information than I did. According to Mr. Woodward, the President's comment was, Is that the best we have? That will never convince Joe Public. And yet we went on to this unnecessary war anyway.

One thing that disturbed me about this also, not as much as the deaths and the woundings, but many people, I think, mistakenly thought this was a conservative war. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) and I are two of the most conservative Members of this House, as is the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HOSTETTLER), another one of our colleagues who voted against the war.

Charlie Reese, a nationally syndicated conservative columnist, who was chosen several years ago as the favorite columnist of C–SPAN viewers, said before the war that it is ludicrous to think that a Third World country like Iraq is a threat to the United States.

He went on to write, ''A U.S. attack on Iraq is a prescription for the decline and fall of the American empire. Overextension, urged on by a bunch of rabid intellectuals who wouldn't know one end of a gun from another, has doomed many an empire. Just let the United States try to occupy the Middle East, which will be the practical result of a war against Iraq, and Americans will be bled dry by the cost in both blood and treasury.''

James Webb, President Reagan's Secretary of the Navy and a Vietnam veteran, wrote a column in the Washington Post strongly opposing this war before it started. He said if we went in, we would be there probably for 30 years.

A professor of international affairs at Sarah Lawrence College wrote in the Washington Post before the war started, ''Initially, a military liberation of Baghdad could unleash joy in the streets of Iraq. But unless the United States is willing to forcefully police the new order for many years to come, Iraq will fracture and descend into chaos, destabilizing its neighbors and giving rise to new jihad groups that will attack Americans. Not only will there be no democracy in Iraq, but U.S. vital interests will be in danger.''

The gentleman mentioned the word ''isolationist'' a few minutes ago. Anyone who opposes any foreign adventure or misadventure is sometimes referred

to as an isolationist. But our policies and actions in Iraq have isolated us almost more than anything else we have done from the rest of the world.

I have traveled in many foreign countries, and in almost every country I have been told 75 to 80 percent of the people have been against the war. Dick Armey, the Republican majority leader at the time we voted on the war, said before the war started, ''I do not believe that America will justifiably make an unprovoked attack on another nation. It would not be consistent with what we have been as a Nation. My own view would be to let him bluster, let him rant and rave all he wants, and let that be a matter between he and his own country. As long as he stays within his own borders, we should not be addressing any attack or resources against him.''

Jack Kemp wrote before the war, ''If there is a lack of sufficient hard evidence that Saddam Hussein has his finger on the trigger of a weapon of mass destruction or is at least taking active steps to use one in the near future, are we prepared to assert the moral and legal authority to invade and conquer Iraq preemptively because we fear Saddam might use a weapon of mass destruction against us if he were able to acquire one? Would the same apply, say, to Pakistan or Iran if we fear the current regimes might fall and Taliban-like regimes take their place? What is the evidence that should cause us to fear Iraq more than Pakistan or Iran in this regard? Do we reserve the right to launch a preemptive war exclusively for ourselves, or might other nations such as India, Pakistan or China be justified in taking similar action on the basis of the fears of other nations? Based on the hard evidence I have seen, I do not believe the administration has made a compelling case for the invasion and occupation of Iraq.''

Georgie Ann Geyer, a nationally syndicated columnist, wrote after the war started, ''Critics of the war against Iraq have said since the beginning of the conflict that Americans, still strangely complacent about overseas wars being waged by a minority in their name, will inevitably come to a point where they will see they have to have a government that provides services at home or one that seeks empire across the globe.'' That seems to be what we are doing in this situation.

President Kennedy said in 1961, ''We must face the fact that the United States is neither omnipotent nor omniscient, that we are only 6 percent of the world's population,'' now 4 percent, ''that we cannot impose our will upon the other 94 percent of mankind, that we cannot right every wrong or reverse every adversity, and therefore, there cannot be an American solution to every world problem.''

I can also tell Members that last year Robert Novak wrote a column and said Republicans all over the country are ''distraught about the U.S. adventure in Iraq.'' He quoted from a speech by Senator ROBERTS, who said, ''We need to restrain our growing messianic instincts, a sort of global social engineering, where the United States feels it is both entitled and obligated to promote democracy, by force, if necessary.''

And of course we know, too, a few days ago that the godfather of conservativism William Buckley came out and said it is time to exit Iraq. A few months before he said if he had known in 2002 what he knows now, he would have opposed the war from the beginning.

It has not been a conservative war from the start. It was totally unfair and unconservative to put the total burden of enforcing U.N. resolutions on our taxpayers and our military. Conservatives have traditionally been the biggest critics of the U.N.

I get back to the word ''isolationists,'' and say we should try to be friends with every nation. I think most of us support helping out during humanitarian crises. We should have trade and cultural and educational exchanges, but we should never go to war except as a very last resort.

Another great, great conservative from many years ago, Senator Robert Taft, wrote, ''No foreign policy can be justified except as a policy devoted to the protection of the liberty of the American people with war only as the last resort and only to preserve that liberty.'' That is the true conservative position. The true conservative position is to put our own country and our own people first, and we are not doing that.

Most of what we have done in Iraq has been massive foreign aid. We have built or rebuilt over 6,000 schools. We have been rebuilding roads, water systems, power plants. We have set up a witness protection program, small business loan program, and even Internet cafes. I know that the soldiers over there are proud of these good things that they have done, but at a time when the Congress, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) and I do not vote to raise the national debt, but the Congress voted recently to raise our national debt to $9 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, it is not going to be many years ago, they talk about 2046, but it is going to be much sooner when we are not going to be able to pay all of our Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid. Every article says Medicare and Medicaid are in worse shape than Social Security. We have guaranteed 44 private pensions through an agency called the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation. We have added on a trillion-dollar prescription drug benefit. There is nobody up here that I have talked to on either side of the aisle who says we are going to be able to pay all of these obligations in the near future.

So what will we do, first we will start printing more money, but that does not work for very long. It is like a ball rolling downhill; it gets faster as it goes along, and then they are going to have to cut benefits. At the most we have 12 or 15 more years probably, and that is at the most.

A few days ago the pensioners of United Airlines woke up, and their pensions had been cut in half. It will not happen that drastically with the government, but that is the kind of future we are facing if we try to take on the obligations of the entire world.

We went into Iraq, and I can tell Members this: In 1998, I voted to give the Iraqi opposition $100 million to start the movement to take out Saddam Hussein. I was convinced that we should have let them fight their own war instead of sending our kids over there to fight and die. I think what we should do now, we should start, and I wish the President would announce a phased and orderly withdrawal. I think he could do this in a very positive way. He could say we have done far more for Iraq than any other nation has done for another in the history of the world. He could point to the $300 billion we have spent there, and he also could refer to the polls showing almost all Iraqis view us as occupiers rather than liberators. Last year in the last poll that the government took, it was 92 percent, and 78 percent in a poll taken by CNN, that the Iraqis view us as occupiers rather than liberators. They do not really appreciate what we have done. They do want our money. This is a country that Newsweek said had a gross domestic product of $65 billion before the war, and we have spent $300 billion in just a couple of years' time.

As I said earlier, some may say this is isolationist, but the truth is the war in Iraq has isolated us from almost everyone except a few foreign policy elitists around the world. When they use thoughtless cliches like we cannot cut and run, or we must stay the course, we should ask, why? Is what we are accomplishing or not accomplishing in Iraq worth one more young American being killed? Would it be worth the life of your son and daughter, I would say to anyone who happens to be listening to this?

Last June about this time I read in the Chicago Tribune a story about a young soldier who had just been killed in Iraq. Just a few days earlier he had called his mother and told her, this is not our war. We should not be here. I can tell Members this: We changed the name of the War Department many years ago to the Department of Defense. We should make it truly a Defense Department once again and bring our troops home.

I can tell Members very few people in this Congress, I do not think anybody in the Congress, really respects and admires the military more than I do, but I believe in national defense. I do not believe in international defense, and if we take on the defense obligations of the entire world, and that is another thing, conservatives have never believed in world government. This is not a conservative war. We should begin a phased, orderly withdrawal and stop

the killing over there. It is such a sad thing, and it is just not worth what we are going through.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) for getting this time tonight and all of his comments.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for participating, and thank him for his leadership, his votes and his energy that he puts in in trying to keep this Congress straight and the budget straight.

I think the points the gentleman made about the issue of whether the conservative position is for the war or against the war is, I think, very appropriate, because too often it is assumed if there is a war going on, the conservative position is you have to promote that war.

□ 1900

As a matter of fact, sometimes I like to think of the term, which is conservative, and that is belief in the Constitution, which is a very conservative view. I believe if we adhered more strictly to the Constitution, we would probably be involved much less so in these kinds of wars.

During the time when this resolution came up, I am on the Committee on International Relations, I offered an amendment to declare war, not that I supported the war nor would I vote for the amendment, but to make the point that if this country, this Congress wants to go to war, they ought to be up front with it and make a declaration of war, decide what we have to do and go and win it. But not one single person voted to declare war. As a matter of fact, it was turned back to me and said, why would I think of bringing up such a frivolous notion about the Constitution and declaration of war? Another Member said, That part of the Constitution is anachronistic. We don't look at that anymore.

Mr. DUNCAN. If the gentleman will yield, just one brief comment. Probably, unfortunately, one of the weakest arguments up here against any legislation is that it is unconstitutional, but it should be the strongest argument.

Mr. PAUL. If we do not use that argument, what good is our oath of office? What good is our oath to our people when we talk to them at home? I think that is our obligation. Sometimes I will take a vote that I am not particularly happy with, but I will do it because I believe I am adhering to my oath of office and believe it is the process that is not correct and we have to change the Constitution if we need to do it. I think this is so important, because I do not think we have the authority in the Constitution to start preemptive war, to go into nation-building and to change regimes. I just cannot see that it is there. I think that has led us to get into these problems since World War II especially.

Of course, I did mention in my prepared text that declaration of war is important but also if we would restrain, as the Constitution does, the monetary authorities from printing money at will to finance wars like this, I think we would be fighting a lot less wars.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for June 7 on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. KAPTUR) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUTIERREZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STUPAK, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PAUL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, June 21.

Mr. FOSSELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, June 15.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 15, 2005, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2324. A letter from the Directors, Congressional Budget Office and Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a joint report on the technical assumptions to be used in preparing estimates of National Defense Function (050) fiscal year 2006 outlay rates and prior year outlays, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 226(a); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2325. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General Donald G. Cook, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2326. A letter from the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Admiral Walter F. Doran, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2327. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology, & Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting information submitted to the Base Closure and Realignment Commission, pursuant to Public Law 101–510, section 2903(c)(6) and 2914(b)(1); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2328. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Australia for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 05–13), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

2329. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment sold commercially to Greece (Transmittal No. DDTC 014–05), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

2330. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting pursuant to Section 23(g) of the Arms Export Control Act (AECA), notification concerning the request for the Goverment of Israel to cash flow finance a Foreign Military Sales (FMS) case for the procurement of repair and maintenance services under a Fleet Modernization Program (FMP) for Pratt & Whitney engines in the Israeli Air Force's F–16I fighter aircraft; to the Committee on International Relations.

2331. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Pursuant to the Anti-Economic Discrimination Act of 1994, part C of Title V, Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995, as amended (Public Law 103–236), the Secretary's determination suspending prohibitions on certain sales and leases under the Anti-Economic Discrimination Act of 1994 and the accompanying Memorandum of Justification; to the Committee on International Relations.

2332. A letter from the Chief Executive Officer, Corporation for National & Community Service, transmitting the Corporation's Report on Final Action as a result of Audits in respect to the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2004 through March 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2333. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Policy, Planning, and Preparedness, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting in accordance with Pub. L. 105–270, the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998 (FAIR Act), the Department's inventory of commerical activities for calendar year 2004; to the Committee on Government Reform.

2334. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's audit covering the period October 1, 2004 through March 31, 2005 and a report providing management's perspective on the implementation status of audit recommendations, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2335. A letter from the Chairman, National Science Board, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General for the period October 1, 2004 through March 31, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2336. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the 2004

Annual Report for the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (OSM), pursuant to 30 U.S.C. 1211(f), 1267(g), and 1295; to the Committee on Resources.

2337. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a petition on behalf of a class of workers from the Iowa Army Ammunition Plant (IAAP) in Burlington, Iowa, to have IAAP added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2338. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; CENTRAIR 101 Series Gliders [Docket No. FAA–2004–19522; Directorate Identifier 2004–CE–36–AD; Amendment 39–14064; AD 2005–08–12] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2339. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC–8–33 and -43 Airplanes; Model DC–8F–54 and DC–8F–55 Airplanes; and Model DC–8–60, -60F, -70, and -70F Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA–2005–20135; Directorate Identifier 2003–NM–231–AD; Amendment 39–14060; AD 2005–08–08] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2340. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Glaser-Dirks Flugzeugbau GmbH Model DG–800B Sailplanes [Docket No. 2003–CE–65–AD; Amendment 39–14065; AD 2005–08–13] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2341. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Limited Models B4–PC11, B4–PC11A, and B4–PC11AF Sailplanes [Docket No. FAA–2004–20006; Directorate Identifier 2004–CE–49–AD; Amendment 39–14059; AD 2005–08–07] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2342. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Model Avro 146–RJ Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA–2005–20078; Directorate Identifier 2004–NM–210–AD; Amendment 39–14068; AD 2005–08–16] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2343. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 707 Airplanes and Model 720 and 720B Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA–2005–20023; Directorate Identifier 2004–NM–49–AD; Amendment 39–14067; AD 2005–08–15] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2344. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; LET a.s. Model Blanik L–13 AC Sailplanes [Docket No. 2003–CE–57–AD; Amendment 39–14066; AD 2005–08–14] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2345. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon Model 800XP Airplanes [Docket No. FAA–2005–20251; Directorate Identifier 2004–NM–164–AD; Amendment 39–14071; AD 2005–09–03] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2346. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9–81(MD–81), DC–9–82 (MD–82), DC–9–83 (MD–83), DC–9–87 (MD–87), and MD–88 Airplanes [Docket No. 2001–NM–293–AD; Amendment 39–14072; AD 2005–09–04] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2347. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737–300, -400, and -500 Airplanes Modified In Accordance With Supplemental Type Certificate (STC) ST00127BO [Docket No. FAA–2004–19891; Directorate Identifier 2004–NM–136–AD; Amendment 39–14006; AD 2005–05–17] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2348. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL–600–2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100 & 440) Airplanes [Docket No. 2001–NM–322–AD; Amendment 39–13221; AD 2003–14–02] (RIN: 2120–AA63) received May 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2349. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca S.A. Arriel 1 Turboshaft Engines [Docket No. 2002–NE–43–AD; Amendment 39–13199; AD 2003–12–14] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2350. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McCauley Propeller Systems, Inc. Propeller Hub Model B5JFR36C1101, C5JFR36C1102, B5JFR36C1103, and C5JFR36C1104, Correction [Docket No. 2003–NE–32–AD; Amendment 39–13285; AD 2003–17–10] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2351. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; International Aero Engines AG (IAE) V2522–A5, V2524–A5, V2527–A5, V2527E-A5, V2527M-A5, V2530–A5, and V2533–A5 Turbofan Engines; Correction [Docket No. 2003–NE–21–AD; Amendment 39–13183; AD 2003–11–23] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2352. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Hartzell Propeller Inc. ()HC-() (2,3) (X,Y) ()—() Series and HA-A2V20–1B Series Propellers with Aluminum Blades; Correction [Docket No. 96–ANE–40–AD; Amendment 39–13212; AD 97–18–02R1] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2353. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL–600–2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100 & 440) Airplanes [Docket No. 2002–NM–100–AD; Amendment 39–13070; AD 2003–04–21 R1] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 19, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2354. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a biennial report on evaluation, research and technical assistance activities supported by ''The Promoting Safe and Stable Families Program,'' pursuant to Public Law 107—133; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 420. A bill to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 109–123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House of the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 38. A bill to designate a portion of the White Salmon River as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (Rept. 109–125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 539. A bill to designate certain National Forest System land in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System; with an amendment (Rept. 109–126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 800. A bill to prohibit civil liability actions from being brought or continued against manufacturers, distributors, dealers, or importers of firearms or ammunition for damages or injunctive or other relief resulting from the misuse of their products by others; with an amendment (Rept. 109–124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 315. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2863) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2006, and for other purposes (Rept. 109–127). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 975. A bill to provide consistent enforcement authority to the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Forest Service to respond to violations of regulations regarding the management, use, and protection of public lands under the jurisdiction of these agencies, and for other purposes (Rept. 109–128 Pt. 1). Order to be printed.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 599. A bill to provide a source of funds to carry out restoration activities on Federal lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 109–129 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 554. A bill to prevent legislative and regulatory functions from being usurped by civil liability actions brought or continued against food manufacturers, marketers, distributors, advertisers, sellers, and trade associations for claims of injury relating to a person's weight gain, obesity, or any health condition associated with weight gain, or obesity; with an amendment (Rept. 109–130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 10. Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States (Rept. 109–131). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on Agriculture discharged from further consideration. H.R. 599 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on Agriculture discharged from further consideration. H.R. 975 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FORD (for himself, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. BARROW, Mrs. MCCARTHY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. BERRY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. HIGGINS):

H.R. 2874. A bill to provide for a program under which postal benefits shall be made available for purposes of certain personal correspondence and other mail matter sent from within the United States to members of the Armed Forces serving on active duty in military operations abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WALDEN of Oregon (for himself and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico):

H.R. 2875. A bill to amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to provide for the conduct of projects that protect forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. REICHERT, Ms. HART, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. POE, Mrs. MALONEY, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. CAPPS, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 2876. A bill to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mr. PLATTS):

H.R. 2877. A bill to provide for the expansion and intensification of efforts for prevention, education, and research activities with respect to Lyme and other tick-borne diseases, including the establishment of a Tick-Borne Diseases Advisory Committee; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CANTOR:

H.R. 2878. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to redesign $1 Federal reserve notes so as to incorporate the preamble to the Constitution of the United States, a list describing the Articles of the Constitution, and a list describing the Amendments to the Constitution, on the reverse side of such notes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 2879. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on P Tolulene Sulfonyl Chloride; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 2880. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 3,3 Dichlorobenzidine Dihydrochloride; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 2881. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on p-Amino Benzamide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 2882. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on p-Cloro Aniline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 2883. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on p-Chloro-o-Nitro Aniline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 2884. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 3 Chloro-4-Methylanine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 2885. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Acetoacet-o-Chloro Anilide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 2886. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Acetoacet-p-Anisidine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 2887. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Alpha Oxy Naphthoic Acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 2888. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Pigment Green 7 Crude, not ready for use as a pigment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 2889. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 1,3 Diamino Isoindoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 2890. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 1,8 Naphthalamide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 2891. A bill to establish a servitude and emancipation archival research clearinghouse in the National Archives; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Ms. HARRIS):

H.R. 2892. A bill to amend section 255 of the National Housing Act to remove the limitation on the number of reverse mortgages that may be insured under the FHA mortgage insurance program for such mortgages; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (for himself, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. MOORE of Kansas):

H.R. 2893. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a nonrefundable credit against income tax liability for gasoline and diesel fuel used in highway vehicles for nonbusiness purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky (for himself, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. CHANDLER, Mrs. NORTHUP, and Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky):

H.R. 2894. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 102 South Walters Avenue in Hodgenville, Kentucky, as the ''Abraham Lincoln Birthplace Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. WEINER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 2895. A bill to reestablish the Office of Noise Abatement and Control in the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCCRERY:

H.R. 2896. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to remove the 100 percent tariff imposed on roasted chicory and other roasted coffee substitutes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCNULTY:

H.R. 2897. A bill to amend title 4, United States Code, to provide for the proper display of the flag over a one-way street; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD:

H.R. 2898. A bill to authorize the Consumer Product Safety Commission to issue a consumer product safety rule to prevent injuries to users of vending machines; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MOORE of Kansas (for himself, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MATHESON, and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 2899. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the credit for producing fuel from a nonconventional source; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 2900. A bill to enable the residents of the Bayshore Manor assisted living facility in Key West, Florida, to continue to receive supplemental security income benefits under title XVI of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. TAUSCHER (for herself, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. REYES, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SNYDER,

Ms. LEE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. BORDALLO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 2901. A bill to provide for the transmission to congressional committees of certain reports pertaining to international human rights law or related laws in connection with military detainees; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WALSH, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FOLEY, Ms. WATSON, Mr. LEACH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mrs. MCCARTHY):

H.J. Res. 54. A joint resolution proclaiming Casimir Pulaski to be an honorary citizen of the United States posthumously; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. ANDREWS):

H. Con. Res. 177. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the crisis regarding the Iranian nuclear program should be primarily resolved through diplomatic means; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. NORWOOD (for himself, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. HALL, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LINDER, and Mr. PICKERING):

H. Con. Res. 178. Concurrent resolution recognizing the need to pursue research into the causes, a treatment, and an eventual cure for idiopathic pulmonary fibrosis, supporting the goals and ideals of National Idiopathic Pulmonary Fibrosis Awareness Week, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. RADANOVICH (for himself, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. DREIER, Mr. WEINER, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SOUDER, Ms. WATSON, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. BRADLEY of New Hampshire, Mr. BASS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. NUNES, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SHAW, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. COSTA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ISSA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. ROYCE):

H. Res. 316. A resolution calling upon the President to ensure that the foreign policy of the United States reflects appropriate understanding and sensitivity concerning issues related to human rights, ethnic cleansing, and genocide documented in the United States record relating to the Armenian Genocide, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. RADANOVICH (for himself, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin):

H. Res. 317. A resolution honoring Lao and Hmong veterans and their refugee families and the 30th year of the end of the Indochina conflict in Laos; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PENCE, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. GOODE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. AKIN, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WAMP, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. TURNER, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas):

H. Res. 318. A resolution supporting responsible fatherhood, promoting marriage, and encouraging greater involvement of fathers in the lives of their children, especially on Father's Day; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. EVANS introduced a bill (H.R. 2902) for the relief of Diana Gecaj Engstrom; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 97: Ms. HARRIS and Mr. MCCAUL of Texas.

H.R. 164: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 226: Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 239: Mr. GOODE, Mr. NORWOOD and Mr. PENCE.

H.R. 269: Mr. HAYES and Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 277: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 282: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. FARR, Mr. CANNON, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. CASE, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. CAMP, and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 283: Mr. COSTA, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. LEE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 303: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 304: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 305: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. CARNAHAN, and Mr. BEAUPREZ.

H.R. 314: Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 414: Mr. WAMP and Ms. SCHWARTZ of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 415: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 438: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 515: Mr. WEINER and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 521: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 534: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 535: Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 567: Mr. DAVIS of Florida.

H.R. 602: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 613: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 625: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 771: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 823: Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 827: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 831: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 874: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 880: Mr. SWEENEY.

H.R. 881: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 887: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 896: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 920: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 930: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, and Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 998: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1000: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 1079: Mr. HAYES.

H.R. 1088: Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 1120: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1139: Mr. ZOE LOFGREN of California.

H.R. 1142: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 1156: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1159: Mr. BEAUPREZ.

H.R. 1175: Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 1200: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. OWENS, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1204: Mr. BACA and Mr. CASTLE.

H.R. 1220: Mr. STRICKLAND and Mr. SALAZAR.

H.R. 1246: Mr. BONNER.

H.R. 1298: Mr. POMEROY, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BARROW, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. MCCOTTER, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. FORD.

H.R. 1299: Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 1345: Mr. GALLEGLY, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1352: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 1355: Mrs. CAPITO.

H.R. 1357: Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 1358: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.R. 1382: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.

H.R. 1402: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1409: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 1425: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mrs. MCCARTHY.

H.R. 1426: Mr. STUPAK and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1449: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 1498: Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan, Mr. COSTA, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1515: Mr. MELANCON and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 1588: Ms. HARMAN and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1602: Mr. BASS.

H.R. 1615: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. FILNER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. EMANUEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1621: Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan.

H.R. 1647: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1748: Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 1770: Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mr. PUTNAM.

H.R. 1772: Miss MCMORRIS.

H.R. 1791: Mr. BERRY and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1804: Mr. AKIN.

H.R. 1814: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SABO, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. EMANUEL.

H.R. 1850: Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 1876: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1955: Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 1973: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 2000: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 2014: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 2062: Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. PETERSON of Pennylvania, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 2063: Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota.
H.R. 2090: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 2106: Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan.
H.R. 2134: Mrs. MALONEY.
H.R. 2206: Mr. SCHWARZ of Michigan and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 2207: Mr. PALLONE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 2238: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 2308: Mr. GOODE.
H.R. 2323: Mr. HONDA and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
H.R. 2327: Mr. RUSH, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. LAHOOD.
H.R. 2343: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 2355: Mr. PUTNAM and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 2363: Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 2391: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 2410: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CROWLEY, and Ms. WATSON.
H.R. 2420: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 2429: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 2471: Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 2513: Mr. AKIN, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 2574: Mr. BEAUPREZ.
H.R. 2588: Mr. CASTLE.
H.R. 2629: Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 2642: Mr. MELANCON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. POMEROY.
H.R. 2647: Mr. RAMSTAD and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2648: Mr. PUTNAM.
H.R. 2671: Mr. REYES.
H.R. 2673: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. CASTLE.
H.R. 2688: Mr. MARKEY and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
H.R. 2693: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. Lee, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 2794: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2804: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
H.R. 2835: Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2840: Mr. BOUCHER and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 2842: Mr. CULBERSON.
H.J. Res. 10: Mr. BOYD, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. CHOCOLA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. FEENEY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. MCCRERY, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. BONO, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. COLE of Oklahoma, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BERRY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. WELLER, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. HOBSON.
H.J. Res. 53: Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. GOODE, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, and Mr. HOEKSTRA.
H. Con. Res. 128: Mr. UPTON, Mr. LYNCH, and Mr. BECERRA.
H. Con. Res. 155: Mr. LANTOS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCCOTTER, and Mr. GERLACH.
H. Con. Res. 172: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. KAPTUR.
H. Res. 52: Mr. REICHERT.
H. Res. 53: Mr. REICHERT.
H. Res. 199: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H. Res. 246: Mr. BERMAN.
H. Res. 297: Mr. UDALL of Colordo.
H. Res. 306: Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. HERSETH. Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. HONDA.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2862

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 22: At the end of the bill (preceding the short title), insert the following:

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 8____. None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading ''OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS—JUSTICE ASSISTANCE'' may be used to fund State or local anti-drug task forces that do not collect, and make publicly available, data as to the racial distribution of convictions made as a result of their operation.

H.R. 2862

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 23: At the end of the bill (preceding the short title), insert the following:

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 8____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to facilitate the issuance of affirmances by single members of the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA) without an accompanying opinion.

H.R. 2862

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 24: Page 55, line 5, after the dollar amount insert ''(increased by $50,100,000)''.

Page 82, line 25, after the dollar amount insert ''(reduced by $50,100,000)''.

H.R. 2862

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

AMENDMENT NO. 25: At the end of the bill (preceding the short title), insert the following:

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 8____. None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading ''STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE'' may be used to assist the patrol of borders of the United States except as authorized by law.

H.R. 2862

OFFERED BY: MR. MORAN OF VIRGINIA

AMENDMENT NO. 26: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO LICENSE EXPORT OF CENTERFIRE 50 CALIBER RIFLES

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay administrative expenses or compensate an officer or employee of the United States in connection with licensing the export of a nonautomatic or semiautomatic rifle capable of firing a center-fire cartridge in 50 caliber, .50 BMG caliber, any other variant of 50 caliber, or any metric equivalent of such calibers, to a country that is not a member country of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or a major non-NATO ally for purposes of section 517 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

H.R. 2862

OFFERED BY: MR. WEINER

AMENDMENT NO. 27: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 8____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by increasing the amount made available for ''OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS—COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES'', and by reducing the amount made available for ''NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION—RESEARCH AND RELATED ACTIVITIES'', by $147,053,848 and $147,053,848, respectively.

H.R. 2862

OFFERED BY: MR. KING OF IOWA

AMENDMENT NO. 28: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title), the following:

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. (a) For expenses necessary for enforcing subsections (a) and (b) of section 642 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373), $1,000,000.

(b) The amount otherwise provided in this Act for ''DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—LEGAL ACTIVITIES—SALARIES AND EXPENSES, GENERAL LEGAL ACTIVITIES'' is hereby reduced by $1,000,000.

H.R. 2862

OFFERED BY: MR. OTTER

AMENDMENT NO. 29: Page 108, after line 7, insert the following:

TITLE VIII—LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY TO DELAY NOTICE OF SEARCH WARRANTS

SEC. 801. Section 3103a of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''may have an adverse result (as defined in section 2705)'' and inserting ''will endanger the life or physical safety of an individual, result in flight from prosecution or the intimidation of a potential witness, or result in the destruction of or tampering with the evidence sought under the warrant''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''a reasonable period'' and all that follows and inserting ''seven calendar days, which period, upon application of the Attorney General, the Deputy Attorney General, or an Associate Attorney General, may thereafter be extended by the court for additional periods of up to 21 calendar days each if the court finds, for each application, reasonable cause to believe that notice of the execution of the warrant will endanger the life or physical safety of an individual, result in flight from prosecution, or result in the destruction of or tampering with the evidence sought under the warrant.''; and

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

''(c) REPORTS.—(1) On a semiannual basis, the Attorney General shall transmit to Congress and make public a report concerning all requests for delays of notice, and for extensions of delays of notice, with respect to warrants under subsection (b).

''(2) Each report under paragraph (1) shall include, with respect to the preceding six-month period—

''(A) the total number of requests for delays of notice with respect to warrants under subsection (b);

''(B) the total number of such requests granted or denied; and

''(C) for each request for delayed notice that was granted, the total number of applications for extensions of the delay of notice

and the total number of such extensions granted or denied.''.

H.R. 2862

OFFERED BY: MR. BAIRD

AMENDMENT NO. 30: Page 12, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 26, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 39, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 39, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 40, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

H.R. 2862

OFFERED BY: MR. MORAN OF VIRGINIA

AMENDMENT NO. 31: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO LICENSE EXPORT OF CENTERFIRE 50 CALIBER RIFLES

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to pay administrative expenses or compensate an officer or employee of the United States in connection with licensing the export of a nonautomatic or semiautomatic rifle capable of firing a center-fire cartridge in 50 caliber, .50 BMG caliber, any other variant of 50 caliber, or any metric equivalent of such calibers, to a country other than Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Greece, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, the United Kingdom, Australia, Argentina, Bahrain, Egypt, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Pakistan, New Zealand, Philippines, the Republic of Korea, or Thailand.

H.R. 2862

OFFERED BY: MR. STEARNS

AMENDMENT NO. 32: Page 22, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 23, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

Page 81, line 19, after both dollar amounts, insert ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

H.R. 2862

OFFERED BY: MR. HAYWORTH

AMENDMENT NO. 33: Page 65, line 20, after the dollar amount insert the following: ''(reduced by $218,000,000)''.

H.R. 2863

OFFERED BY: MR. KUCINICH

AMENDMENT NO. 2: In title IV, under ''Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Army'', insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(decreased by $15,000,000) (increased by $15,000,000)''.

H.R. 2863

OFFERED BY: MR. BLUMENAUER

AMENDMENT NO. 3: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

TITLE X—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 10001. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the transfer, render, or return of any person who is imprisoned, detained, or otherwise held in the custody of a department, agency, or official of the United States Government, or any contractor of any such department or agency, to Algeria, Egypt, Jordan, Libya, Morocco, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey, Yemen, or Uzbekistan.

H.R. 2863

OFFERED BY: MR. DEFAZIO

AMENDMENT NO. 4: Page 117, after line 5, insert the following title:

TITLE X—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 10_____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to initiate military operations that—

(1) are against any country other than a country against which military operations were being carried out as of the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) are not authorized by Congress pursuant to Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

H.R. 2863

OFFERED BY: MR. DEFAZIO

AMENDMENT NO. 5: Page 117, after line 5, insert the following title:

TITLE X—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 10_____. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to carry out military operations that were not in progress as of the date of the enactment of this Act and are not authorized pursuant to Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States or pursuant to the laws of the United States.